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narrative into Katherine’s Vita refers the reader to two unpublished conference papers by
one person, an unpublished dissertation, and an unfortunately unreliable introduction to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 mehr-
fachen Schriftstums in Dantes “Commedia.” (Text und Kontext: Romanische Literaturen
236; black-and-white figures and tables.

A revision of his doctoral dissertation (Berlin, Freie Universität, 1995), Otfrid Lieberknecht’s
Allegorie 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 oppo-
sites, 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 his-
torical 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 con-
ceptualized 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 facili-
tmates 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 Lie-
berknecht’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 ur-
gency. 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 quality (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 scholar-
ship. With references to Auerbach, Saroni, 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 SCHILDEGEN, University of California, Davis

PHILIPPE LOGIE, L’”Enées,” une traduction au risque de l’invention. (Nouvelle Bibli-
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 Enées is a highly crafted and