

ference papers. A critical discussion about dating the incorporation of the mystical marriage narrative into Katherine's *Vita* refers the reader to two unpublished conference papers by one person, an unpublished dissertation, and an unfortunately unreliable introduction to an edition of a life of the saint (p. 107). Elsewhere, primary sources are cited via secondary sources rather than directly—readers interested in a passage on midwives from John Mirk's *Festial* are referred to another book rather than to the original text (p. 147).

Overall, however, this book brings together a wealth of material from sources that are too often overlooked or segregated by discipline. It serves as a useful introduction to the nature of saints' cults in the late Middle Ages in general and as a store of information about the devotees of St. Katherine in particular.

WENDY LARSON, Boston University

OTFRIED LIEBERKNECHT, *Allegorese und Philologie: Überlegungen zum Problem des mehrfachen Schriftsinns in Dantes "Commedia."* (Text und Kontext: Romanische Literaturen und Allgemeine Literaturwissenschaft, 14.) Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1999. Paper. Pp. ix, 256; black-and-white figures and tables.

A revision of his doctoral dissertation (Berlin, Freie Universität, 1995), Otfried Lieberknecht's *Allegorese und Philologie* undertakes a reexamination of the ongoing debate as to whether Dante's *Commedia* should be interpreted as allegorical. Despite the fact that the debate has lost its polemical charge since the 1950s, Lieberknecht argues, this is not because of consensus about the issue. In an effort to combine philological scholarship with the traditions of patristic exegesis—thus the title *Allegorese und Philologie*—Lieberknecht endeavors to answer the question, Can evidence be mounted to demonstrate definitively that the method of patristic medieval exegesis is in accordance with Dante's intention?

Thus the title is meant to synthesize two possible ways of reading Dante, but the leading purpose of this book is not to dichotomize allegory and philology as irreconcilable opposites, even though they are often seen thus in research. Also, they are not presented simply as alternative options for interpretations of Dante's work, that is, the personal positions of critics. Lieberknecht hopes to move both sides toward a profitable consensus/cooperation. This he demonstrates in his study when he links philology, which he identifies with *Quellenforschung*, or investigation of sources, with allegory through the process of historical contextualization.

To answer the question he has posed, Lieberknecht considers the implied or real reader of the *Commedia*. Chapter 1 attempts to modify the common assumption of an average human reader, or ordinary person, from Dante's comments on the allegorical meaning of his text. Lieberknecht argues for an explicitly hierarchically arranged readership, people who read according to their various intellectual abilities. Addressing the problem of the *Letter to Can Grande* and the controversial question of whether the *Commedia* was conceptualized according to the system of multiple exegesis of the Bible, chapter 1 discusses allegory in relationship to Dante's expectation of his audience. Lieberknecht argues that, whether or not the *Letter to Can Grande* is authentic, the question of making meaning through allegory already comes up in the *Convivio*, originally planned in fifteen books and broken off in book 4. In the second book Dante talks about the fourfold interpretative method.

Out of this specific expectation of a type of readership emerge consequences for the understanding of Dante's texts that are taken up in chapter 2. Here Lieberknecht evaluates the role of the science of sources (*Quellenforschung*) in delineating the specific expectations of readers. By sources Lieberknecht means not just generic elements or structures in the text but also intertextual parallels and notations that function to steer the understanding

of the reader. The ability to discern these allusions, references, and intertexts serves to distinguish a versed and a nonversed reader—and, Lieberknecht argues, Dante's text facilitates this process of distinguishing.

Chapter 2, in connection with an overview of previous interpretative approaches in Dante research, also argues for the continuation of the allegorical system of the American Dante scholar Charles Singleton. Singleton, who is recognized as one of the preeminent American Dante scholars of the twentieth century, was the editor and translator of the standard American edition of the *Commedia* (Princeton, N.J., 1970–75) and the author of innumerable essays applying his exegetical approach to Dante's poetry and of the two-volume *Dante Studies* (Cambridge, Mass., 1954 and 1957), all of which are cited in Lieberknecht's book. Singleton put the Bible and the medieval exegetical tradition of the Bible at the center of his allegorical interpretations of the *Commedia*.

In chapter 3 Lieberknecht clarifies this approach and argues for its contemporary urgency. Using cantos 10 and 12 of *Paradiso* to draw out the meanings of the text when intertextual parallels to the Bible are cited, he links the twelve figures of both cantos to the twelve apostles of Luke 6.13. In chapter 3 Lieberknecht attempts to qualify (evaluate) the allusions in order to identify the biblical text but also to limit the inclusion of these texts in the exegetical discourse. These biblical texts, Lieberknecht argues, Dante himself saw as fundamental, and he expected his versed readers to have this knowledge.

Nonetheless, recognizing that writers using biblical commentary traditions have gone to excess in their misrecognition of intertextual parallels, Lieberknecht seeks to rectify this flaw. In chapter 4 he attempts to offer specific examples of source research that take off from Dante's technique of adapting biblical exegesis. The last chapter (5) treats several methodological questions that emerge specifically from the treatment of numbers in the *Commedia*. In harmony with the general orientation of this book, the emphasis here is not on aesthetics but on the role of numbers in the allegorical dimension of the poem.

This book reflects the very best in Germanic philological traditions. In addition, it is thoroughly in dialogue with American Dante scholarship, from which in fact Lieberknecht takes his lead. A brief look at the bibliography will show that the study is steeped in the exegetical traditions of both the patristic and medieval periods. Lieberknecht has explored deeply the medieval commentary tradition on the Bible, combing the huge body of exegesis that is often ignored by scholars, whether in literature or theology. In addition, he has searched the medieval encyclopedias for widely dispersed theories of reading in the period. In fact, the first footnote in the book reveals the specific orientation of his Dante scholarship. With references to Auerbach, Sarolli, Demaray, Scott, Mazzotta, Durling, Armour, Freccero, Schnapp, Auerbach, Singleton, Nardi, and Barolini, he shows his approach is both philological and exegetical. Fully versed in Italian, British, French, and German Dante scholarship, Lieberknecht's bibliography nevertheless clearly reflects the legacy of Charles Singleton in the United States, which, led by such figures as John Freccero and Giuseppe Mazzotta, has created an American school of Dante criticism.

The book also includes an appendix, a bibliography of primary sources, a bibliography of commentaries on and editions of Dante, a bibliography of secondary sources on Dante, and an index of names and of things.

BRENDA DEEN SCHILDGEN, University of California, Davis

PHILIPPE LOGIÉ, *L'Enéas, une traduction au risque de l'invention*. (Nouvelle Bibliothèque du Moyen Age, 48.) Paris: Honoré Champion, 1999. Pp. 507; tables. Distributed outside France by Editions Slatkine, Geneva.

The title of this book suggests an ambivalence toward the medieval rendering of the *Aeneid*. Logié claims to be committed to the notion that the medieval *Enéas* is a highly crafted and