

LE FORME e LA STORIA

Rivista di filologia moderna
n.s. VI (1994), 1-2

Letture dantesche, II

BIBLIOTECA
FACOLTA' DI LETTERE
CATANIA



Rubbettino Editore

UNIVERSITA' DI CATANIA
BIBLIOTECA FACOLTA' DI LETTERE
N. INV.

Robert Hollander

Dante and Cino da Pistoia *

In light of the affection and high degree of visibility lavished upon Cino da Pistoia by Dante in *De vulgari Eloquentia*¹, readers of the *Commedia*, at least those readers who choose to deal with the problem, are properly surprised, even amazed², that Dante makes no mention of his friend³ in the *Commedia*⁴. This study is divided into three parts: brief introductory remarks concerning the relations between the two poets are followed by discussion of two main points: first, that Cino, even if he doesn't figure at all as a character in Dante's cast of vernacular poets in the *Commedia*⁵, does serve significantly as a source for Dante⁶, an argument that will take its focus from a single example; second, that Cino was to have had a highly significant role in the *Paradiso*, but was finally not included because of a falling out between the two poets⁷, a far more hypothetical argument. While the first of these points only requires documentation (and this exists; I hope to have added somewhat to it), the second can perhaps never be documented.

1. *Dante and Cino*

Although anything like certainty in these matters is beyond our reach, the friendship of the two Tuscan poets seems to have had three principal moments⁸. In the first of these, ca. 1283-1291, it was perhaps Cino who responded to Dante's sonnet (the first poem presented in the *Vita Nuova*) describing his vision of Beatrice in the arms of Amore⁹; Dante is likely to have visited Bologna, where he may have gained his first gleanings of the Bolognese *studium*, to which Cino was soon to repair¹⁰; Cino wrote a consolatory poem («Avegna ched el m'aggia più per tempo») for Dante upon the death of Beatrice¹¹. Given the lack of firm data, all that can be said with something

like certainty is that by 1291 Dante and Cino were aware of one another's poetic activity. In the second, ca. 1304-1306, the fellow exiles (Dante the Florentine elsewhere in Italy, Cino the Pistoian in Florence) seem most interested in the craft of poetry, as is evidenced by the ten poems that they exchanged (numbered 175-180 in Marti's collection) and by Dante's third Epistle, «Exulanti Pistoriensi», addressed to Cino. In the third, ca. 1310-1313, it is their support for the Emperor Henry VII which would most closely associate them, if we have no documents that show either of them being aware of the other's involvement in their common cause¹². The two parts of Cino's production, poetry and jurisprudence, are rarely studied under the same aegis or in the same place. This is perhaps understandable, given the diverse nature of the materials involved¹³. However, while Cino's work is split rather neatly into two, a corpus of amatory lyrics with only some political interests (more or less in the same proportion as will later be found in Petrarch's collection of lyrics) and prose commentary of a juridical nature, Dante's is less neatly divided. We may separate love lyric from treatise in Dante as well; however, the *Commedia* blurs any such attempt at distinction. Thus we should attempt to understand the nature of Dante's response to both aspects of Cino's literary production. The first of these has left its mark in the *Commedia* (and still more visibly in Dante's lyrics, as well as in *De vulgari Eloquentia*), the second perhaps only in the *Paradiso*, since Cino finished writing his first juridical treatise no earlier than 1314¹⁴. It is nonetheless possible that, if Dante met Cino when he first visited Bologna in 1287, he may have then become aware of Cino's early and abiding interest in Justinian's codification of Roman law. Giorgio Petrocchi speaks of the certainty of a brief stay in Bologna on Dante's part¹⁵. Chiappelli believes that Cino studied law at Bologna for eight or nine years (the time mandated for this course of study by the Statute of 1252), finishing in 1300¹⁶. Since his response to Dante's sonnet (*Vita Nuova* 3) «A ciascun'alma presa e gentil core» was written ca. 1283 (it must be remembered that Chiappelli was far more assured of Cino's authorship than many are today), Chiappelli is certain that Dante was by that date interested in Cino as fellow poet of love.

It is much more difficult to date his first awareness of Cino the jurist, unless «nomina sunt consequentia rerum» (*VN* 13.4) reflects not only the glosses to the *Corpus iuris civilis*, as Bruno Nardi proposed¹⁷, but also Cino's interest in such things. Nardi points out that while the phrase, in one form or another, seems to be a commonplace of the schools of Roman law, he has not found it among grammarians, logicians, or others¹⁸. Domenico

De Robertis argues that the phrase does not serve as a source for Dante, claiming that it was too generally current to require any awareness of a particular source on Dante's part¹⁹. Whether or not the phrase points to Cino as a potential source, it may well reflect an awareness of Roman law gained from a proximity to the *studium* at Bologna. Whatever we may eventually come to know about their actual meetings and literary communications, the one thing we should probably be most concerned to understand is that Cino, whether or not he was indeed the younger of the two, knew he was the lesser, and behaved accordingly. Nonetheless, the relations between the two young poets show elements of reciprocity. It is to some extent the more obvious nature of Cino's debt to Dante, to some extent Dante's rather magisterial treatment of the younger poet in *De vulgari Eloquentia* that have led so many to treat the relationship as one best described as centered in Cino's dependence upon the work of Dante²⁰. It makes more sense to understand that each responded to the other, if Dante was clearly the dominant figure. Cino was, after all, the only other poet who, by almost any measure, had come close to expressing the special nature of Dante's love for Beatrice. His canzone on the occasion of her death («Avegna ched el m'aggia più per tempo»²¹) is clearly reminiscent of Dante's lyrics for his lady²². The *consolatoria* is ample proof of Cino's intense involvement with Dante's texts; we can only imagine how gratefully Dante might have received and read the poem, which has the merit of supporting the notion that the God of Beatrice (and of Dante) is not Amore but «Dio, lo signor verace» (v. 75)²³. And it was Cino who, beginning in 1310, had joined forces with Henry VII in ways that were even more significantly involved in the imperial cause than those that marked Dante's adhesion to it²⁴. In short, the careers of the two poets during the twenty-three years that spanned the death of Beatrice and that of Henry show remarkably similar concerns and allegiances. We may only speculate on what Dante thought of Cino's eventual worth as poet and thinker; we must acknowledge that his view of Beatrice and his honoring of Dante made him as «poetically correct»²⁵ as his view of the Emperor must have made him, in Dante's eyes, politically so.

2. Guido and Cino and Dante: *Inferno* 10.63

Nearly all the studies of the relationship between the two friends are devoted to the influence of the greater poet upon Cino²⁶. Yet it seems in-

creasingly clear that the relationship was a complex and reciprocal one²⁷. In what follows I want first to return to one of the most over-studied verses of the *Commedia*, «forse cui Guido vostro ebbe a disdegno», *Inferno* 10.63, for it reflects, as has rarely been noted (and only once meaningfully-- by Guglielmo Gorni) a text of Cino's. In my opinion, it does so in ways that clarify the meaning of the *crux interpretum* that it contains and also shed light on Dante's relationship to the shade of Guido Cavalcanti and to the living presence of Cino da Pistoia in the first decade of the fourteenth century. Before addressing Cino's text, let us remind ourselves of the problems presented by Dante's. Cavalcante de' Cavalcanti speaks and Dante answers (*Inferno* 10.58-63):

piangendo disse: «Se per questo loco
carcere vai per altezza d'ingegno,
mio figlio ov'è? e perché non è teco?»
E io a lui: «Da me stesso non vegno:
colui ch'attende là per qui mi mena,
forse cui Guido vostro ebbe a disdegno».

The history of the problem has been treated completely enough so that both writer and reader may here be spared it. Cassata and Cerisola will serve well anyone who wishes to become acquainted with the various arguments concerning the last of these verses that have been made during the past hundred years²⁸. Indeed, exegetes during the first five hundred and fifty years of the verse's history were not aware of the problem, so widely and variously addressed in the past century and a quarter, involving the reference of the pronoun *cui*. As is generally acknowledged, it was only in 1870 that Francesco D'Ovidio first suggested that the *cui* of verse 63 did not simply refer to Virgil, but to Virgil as symbol of Reason illumined by Faith (D'Ovidio was to change his mind several times before he died in 1925, finally returning to the notion that the pronoun referred to Virgil as author of the *Aeneid*²⁹). Until 1870 everyone who discussed the verse, apparently motivated by the greater grammatical usualness of *cui* as accusative³⁰, simply said that the reference was to Virgil. Facing so unanimous an opinion, the modern interpreter should tread softly. However, the problem hidden in the apparent unanimity of the commentary tradition is that it is in fact extraordinarily garbled. For if all agree that it is Virgil whom Guido held in disdain, there is little by way either of cogent argument as to why this should have been true or of anything like a common understanding as to what this disdained Virgil should be un-

derstood to represent. The following is an abbreviated review of the principal interpretations³¹: (1) Dante derived his poem from Virgil, while Cavalcanti did not know Virgil's text and thus could not write such a poem (Iacopo della Lana); (2) Cavalcanti held the «scientias poeticas» in derision (Guido da Pisa); (3) Guido was more a philosopher than a poet, as is evidenced by the fact that one of his love songs («Donna me prega») was so profound that Aegidius Romanus and Dino del Garbo wrote commentaries upon it (Benvenuto da Imola, whose basic view — an expansion, perhaps, of the formulation offered by Guido da Pisa — found more takers than anyone else's³²; this formulation is followed by Francesco da Buti, the Anonimo Fiorentino, Giovanni da Serravalle, Vellutello, Landino, Daniello, Castelvetro [who repeats the assertion, but denies that it is true], Venturi, Portirelli, and Di Siena, who, in 1867, explicitly cites Benvenuto's argument); (4) the first interesting variant among such formulations is found in Paolo Costa (1819): Cavalcanti did not like epic; (5) literally what is meant is that Guido did not appreciate either the elegance of classical style or the study of the classics as much as Dante did, as is evident from «Donna me prega» (characterized by this commentator as a «guazzabuglio» — a hodgepodge); allegorically, Virgil's natural and political philosophy were, respectively, religious and Ghibelline, while Guido was not very religious and a Guelph (Tommaso); (6) a second negation of the earlier arguments (after Castelvetro's) claimed that all of them seemed incorrect, that perhaps all we should understand is that Guido did not approve of Latin as a poetic language (Bianchi); this argument is taken one step further by an acerbic Scartazzini, who impatiently observes that all we can say is that, in Dante's view, Guido did not care for Virgil, but that we have no clue as to the reason for such disdain. It is only with D'Ovidio's intervention, as we have observed, that the direction of the commentary tradition began to change.

In the last 120 years other possibilities have made their way forward. Among those who have turned aside from Virgil as the object of Guido's disdain, Beatrice has garnered the vast majority of votes, if a few have followed Pio Rajna's choice of God. (The major problem with this interpretation remains that Virgil does not lead Dante to God but to Beatrice)³³. It seems to me that the most reasonable solution of the problem is to conclude that *cui* refers to Beatrice. This is to return to Antonino Pagliaro's solution without embracing his probative arguments³⁴. I offer the following summary of the several most debated questions occasioned by the infamously puzzling verse³⁵ along with brief answers to them, not so much because I

hope to convince anyone who does not agree with me thereby, but only to be clear about my own positions.

1) What or who was the object of Guido's disdain and why? Beatrice, when Guido criticized Dante for «theologizing» her ³⁶.

2) What does the adverb *forse* modify, *mena* or *cui*? It modifies the verb; it is Dante's gesture of humility in the face of the astounding promise that, although still a mortal, he will experience a journey to heaven. That this is the probable solution is underlined by his similarly deferential statement to Brunetto, when he refers to the predictions concerning his future life he has heard from Farinata and Brunetto as texts to be glossed by a lady, *if* he but reach her («s'a lei arrivo») ³⁷.

3) What is the force of the *passato remoto* of the verb *avere* ³⁸? Dante's *ebbe* either refers to the fact that Guido's «disdain» for Beatrice has ceased because she is now dead (and thus beyond the reach of the scorn of the living Guido ³⁹), or because, at a certain point after her death, Guido and Dante disagreed about the appropriateness of writing of her. About this particular there has been much debate. How could Dante think Guido held the actual woman Beatrice in disdain? The best answers to this question have been offered by Gianfranco Contini and Francesco Mazzoni: the «historical» Beatrice, even after her death, is still an «analogy» for a higher presence, and is thus a different kind of woman than such as Guido wanted to celebrate ⁴⁰. And, if Dante's *cui* refers to Beatrice, as I believe it does, I think the eventual reasons for Guido's disdain are best discovered in a sonnet written to Guido by Cino da Pistoia, «Qua' son le cose vostre ch'io vi tolgo?».

Discussion of the presence of Cino in current studies of the *Commedia* is not extensive. Marti's fairly dense and certainly careful annotations of the 186 poems attributed to Cino ⁴¹ (some twenty are «crime dubbie») are a helpful source of reflections of Dante's *Rime* and *Vita Nuova* in Cino's lyrics, but offer, naturally enough, far fewer citations of Cino in the *Commedia*. There are, on the other hand, many lexical and stylistic parallels drawn between elements of Cino's lyrics and passages in the *Commedia*. It is important to know, since there are dozens and dozens of these rapprochements, that Marti, in this respect, carefully avoids any discussions of «influence» or citation. He is only observing, in good philological practice, illuminating parallels. E.g., the use of the word «novella» (Cino, 39.55) to mean «discourse, conversation», which is also attested by *Inf.* 25.38 ⁴². This example may stand for all, or nearly all, of the lengthy list gleaned from his pages and which is presented here as a convenience ⁴³. More to the point, with re-

spect to the purpose of this investigation, are moments in which Marti perceives a relationship between Cino and the Dante of the *Commedia*. Here there are some interesting confrontations that lead to another kind of speculation. The entire problem is made more vexatious by our lack of certain dates for many of Cino's lyrics. Thus, if we find what seems to be a resonance of one poet in the other's verse, which one was borrowing from the other? In the following table the reader will find a fairly full indication of the status of the question as Marti and others have presented it (arrows between elements indicate Marti's sense of which is the influential text; question marks indicate his less certain judgments):

- 4.12: «or si parrà chi ha 'n sé nobilitate» → «qui si parrà la tua nobilitate» (*Inf.* 2.9);
- 4.14: «sì li abella» →? «secondo che v'abbella» (*Par.* 26.132);
- 5.7: «ch'io traggà del mio cor ciò ch'io canto» → «io mi son un che quando...» (*Purg.* 24.52-54) ⁴⁴;
- 21.7: «viltà» →? «viltate» (*Inf.* 2.45) = «virtute stanca» (*Inf.* 2.130);
- 46.23-24: «astioso... invidia» → «astio... invidia» (*Purg.* 6.20);
- 60.4: «de la sua virtù non è possente» →? «guarda la mia virtù s'ell'è possente» (*Inf.* 2.11);
- 64.7: «e soverrebbe a voi del mio dolore» → «sovenha vos a temps de ma dolor» (*Purg.* 26.147);
- 90.78: «'l gran piacer ch'Amor mi mosse» → «Amor mi mosse, che mi fa parlare» (*Inf.* 2.72) [here Brugnolo would add 17.11: «questa donna gentil che 'l fa parlare»];
- 114.10: «del suo dolor, che sì mi punge amaro» →? «e tanto più dolor che punge a guai» (*Inf.* 5.3);
- 136a.1 (Onesto da Bologna to Cino): «se ben v'adocchio» → «se ben t'adocchio» (*Inf.* 29.138);
- 137.2: «Amor che pur m'offende» ← «Amor... prese costui... e 'l modo ancor m'offende» (*Inf.* 5.100-102);
- 152.9: «tutto 'l mondo conven star coverto» ← il mondo «di malizia gravido e coverto» (*Purg.* 16.60);
- 160.9-11: «di cui dottar degg'io parlando / d'Amor? che dal suo spirito procede, / che parla in me, ciò ch'io dico rimando» ←? «io mi son un che quando...» (*Purg.* 24.52-54);
- 163.8-9: «lume... come» ←? «come... lume» (*Inf.* 10.67, 69);
- 164.2: «drieto a lo stil del nostro ragionare» ← «di qua dal dolce stil /

- novo ch'Y' odo» e «non vede più da l'uno a l'altro stilo» (*Purg.* 24.57, 62);
- 164.5-6: «quella fonte, / ne la cui acqua si potea specchiare» ← «e quella fonte, / che spandi di parlar sì largo fiume» (*Inf.* 2.79-80);
- 164.8: «nel dritto segno» ← «per dritto segno» (*Par.* 11.120);
- 164.11: «quest'anima bivolca» ← «a seminar qua giù buone bobolce» (*Par.* 23.132);
- 164.14: «amorosi dubî» ← «i pensieri dubi» (*Par.* 28.97) or «dubbiosi dsiri» (*Inf.* 5.120);
- 164.22: «dolce lingua» ← «mia lingua» (*Inf.* 15.87) or «da gloria de la lingua» (*Purg.* 11.98);
- 164.22: «latini» ← «l' discreto latin» (*Par.* 12.144,) or «con preciso / latin» (*Par.* 17.35);
- 164.30: «ha ben di lungi al becco l'erba» ← «ma lungi fia dal becco l'erba» (*Inf.* 15.72);
- 164.36: «al tuo tesoro» ← «quivi si vive e gode del tesoro» (*Par.* 23.133);
- 164.37: «degnà per gran loda» ← «degne lode» (*Par.* 20.36);
- 164.38: «per vendetta» ← «vendetta di Dio» (*Inf.* 14.16; *Purg.* 33.36);
- 170.12: «gran foco nasce di poca favilla» ← «parva favilla gran fiamma secunda» (*Par.* 1.34);
- 186.5: «Sordello» ← (*Purg.* 6).

It should be pointed out that the poem numbered 164 is the elegiac salute to Dante, written, one supposes, ca. 1321. It is an excellent benchmark against which to measure Cino's other textual citations. Never else is he as openly involved in the text of the *Commedia* as here. The obviousness of the citations sets into relief not only the relative sparseness of these in most of Cino's other poems, but the similar lack of evident citation of Cino by Dante in the *Commedia*. Nonetheless, it is also clear that a good deal more time and energy have gone into seeking out Cino's citations of Dante than into discovering the extent of Dante's debt to Cino. Contini (or De Robertis, whose notes Contini depends upon) seems to privilege unnecessarily Cino's debt to Dante over that to Cavalcanti; he is also chary in his citations of Cino in Dante:

- 47.2,9: «doneava... donear» →? «donnea» (*Par.* 24.118; 27.88);
- 56.15: «loda vera Iddio» ← «Beatrice, loda di Dio vera» (*Inf.* 2.103);
- 117.12: «novo tormenta» ← «novi tormenti e novi tormentati» (*Inf.* 6.4);
- 131.9: «artista» →? «artista»⁴⁵;

- 163.8-9: «dume... come» ← «come... lume» (*Inf.* 10.67, 69)⁴⁶;
- 163.36: «nel beato regno» ← «al beato regno» (*Par.* 1.23);
- 164.8: «dritto segno» ← «per dritto segno» (*Par.* 11.120);
- 164.11: «bivolca» → «buane bobolce» (*Par.* 23.132);
- 164.14: «amorosi dubî» ← «i pensier dubi» (*Par.* 28.97);
- 164.30: «ha ben di lungi al becco l'erba» ← «ma lungi fia dal becco l'erba» (*Inf.* 15.72)⁴⁷.

The record of Dante's commentators' response to the question of Dante's interest in Cino as reflected in the *Commedia* is also of interest. Of the 44 currently consultable in the Dartmouth Dante Project, only 25 even mention Cino (a total of 94 times in all). Among the early commentators only the Ottimo and the Anonimo Fiorentino (it must be remembered that Francesco da Buti has not yet been included in the DDP) even mention him, and then only once (although the Ottimo, to *Purg.* 30.121-123, does give some sense of Cino's potential importance for Dante as celebrant of Beatrice). While Lombardi, Portirelli (a close follower of Lombardi), and Tommaseo all mention Cino three times, Gregorio di Siena was the first commentator to pay significant attention to Cino in Dante (nine references to Cino in his commentary to *Inferno*), and Torraca remains the commentator most concerned with Cino's presence in Dante (15 references and a number of citations, as will be seen momentarily), if Bosco/Reggio (13 references) also evince significant interest. Some sense of the presence of Cino as potential source for the *Commedia* in the commentary tradition may be gleaned from the following table:

- 30.10: «in disdegno» → «in disdegno» (*Inf.* 14.70); Torraca;
- 35.4: «rignardo» → «rignardo» (*Inf.* 11.12); Torraca;
- 56.15: «loda vero Iddio» ← «loda di Dio vera» (*Inf.* 2.103); Bosco/Reggio, more emphatically than Contini (see above)⁴⁸;
- 64.14: «quando davanti passo» → «lor passeggiare anzi» (*Purg.* 31.30); Grandgent⁴⁹;
- 68.9-10: «mi pianse ogni pensiero / ne la mente dogliosa» → «n tutti suoi pensier piange e s'attrista» (*Inf.* 1.57); Torraca (followed by Scartazzini/Vandelli and Sapegno);
- 80.6: «tostamente» → «tostamente» (*Inf.* 23.22, where it is a hapax); Casini/Barbi;
- 102.20-21: «saetta... ferrata... di... piacere» → «ferrati avean li strali» (*Inf.* 29.44); Tommaseo⁵⁰;

- 110.28: «ben faria — e mercè chi m'ancidesse» → «mercedis» (*Inf.* 4.34); Lombardi, Portirelli;
 118.41-42: «Selvaggia, ciò è strana / d'ogni pietà» → «selvaggia» (*Purg.* 2.52); Torraca, Casini/Barbi;
 118.61: «'l diritto segno» → «per dritto segno» (*Par.* 11.120); Torraca⁵¹.

Whatever we may eventually come to know about this matter, it even now seems that Cino's poems were more on Dante's mind as he wrote the *Commedia* than is presently acknowledged⁵². And one instance of Cino's effect on Dante is, if only recently, nonetheless finally, pellucidly clear; at least one of Cino's sonnets, reflecting his difficult relationship with Cavalcanti, was of considerable interest to the greater poet. It is an early poem, composed almost certainly before 1300 and addressed to Guido Cavalcanti⁵³:

Qua' san le cose vostre ch'io vi tolgo,
 Guido, che fate di me sì vil ladro?
 Certo bel tanto volentier ricolgo
 ma furne vostro mai nessun leggiadro?
 Guardate ben, ch'è ogni carta volgo:
 se dite il vero, l' non sarò bugiadro.
 Queste cose mie, dov'io le sciolgo,
 ben le sa Amore, innanzi a cui le squadro.
 Ciò è palese: ch'io non sono artista,
 nè cuopio mia ignoranza con disdegno,
 ancor che 'l mondo guardi pura vista;
 ma sono un uomo così di basso 'ngegno
 che vo piangendo, tant'ho l'anima trista,
 per un cue, lasso, ch'è fuor d'asta regno.

[What are these things of yours I take from you,
 Guido, that you make of me so vile a thief?
 To be sure I am glad to assemble fair poetic speech,
 but was none of yours ever pretty?
 Pay close attention, for I am turning over every page;
 if you but tell the truth, then I am not a liar.
 Where I set loose these little things of mine
 Love knows very well, before whom I deploy them.
 That I am no artist is plain to see,
 nor do I hide my ignorance behind contempt,
 as is clear from but a superficial glance;
 for I am such a one, of lowly genius,

who go forth weeping, so sad a soul have I,
 for a heart, alas, that is outside this [realm].

Cino's complaint is that Guido has accused him of poetic theft. And while he accepts some responsibility, as a working poet, for knowledge of his accuser's texts⁵⁴, he absolutely denies the role of inspiration to Guido (or any other human agent), suggesting, rather, that only the god of Love knows his source of inspiration⁵⁵.

What, for a Dantist, is astounding about this sonnet is that it has had so little notice as a source for several passages in the *Commedia*, especially in the tenth canto of the *Inferno*⁵⁶. In this subject our best guide is Guglielmo Gorni. His «Cino "vil ladro"» is the most attentive study of the sonnet that has yet appeared and is also convincing in its demonstration that the author of the *Commedia* was conversant with it⁵⁷. Gorni offers a convincing suggestion that Dante is thinking of the *ladro* of verse 2 in *Inf.* 24.138 and 25.1-3, where he portrays Vanni Fucci, another Pistoian, in language that is borrowed from Cino's poem⁵⁸. The echo of «a cui le squadro» in «a te le squadro» is evident enough to have been heard before⁵⁹.

The bulk of Gorni's essay (pp. 129-135) is devoted to showing that the sonnet is filled with reminiscences of Guido's and Dante's earlier poems. In his words, «not a word in the sonnet is innocent» (a perhaps forgivable overstatement in light of the lack of attention previously paid the allusiveness of the sonnet — p. 131). Gorni is also the first to insist (p. 134) that the phrases «con disdegno» and «di basso 'ngegno» are consciously reflected by Dante in *Inferno* 10, although Isidoro Del Lungo had said almost as much over a century ago⁶⁰. Not only does Dante involve himself with the sonnet in *Inferno* 24 and 25, he surely seems to have it in mind as he defines the *dolce stil novo* in *Purgatorio* 24.52-54. That passage seems specifically mindful of Cino's way of describing his authorial independence from Cavalcantian poetic models: «ma sono un uomo... che vo piangendo» — a formulation that reflects Cavalcantian verse⁶¹ — may be the closest single potential model which we can find for Dante's «l' mi son un che... vo significando»⁶². Further, in these passages both poets also assert that Amore is the source of their poetry's significance, at least that they themselves, unlike the self-conscious *faber*, Guido, are not. While one must be aware of the conventional nature of such claims in some poets, from the vantage point of the poet of the *Commedia*, who makes his claim for higher inspiration in far more serious and disturbing ways, Cino may have seemed more of an ally than even he intend-

ed to be. I think Dante, by the time he is writing the *Commedia*, has a far higher definition of «Amore» than Cino ever divined; I also believe it possible that he contrived to think of both of them as once having practiced a similar kind of poetry of praise.

As I need hardly remark, this study touches on a number of continuing problems in our understanding of Dante in relation to his vernacular predecessors; yet perhaps none is so intimidating as that generated from the questions raised by the meaning of Bonagiunta's phrase «dolce stil novo» (*Purgatorio* 24.57) and the resultant question of who is to be included — in Dante's mind — in this «school». To speak bluntly, the traditional understanding is so vague, indicating those who wrote under the aegis of the «god of Love», hence, almost any poet Dante ever seems to have praised (e.g., Cino, Guido Cavalcanti, Guido Guinizelli, Lapo Gianni [Lippo Paschi de' Bardi? ⁵³], Dino Frescobaldi, Gianni Alfani) are some of the more frequently named candidates, more or less in descending order of frequency ⁵⁴). Some *danisti* tend to speak of the school as though it actually existed, as though it had not been an invention (even a fabrication?) of Dante's own devising ⁵⁵. It is interesting to see how the commentary tradition has dealt with the question of the canon of *dolcestilnovisti*. First of all, the question does not really arise until the very end of the eighteenth century, with Lombardi. He includes Guido Cavalcanti and Cino da Pistoia as the other probable members, allowing for the addition of still others, as will many a later commentator: e.g., Portirelli, Tommaseo, Bianchi, Scartazzini, Torraca, Mestica, Trucchi, Porena, Sapegno, Giacalone, Bosco/Reggio. If Guido and Cino are constants in this representative sampling of the dozen commentators in the DDP who do, in response to *Purgatorio* 24.55-57, make their choices know, Lapo Gianni is also mentioned by five of them, Guinizelli by three. What nearly all have failed to understand is how radically exclusive Dante intended the «school» to be ⁵⁶; one of poets inspired not by Amore but by God himself ⁵⁷. If Dante is here intimating that his new style is the humble, vernacular, Christian poetry that counters and supersedes all previous vernacular love poetry, it is clear that very few other Italian poets are meant to be included — and surely not Cavalcanti. The only other poet I think he certainly meant to include by the phrase «le vostre penne» (*Purgatorio* 24.58) was Cino (if there were others in his mind, they were more likely to have been followers than contemporaries or precursors) ⁵⁸. Should the present study succeed in promoting any acceptance for its general view of Cino's impor-

rance for Dante, it may also help resolve that crux, if Cino is perceived as the prime reason for the plurality of Bonagiunta's *penne*.

Since our concern is particularly with the tenth canto and its relation to Cino's sonnet to Guido, we should attempt to see how that poem fits into the larger picture of Dante's treatment of Guido Cavalcanti. For Dante, at some point in the course of creating the structuring prose of the *Vita Nuova*, it would seem that his first friend was eclipsed as the nurturing source for his poetry. This is seen in the texts of the poems themselves when Guinizelli becomes the model for the style of praise that, in a real sense, takes away Guido's role as poetic father (or, better, elder brother). There is little indication that the «first friend» ⁵⁹ has this privileged personal relationship no longer, only that his poetic path is no longer that of Dante. The first part of the *Vita Nuova*, recounting the effect of the beloved on the lover, clearly was of Cavalcantian inspiration, even unto the «inscription» afforded by the pun on Guido's name in § 9, «Cavalcando l'altr'ier per un cammino». However, in the later poems, and surely in the accompanying (and still later) prose, it is readily apparent that Dante has moved away from the one Guido to the other (the *saggio* of § 20, undoubtedly meant to be recognised as Guinizelli), thus reversing temporal order (we remember that Dante's history of northern Italian lyric has «l'uno a l'altro Guido» [*Purgatorio* 11.95] taking the «gloria de la lingua») in order to establish, as was confirmed from the later vantage point of *Purgatorio* 26, that the style of praise sponsored by Guinizelli was the more appropriate vehicle for a theologized presentation of the meaning of Beatrice ⁶⁰. Cino da Pistoia was, after Dante's rejection of Guido Cavalcanti, his only real poetic ally ⁶¹. That is clear from *De vulgari Eloquentia*. In the *Commedia* we have no replacement for him (the dead Guinizelli is as close as we come to a positively portrayed Italian poet, and he is clearly a precursor and not a colleague) ⁶². Thus in *Purgatorio* 24, as I have argued, Dante and Cino are probably meant to be understood as the two mainstays of the «school».

It is also clear that, at some point in the 1290's, Dante and Guido had some kind of falling out. A number of critics have suggested that this is reflected in Guido's sonnet to Dante «I' vengo 'l giorno a te 'nfinite volte». Following suggestions made by Contini ⁶³, Padoan has examined the sonnet closely, and sees in it evidence to suggest that the hostile attitude it expresses toward Dante is enough to account for Guido's *disdegno* in *Inferno* 10 ⁶⁴. Padoan's essential hypothesis seems convincing (at least to this reader). At some point between 1290 and 1300 Dante and Guido had a total disagree-

ment as to the purpose of writing about love, Dante moving toward the new theological horizon he had discovered in his contemplation of Guinizelli's work and in the intrinsic dead-end he found in his own enterprise if he could not see in Beatrice more than a mortal thing. We shall never know exactly how or when this came about, only that it did. And it seems utterly reasonable to believe that he and Guido would have argued over these matters. Whether the people who make up the «*annotosa gente*» (v. 6) Guido complains of having found Dante frequenting are theologians (as is frequently supposed) or the tavern-crawlers like Forese and Cecco that Contini insists might also have been in Guido's mind⁷⁵, we at least can be sure that the former *primi amici* are not so any longer⁷⁶. And even if Cino's sonnet were a mere *jeu d'esprit*, it became a matter of record for Dante to build into his own version of events (and Dante was frequently pleased to construct his own version of events).

What has only once been discussed, as far as I have been able to discover, is the possibility that Cino, in his counter-attack on Guido, was also aware of Guido's attack on Dante. That seems likely to Guglielmo Gorni⁷⁷. With or without being certain as to whether or not Cino was acquainted with Guido's poem (if indeed, as Gorni seems prepared to believe, Guido's was written first), I think it is virtually certain that Dante knew both these poems and that he would have paid particular attention to them, since they describe with some accuracy his own view of the relationship among the three poets. Here is Guido calling both Dante and Cino *vile*⁷⁸; here is Cino answering Guido's charge in ways that at least seem to call for a kind of poetic inspiration that Dante would clearly favor⁷⁹; and here is Cino describing Guido just as Dante has come to see him, full of pride and disdain.

In such ways does Cino's sonnet against Guido serve to clarify the intention of the Cavalcanti scene in the tenth canto of the *Inferno*. His pose, that of the poet of lowly *ingegno*, is highly similar to Dante's own pose, that of *scriba dei*, a humble and not a proud poet. (There are those who find Guido's «*altezza d'ingegno*» to be understood in the same terms as the «*alto ingegno*» invoked by the poet Dante in *Inf.* 2.7. The point is that Dante is there invoking God as his source. That is a minority opinion, first inherently advanced by Castelvetro, and warmly embraced by this writer)⁸⁰. Cino, at verse 9, says that he is not an *artista*. If his sonnet was indeed a response to one of Guido's, as is surely the wisest hypothesis, and was composed *per le rime*, as was usual in *tenzoni*, then it is likely that Guido had meant to insult Cino's artistry with a verse ending with some such phrase as «*tu non sei artis-*

ta». Cino's sharp tactic is to accept the blame as praise and turn in back upon his accuser. We may be fairly sure that Guido's disdain for Dante's praise of Beatrice, expressed in increasingly theological terms, is what lies behind Dante's devastating rebuke of his former friend. And that rebuke relies heavily on the formulations Dante found ready to hand in Cino's poem, the very words of which he binds into his treatment of his former *primo amico* in *Inferno*.

3. Cino's Projected Role in the *Commedia*.

Where it is probably safe to claim that the preceding argument is based on fairly strong evidentiary procedures, what follows, on the contrary, is an hypothesis, one that first seemed plausible to me over a decade ago. I will not ask the reader's indulgence for attempting to make so unsubstantiated a claim, but will simply present the hypothesis and hope that what we gain from it may help clarify some problematic texts.

If Dante intended a place in his *Commedia* for Cino, where would it have been⁸¹? One of the enduring puzzles Dante has left his commentators is found at *Inferno* 15, 88-90, where the protagonist tells Brunetto, the third of «*Dante's poets*»⁸² (Cavalcanti being, of the vernacular poets who preceded him, the first referred to in *Inferno*, Pier delle Vigne the second), that his prediction of Dante's future course will be «*glossed*» by a lady, surely Beatrice. Marguerite Mills Chiarenza argues that, when Dante puts the prophecy reserved for Beatrice by Virgil and by Dante himself into the mouth of Cacciaguada, he has not nodded, but is deliberately echoing the similar «*inconsistency*» found in the *Aeneid* when Helenus promises Aeneas that the Sibyl will reveal his future to him (3.458-460); instead, the prophetess leads him to Anchises, who is in fact the one to make good on Helenus's promise (6.756-886)⁸³. The argument is a delightful one, but may be the result of too ingenious an effort to cover over what remains a troubling bit of business, given the fact that not one but two figures both clearly insist that it will be Beatrice's task to foretell Dante's future. Further, the second of these two predictions is so explicit in calling for Beatrice as *chiosatore* that Dante could not expect his reader to think that he had not contradicted himself. Thus, I argue, his desire to make the change was strong enough to overrule the original plan. Whatever Dante's reasons for the apparent eventual substitution of Beatrice by Cacciaguada, it remains a stumbling block for interpreters.

The commentary tradition is troubled when it considers *Inferno* 10.132: Benvenuto says that Dante here *seems* to contradict himself, but that in fact it is through the mediation of Beatrice that he will hear from Cacciaguida in *Paradiso* 17, thus making good on the original promise, if indirectly. Vellutello simply notes the change that will occur, without comment. Castelvetro and Venturi, both of whom take great pleasure in catching Dante out, refer to an «errore di memoria di Dante». Lombardi, who loves to catch Venturi out, attacks this «detractor of Dante's power of memory» and insists, without argument or evidence, that «da lei» is equivalent to saying «in compagnia di lei»⁸⁴.

While any number of hypotheses may account for the change, I would like to propose a new one. First, as we have seen, it is likely that the two passages predicting that Beatrice will tell Dante about the course of his future life in Heaven themselves help confirm the reading that the *cui* of *Inferno* 10.63 refers to Beatrice⁸⁵. In addition, our reading of Cino's sonnet to Guido Cavalcanti has also offered us a further reason for believing that the entire passage is rooted in the relationship among the three vernacular poets and thus also makes far more sense if *cui* refers to Beatrice, the object of their detraction or praise.

Is it possible that Dante, even after finishing *Purgatorio*, planned to have Beatrice occupy a part of the central role in *Paradiso* which he at the last conferred entirely on Cacciaguida? All we can say is that at least as late as the composition of *Inferno* 15 that seems to have been his plan. Cacciaguida's discourse concerning Dante's future clearly picks up the thread left by the protagonist's words to Brunetto, his *chiose* (*Paradiso* 17.94) bringing back to mind the *chiosar* of *Inferno* 15.89⁸⁶. That Cacciaguida is now described as «il mio tesoro» (v. 121), another clear remembrance of *Inferno* 15 (119: «il mio Tesoro») ⁸⁷ suggests that Cacciaguida is to be regarded a truer «father» than Brunetto⁸⁸. His words, finally answering Virgil's promise (*Inferno* 10.132) that Dante will have his future revealed to him (vv. 46-99), and charting his course as poet (vv. 124-142), are clearly meant to «fulfill» the promises made by Virgil in the tenth canto of the *Inferno* and repeated by Dante to Brunetto in the fifteenth⁸⁹. If, as my hypothesis would have it, it was Beatrice who was to perform the prophetic function in the poem eventually given to Cacciaguida, and if her discourse was to refer pointedly to Cino, perhaps partly in recognition of the *consolatoria* offered to Dante by Cino in her memory, it would be advantageous to find some remnant sign of this project in the text of *Paradiso* 17-18. As Dante nears the end of his time in the heav-

en of Mars, Beatrice calls on him to turn toward her and behold her joy in the love of God. The poet now, for the only time in the poem, refers to her as «il mio conforto» (18.8)⁹⁰. Cino, in the *consolatoria*, had heard Amor calling out for *conforto* on Dante's behalf⁹¹. It is possible that the moment is remembered here. It is another circumstance, however, that helps me to believe that at this moment Dante was in fact thinking of Cino. As Cacciaguida finishes naming Dante's version of the nine worthies⁹², he moves among the warrior saints and reveals to Dante what an «artist» he was among the other singers of that heaven («qual era tra i cantor del cielo artista» - 18.51). The locution has always struck me as both wonderfully suggestive and strangely inappropriate. This conception of a crusader/artist makes intellectual sense to us when we think of Cacciaguida as Dante's progenitor (the latter Alighieri may perhaps be conceived of, with the order of the terms reversed, as an artist/crusader); on the other hand, it is difficult to find the notion a readily acceptable one⁹³. Dante uses the word *artista* only three other times, and then only once with this meaning⁹⁴. In *Paradiso* 30.33 he compares himself, compelled to cease his singing of Beatrice's beauty, to any artist who has reached the outer range of his capacity: «ma or convien che mio seguir desista / più dietro a sua bellezza, poetando / come a l'ultimo suo ciascuno artista». It results that the only two personages in the *Commedia* specifically referred to as «artists» are, interestingly enough, Cacciaguida and Dante. And now the intent of the author may seem closer to our reach, especially when we consider that the Italian word *artista* (Latin *artifex*⁹⁵) has had only one or two prior uses in the written (and preserved) Italian vernacular before Dante; the last of these precisely in the sonnet which Cino addressed to Guido Cavalcanti and where he insists: «in non sono artista» (v. 9). Thus we have this further possible confirmation that Dante had Cino in mind as the *artista* who was to have shared with him the poetic crown for the vernacular. Coming to the passage that was intended to contain Beatrice's praise of Cino (in return for his of her), he gives this role to Cacciaguida, and also gives him the word that he had reserved for Cino: *artista*, the reward originally intended for him who had seen, where Guido Cavalcanti had been blind⁹⁶.

Cino was one of the few poets of whom Dante approved in 1303-1306; by 1310-1313 he was also a political ally, closely involved in the cause of Henry VII⁹⁷. If Petrocchi's dating of the composition of the three *contiche* is correct (I would only note that I find it argued convincingly, if this is not the place to take up yet another difficult and lengthy subject), then Dante had finished *Purgatorio* by 1313, before the death of Henry. Between 1313 and

1317³⁶ something happened to dislodge the plan for including the Pistoian at the center of *Paradiso*: Cino's defection from the imperial cause. We can be nearly definitively certain that, by the time of Dante's death, Cino's juridical behavior would have astonished and annoyed his former friend³⁷. In 1320 he lent himself to the Curia's prosecution of Ghibellines in the Marches³⁸. A year earlier he had been party to a *consilium* of jurists, ecclesiastics, and laymen called by the Inquisitor of Florence in order to condemn a Franciscan friar as a heretic³⁹. As Biscaro suggests, such trust on the part of the Inquisitor at least implies that Cino had spent some time among Florentine jurists and ecclesiastics earlier than September of 1319, when the *consilium* took place⁴⁰. If such was the case, it is at least possible and more likely probable that Dante, assiduous follower of the news from his homeland, would have known as much. We can only imagine the strength of his feelings when he learned that his fellow exile, fellow supporter of Henry VII, fellow champion of the splendor of Beatrice, was now in Florence and in consort with the enemy. The matter is not to be resolved without further archival discoveries. All one can say is that there are reasons that make Dante's turning from Cino by the time he began to write *Paradiso* a likelihood. For now, we can say only as much as Biscaro did in 1928: within a few years of the death of Henry, the two friends began to fall out⁴¹. Thus Dante, who had been planning from the beginning to include him at the apex of his *bella scola moderna*, replaced him with his own ancestor⁴². I am aware that so radical an hypothesis has liabilities. It is difficult, for instance, to imagine a *Commedia* without Cacciaguida. However, my argument does not require that we believe that he would not have been included nor that the concerns which he introduces would not have been present. What it does require is the idea that it would not have been he, but Beatrice, who would have given Dante news of his future life and his poetic mission, and that she would have done so by including Cino as the most significant of Dante's poetic brethren. My argument is only that, once Cino was no longer Dante's new *primo amico*, as he was according to *De vulgari Eloquentia*, the role of Beatrice as eventual definer of the canon of the *dolce stil novo* dropped from Dante's plan. The main virtue of the hypothesis is that it accounts for the resulting contradiction of the earlier passages (*Inferno* 10 and 15). Other hypotheses, I think, have done so even less convincingly. I close by reminding the reader that I am aware of the venturesome nature of this undertaking, one that seeks consent less than a willingness to open a closed book.

There are other texts in the *Commedia* that may benefit from being scrutinized in light of Dante's thoughts and feelings about Cino da Pistoia. Among them are not only those that reflect upon the members of the «school» of *dolce stilnovisti* that are referred to in *Purgatorio* 24⁴³, but those relating to the nature of Dante's view of Matelda (and of her identity)⁴⁴, and of the presence of Justinian in *Paradiso*. Whatever resolutions of these and other problems that may arise from a greater sense of Cino's importance for Dante, I hope that as much as has been put forth here will convince the reader that, as is so often the case in our studies of Dante, we should be aware that, for all that has been done, we are nearer the beginning than the end⁴⁵.

NOTE

¹ First published in *Dante Studies* 110 (1992).

² Edmund Gurrain Gardner, «Dante's Correspondence with Guido and Messer Cino», *The Month* (Nov. 1899): 11, believed that the treatise would have been dedicated, had it been finished, to Cino, as «the great monument of Dante's friendship».

³ See Luca Carlo Rossi, «Una ricomposta tenzone (autentica?) fra Cino da Pistoia e Bonone da Gubbio», *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 31 (1988): 49, referring to the «inspiegabile silenzio su Cino nella *Commedia*». Rossi's, the most recent study devoted to Cino's relationship to Dante, is indispensable to mine, even if his investigation is far more involved with Cino's view of Dante than with the reverse. For Cino's absence from the *Commedia* see also Mario Marti, «Orsotto da Bologna, lo stil nuovo e Dante», in his *Con Dante fra i poemi del suo tempo*, 2^a ed. (Florence: Mulino, 1971 [1966]): p. 110: «... nel poema la situazione, nella lontana prospettiva degli anni, muta nuovamente e radicalmente, lui non è mai nominato né direttamente né indirettamente, Cino da Pistoia, mentre ben due episodi sono, se non completamente dedicati a Guido Cavalcanti, almeno arricchiti dal ricordo della personalità di lui» [*Inferno* 33 and *Purgatorio* 11].

⁴ See *De vulgari Eloquio*, ed. Pier Vincenzo Mengaldo, in Dante Alighieri, *Opere minori* (Milano-Napoli: Ricciardi, 1979), 1.10.2; 1.17.3: «Cynum Pistoriensis et amicus eius»; 1.18.4: «omni alium [Dante]... et Cynum Pistoriensem»; 2.2.8: «Cynum Pistoriensem amorem, amicum eius rectitudinem»; 2.5.4: «Cynum Pistoriensis... amicus eius»; 2.6.6: «Cynum de Pistorio... amicus eius». And see Maria Corti, *Dante a un nuovo crocevia* (Florence: Sansoni, 1983): 61-62, for the significance of Dante's phrase (*DV* 1.10.2) describing himself and Cino and those near delicias ubrilisque poetari vulgariter aucts. Corti thinks this suggests that the *stil novo* is meant to partake of the traditions both of the mystical lyric and of notionalism.

⁵ For discussion of a similar phenomenon, the missing presence of Dante as character in the *Decamerone*, see Franco Tido, «Dante personaggio mancato del libro galante», in his *Il regno delle simmetrie imperfette. studi sul «Decamerone»* (Milano: Franco Angeli, 1988 [1977]): 111-125. The ample number of Boccaccian references to Dante's poem and inclusion of Dantean characters in the *Decamerone's* cast have served to alert some of Boccaccio's readers to the importance of Dante as influence, at least in general terms. It is only recently, however, that the *Decamerone* has begun to be studied as being in significant part an elaborately fashioned response to the *Commedia*. For discussion and bibliography see R. Hollander, «Boccaccio's Dante», *Italia* 63 (1986): 278-289.

⁶ In her impressive study of Dante's vernacular predecessors, *Dante's Poets* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), Teodolinda Barolini mentions Cino some dozen times, but does not deal with him as one of «Dante's poets». This is not to upbraid Professor Barolini, who clearly stakes out her ground as being that specifically named by Dante himself, but only to remind all of us that those (and/or not referred to) as personages in the text of the poem (e.g., St. Paul) may still be significant resources for it. Her view of the reasons for Cino's exclusion from the *Commedia* is altogether different from mine: «Cino's disappearance is less problematic than Cavalcanti's» because in the *De Vulgari Eloquio* he is essentially a stopgap used to

fill the space left by Cavalcanti, his presence in the treatise does not foreshadow his presence in the poem. He is not significant enough to be included in the *Comedy's* poetic itinerary, precisely because he is too good a friend, poetically, Cino is Dante's mirror image, an elegiac version of Dante in his sweetest mode. Rather than exerting influence, Cino absorbed it, thereby guaranteeing his exclusion from the *Comedy*» (pp. 135-136). The understanding, most forcefully put forth in our time by Domenico de Robertis, which has it that Cino learned from Dante but that Dante took little or nothing from Cino, is fairly widely shared and is probably responsible for the small effort spent on studying Dante's reaction to Cino more thoroughly. For example, Robert Durling and Ronald Murrin, *Time and the Crystal: Studies in Dante's «Rime Petrosine»* (Berkeley-Los Angeles-Oxford: Univ. of California Press, 1990), only mention Cino once, and in passing (p. 19), in their lengthy exploration of Dante's poetic heritage.

⁷ Some of Dante's various citations of Cino in the *Commedia* have been noted from time to time and in various contexts, as we shall see; far more attention has been spent on the more evident relationship between the lyric *corpora* of the two poets.

⁸ It was only after I had finished a final draft of this study that I received the galley proofs of «Cino (e Orsotto) dentro e fuori la *Commedia»* from Enzo Brugnolo, shortly to be published in the memorial volume *Omaggio a Gianfranco Folena* (Padova: Editoriale Programma 1992). I am indebted to Professor Brugnolo for his willingness to share his work with me in this form. It offers considerable comfort to some of my arguments, as do, I hope, mine to his. His work deserves better notice than my last-minute additions afford (page numbers of the several references to this article are as found in the galley).

⁹ See Rossi, pp. 48-49, for the most recent statement that the friendship apparently began to dissolve with the death of Henry VII in August of 1313. For his views and those of some others who have sponsored this opinion see n. 194.

¹⁰ For an overview see Mario Marti «Cino da Pistoia», *Enciclopedia dantesca* [henceforth *ED*] 2 (Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia italiana, 1970), with basic bibliography (p. 99).

¹¹ Whether the responsive poem «Naturalmente cheres» was written by Cino or by Terzio di Castelliofrentino is, at the current time, an open question. See, for summarizing discussion, Marti, *ibid.*: 7a. But see the interesting argument for Cino's authorship in Guido Zaccagnini, *Cino da Pistoia* (Pistoia: D. Pagnini, 1918): 40-50. Zaccagnini believes that the sonnet was written by Cino, who he believes was born in 1265. Even if Cino was indeed born in 1270, as is more generally supposed, would it have been beyond possibility for a thirteen-year old to have composed the sonnet? The question does not directly address the concerns of this study and, in any case, is possibly beyond resolution.

¹² Zaccagnini, p. 140, believes the two poets did in fact meet in Bologna in 1287. He offers no proof for this opinion.

¹³ Alberto Corbellini, «Questioni ciniane e la *Vita Nuova* di Dante», *Rivista storica pisotina* 6 (1904): 91, is convinced that the *consolatoria* was written before Dante completed *VN*. Most modern discussants agree, dating the work to 1291.

¹⁴ For the possibility of a meeting between the two poets around 1310-1311, although no evidence is adduced for it, we have only the rather weak suggestion of Bruno Nardi («tuttavia non si può escludere un qualche incontro») in his introduction to the *Monografia* in Dante's *Opere minori*, 2 (Milan-Naples: Ricciardi, 1979): 166.

¹⁵ For a fairly recent treatment of Cino's juridical writings, one that insists upon their importance and originality, see Guido Astori, «Cino da Pistoia e la Giurisprudenza del suo tem-

1900, *Colloquio Cino da Pistoia* (Rome, 25 ottobre 1975) [Atti dei Convegni Lincei] (Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 1976): 129-153.

¹ For the manuscripts and editions of Cino's three treatises see Luigi Chiappelli, *Vita e opere giuridiche di Cino da Pistoia con molti documenti inediti* (Pistoia: Fratelli Bazzoli, 1881 [repr. Bologna: A. Forni, 1978]): 229-231; see p. 63 for notice of Cino's laureation on 9 December 1314 after his defense of his commentary on the *Codex*. For a description of these writings see Astuti, pp. 137-139 (bibliography, p. 152).

We should remember that Cino's interest in Justinian dates back at least to 1297, according to Arrigo Solmi. See «Cino da Pistoia giuriconsulto», *Cino da Pistoia nel VI centenario della morte*, a cura del comitato pistoiese per le occasioni (Pistoia: Pacinotti, 1937): 10.

² «Biografia», *ED* 5 (1978): 9a.

³ *Vita e opere*, p. 27.

⁴ See «Nomina sua consequentia remota», *GSLI* 95 (1925): 101-105.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 104.

⁶ *La Vita Nuova* [Milano-Napoli: Ricciardi, 1980], *ad hoc*.

⁷ For example, Domenico De Robertis, «Cino e le "imitazioni" dalle rime di Dante», *Studi danteschi* 29 (1950): «Dante fu per Cino l'"autore" in senso proprio» (p. 111).

⁸ Number 125 in Marti's edition. Dante acknowledges Cino's poem in *DvE* 2.6.6.

⁹ Marti's notes leave no doubt about the numerous citations of Dante's earlier lyrics in the *consolatoria*. On page 721, a. 1, there is a listing of the previous discussions of these textual confrontations. See also Corbellini, «Questioni emiane», pp. 87-92, for a close consideration of the dependence of the *consolatoria* on «Gli occhi dolenti» (*VN* 31).

¹⁰ It has at times been suggested that the «altro chiosatore» to whom Dante leaves the treatment of the death of Beatrice (*VN* 28.2) is indeed Cino, since his canzone almost surely circulated before Dante composed the prose intergment of the work. In his edition of *VN*, p. 192, De Robertis denies the likelihood that this was Dante's meaning. Enrico Zaccagnini had also raised and dismissed the possibility (*Cino da Pistoia*, pp. 42-44). I confess that I find the hypothesis attractive.

¹¹ See Zaccagnini, pp. 150-152; Gennaro Maria Monti, *Cino da Pistoia giurista* (Citta di Castello: D'Salicos, 1924): 45-47. However, Domenico Maffei, *La donazione di Costantino nei giuristi medievali* (Milan: Giuffrè, 1964): 134-145, discusses the limited nature of Cino's opposition to the hierocratic argument and to the arguments for the validity of the Donation of Constantine. Maffei essentially reaffirms his previous view of the matter in «Il pensiero di Cino da Pistoia sulla Donazione di Costantino, le sue fonti e il dissenso finale da Dante», *Lecture classensi* 16 (1987): 119-127. See also his «Cino da Pistoia e il "Constitutum Constantini"», *Annali della Università di Macerata* 24 (1960): 112, where Maffei argues that Cino's change of heart about the Donation (the validity of which he eventually embraced) did not occur before 1316 at the very earliest. And see his *La «Lectura super Diperta Veritas» di Cino da Pistoia* (Milan: Giuffrè, 1963): 54, where he characterizes the positions taken by Cino in the time of Henry VII and then in the early 1320's as follows: «fra il Cino dei tempi di Arrigo VII e il Cino dei tempi di Lodovico il Bavaro corre ormai un abisso».

¹² Or, as Marti puts it, «Cino da Pistoia», *ED* 2 (1978): 7b, to Dante Cino might have seemed «il discepolo che ogni maestro si augurerebbe».

¹³ The central figure in this discussion is Domenico De Robertis. His major contributions are as follows: «Cino da Pistoia e le "imitazioni" dalle rime di Dante», *Studi danteschi* 29

(1950): 103-177; «Cino e i poeti bolognesi», *GSLI* 128 (1951): 273-312; «Cino da Pistoia e la crisi del linguaggio poetico», *Convivium* 1 (1952): 1-35. Others who should be consulted include the following: Vincenzo Pernicone, «Dante e la "stil nuovo" di Cino», *Studi danteschi e altri saggi*, ed. Matilde Dillon-Wauke (Genoa: Università degli studi di Genova, Istituto di Letteratura Italiana, 1984 [1937]): 1-6; Mario Marti, «Onesio da Bologna, lo stil nuovo e Dante», *Cin Dante fra i poeti del suo tempo*, 2^a ed. (Lecce: Milella, 1971 [1966]): 43-68; «Gli umori del critico militante», *ibid.*: 69-121, esp. 102-112; Arnaldo Baldinini, «Cino da Pistoia, Boccaccio, e i poeti minori del Trecento», in *Atti del Colloquio Cino da Pistoia* (Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 1976): 33-85; and, for general bibliography, see Antonio Enzo Quaglio, *Lo stil nuovo e la poesia religiosa* (Bari: Laterza, 1971): 146-147.

¹⁴ Most notably we now have the studies of Guglielmo Gorni, *Il nodo della lingua: studi su Dante e altri duecenteschi* (Florence: Olschki, 1981). This collection of essays offers numerous *approachements* between Cino's work and Dante's, including one that is central to my purpose, as will shortly be apparent.

¹⁵ Letterio Cassata, «Il disdegno di Guido» (*Inf.* 10.63), *Studi danteschi* 36 (1965): 5-49; Pier Luigi Cerisola, «Il "disdegno" di Guido Cavalcanti» (*Inf.*, 10.63-65), *Ateneion* 52 (1978): 195-217 (in substance the same form in his *Il canto X dell'«Inferno» nella storia della critica* [Turin: G. Giappichelli, 1977]: 135-139). For some more recent bibliography see Michele dell'Aquila, *Al di là del vero* (Fasano: Schena, 1989): 93-95. Soon after I had finished what I believed was the final draft of this study, Furio Brugnolo called my attention to still another lengthy consideration of the troublesome verse: Enrico Malato, «Inf., X 63: "forse cui Guido vostro ebbe a disdegno"», *Filologia e critica* 15 (1990): 445-479, of which the first fourteen pages offer still another summary of the history of the problem. Malato does not, however, deal with Gorni's suggestion that Cino's sonnet may help to solve it.

¹⁶ See discussion in Cerisola, pp. 198-199.

¹⁷ See Cerisola, p. 197, for a similar observation.

¹⁸ This summary is derived from the database known as the Dartmouth Dante Project, containing 44 commentaries as this article is being written.

¹⁹ We could, if we chose to, extend Benvenuto's argument to suggest that Dante is still better considered a philosopher, if the amount and extent of commentary caused by the *Commedia* are to be the defining evidence for the establishment of the poem's genre.

²⁰ But see Cassata's attempt to overcome this obstacle (pp. 33-35). It is not, in my opinion, convincing.

²¹ As was the case with the arguments in favor of Virgil's candidacy, Pagliaro's in favor of Beatrice (developed in several stages between 1950 and 1966) are severely flawed. See the expert refutations in Cassata, pp. 25-27, and Cerisola, pp. 204-210. His basic position, however, more or less swept the field for a time, until its flaws caused an entirely reasonable backlash. One must agree with those who have criticized his excesses; however, weak arguments for a viable interpretation have recently been the cause of the re-adaptation of weaker interpretations. Even as competent a scholar as Cassata opts for Pio Rajna's old notion (the *cwi* who was the object of Guido's disdain was God), while Cerisola goes back to the historical Virgil, as does, more recently, Nino Borsellino, «Un pronostico per Guido (*Inferno* X 63)», *GSLI* 166 (1989): 161-182. And with Malato (see n. 25) we have come full circle, as he puts forward a version of D'Ovidio's allegorized Virgil: «sembra a trer tar to probabile che l'allusione sia non al

poeta latino — contro il quale indubbiamente Guido non poteva avere alcun motivo di risentimento —, bensì a ciò di cui egli è il simbolo: la ragione» (p. 263).

¹⁷ Charles S. Singleton, «*Inferno* X: Guido's Disdains», *MLN* 77 (1962): 55, complains that «many commentators, indeed surprisingly many, avoid the question». His own commentary, published only eight years later, says not a word about the crux.

¹⁸ See the arguments of Gianfranco Contini and Giorgio Padoan, which are discussed below (after n. 73).

¹⁹ Lorenzo Filomusi Guelfi, *Due chiome dantesche* (Turin: V. Bona, 1889): «Chi non vede, in questo *se a lei arriva* [*Inf.* 15,90], spiegato il forse...?» (p. 9). One who has seen it is F. W. Locke, «Dante's Miraculous Enemies», *Dante Studies* 85 (1967): 68; many others have not.

²⁰ The *ebbe* is pointed in the extreme. Against those who would argue that it may be here construed as having the force of a *passato prossimo* (e.g., Cassara, p. 44: «ha avuto a disdegno»), we may cite the Ottimo: «se nota che dice: «elli ebbe, non «elli ha»; per lo quale dire «elli ebbe», il detto Messer Cavalcante intese che Guido fosse morto, e indi concepette dolore e tristizia».

²¹ Guido Mazzoni, «Il disdegno di Guido» (*Inf.*, X, 62-63), in his *Almea haec mabe eroces* (Bologna: Zanichelli, 1941): 213-221, following Filomusi Guelfi (see n. 37), reformulates the issue as follows (p. 214): from D'Ovidio he takes the notion of Guido's lack of religious faith, from Rajna the explanation of the passage's syntax (*cul* = *ad eam quem*), from Torraca and Filomusi Guelfi the idea that *cul* refers to Beatrice, and from Filomusi Guelfi that what is at stake is Guido's disdain for her (and not hers for him, as Torraca believes), but differs with Filomusi Guelfi: Guido's disdain is not for the lady but for theology. On p. 219 he cites Perroni Grande: «Morta Beatrice, hai il disdegno», a formulation that is much like Filomusi Guelfi's.

²² See F. Mazzoni, *La «Divina Commedia» con i commenti di Tommaso Casini-Silvio Alessio Barbi e di Attilio Montigliano* (Florence: Sansoni, 1979 [1972]): 205; Contini, *Un'idea di Dante* (Turin: Einaudi, 1976): 148-153, where what is at stake is Guido's failure to understand the reasons for writing of Beatrice even *in morte*. Most recently, for a reading in an Augustinian key, see John Freccero, «Ancora sul disdegno di Guido», *Lettere classiche* 18 (1989): 79-92.

²³ The most recent complete edition of Cino's lyrics is that prepared by Marti in his *Poeti del Dolce stil nuovo* (Florence: Le Monnier, 1969): 421-923. (English readers should be aware that Christopher Kleinhenz's edition, translation, and commentary is soon to be published by Garland.) Marti's edition, as he informs us (p. 426), is essentially a reprinting of the texts established by Luigi Di Benedetto, *Rimatori del Dolce Stil Nuovo* (Bari: Laterza, 1939), except where Gianfranco Casini, abetted by Domenico De Robertis, has published new versions of the poems. For these, 46 of the 186 poems that are found in Di Benedetto/Marti, see *Poeti del Duecento*, 2 (Milan/Naples: Ricciardi, 1960): 629-690. Also to be consulted, if it is now superseded, is *Le Rime di Cino da Pistoia*, ed. Guido Zaccagnini (Geneva: Olshki, 1925). Zaccagnini's is the most ample of all the collections: 187 poems + 22 of dubious authenticity.

²⁴ Marti, *Poeti*, p. 513.

²⁵ Marti, *Poeti*, pp. 442, 447, 478, 490, 504, 508, 511, 513, 519, 521, 525, 526, 536, 539, 541, 542, 550, 551, 554, 570, 572, 584, 585, 605, 626, 627, 649, 665, 669, 674, 678, 695, 700, 703, 704, 718, 724, 734, 744, 751, 758, 777, 782, 853, 867, 881, 882, 890, 892, 903, 907, 909.

²⁶ However, Marti continues, citing C. De Lollis, *Studi medioevali* I (1904), 5-23, by claiming that there is no question of influence here, that we are dealing with a traditional topos.

²⁷ Contini's phrasing is instructive: «prima che lo usasse il Paradiso», as though to suggest that its later use by Dante probably does not reflect its presence here. See the later discussion of the four *loci* in *Paradiso* in which Dante makes use of the word.

²⁸ Contini seems certain that this is a reference to Dante's verses, while, as we have seen, Marti is more hesitant; see also the opinion that Dante's rhymes reflect those found in Cavalcanti's «*Donna me prega*», an opinion first advanced by Di Siena (1867) and then discussed by Parodi (for citations, *BSDI* 3, p. 96; 20, p. 140; see Casini-Barbi on *Inf.* 10, 69); see also Singleton, *ibid.*

²⁹ This unmistakable citation is widely noted. It is noteworthy that the two passages that Contini and De Robertis think may reflect Dante's response to Cino are put forward only tentatively; they are apparently far more ready to believe that Cino is paying heed to his bettor.

³⁰ No commentator seems willing to consider the possibility that Cino's canzone was written before *Inferno*.

³¹ Among the English writing commentators currently in the DDP (others include Longfellow, Tozer, and Singleton), only Grandgent mentions Cino; and he does so only once. The wider English and American tradition of Dante studies mirrors this neglect.

³² Tommaseo's text of Cino read «ferrata» where Marti's reads «fabbrica».

³³ Other citations refer to texts no longer believed to have been composed by Cino and are as follows:

«la bella stella, che 'l tempo misura» → «la stella» (*Inf.* 2, 55); Di Siena;

«A nullo amaro amar perdona amore» → «Amor, ch' a nullo amaro amar perdona» (*Inf.* 5, 103); Martini;

«D'ogni amara mal sei la radice» → «la prima radice / del nostro amore» (*Inf.* 5, 124-125); Tommaseo;

«Lo volto ond'io son casso» → «casso» (*Purg.* 30, 87, where it is a hapax); Torraca;

«Se solo un pochetto sorride / quale il sole novo, strugge i miei pensieri» → «come ai colpi de li caldi rai / de la neve riman mado il soggetto» (*Par.* 2, 106-107); Scartazzini;

«la bella stella, che 'l tempo misura» → «col suo lume il tempo ne misura» (*Par.* 10, 30); Casini-Barbi.

³⁴ For only the most recent downplaying of the importance of Cino's poems to Dante see J.F. Took, *Dante Lyric Poet and Philosopher: An Introduction to the Minor Works* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1950): 77; where some of Dante's political positions have a distinctly Cinian ring about them (especially his view of the Donation of Constantine); «poetically, however, and in everything to do with the theory and practice of love, it was the other way round, Cino being far and away the greater poetic beneficiary». One does not quarrel with this assessment, except that in practice neither Took (nor almost any other critic) pays genuine attention to the question of Cino's actual influence on Dante. Thus what gets paid lip service as a two-way street is treated in fact as a one-way boulevard.

³⁵ The poem is numbered VI in the Contini/De Robertis edition (which is presented here as it is reprinted by Marti), with only a few formal variations). Zaccagnini's version differs in a few particulars. The problem of variant readings touches in no case on matters discussed below; nor is there much doubt about the fact that the Guido in question is Cavalcanti. We cannot know whether or not Cino is answering *per le rime* an actual sonnet of Guido's or invoking an occasion; all current students of the problem are more than content to accept the former hypothesis, which seems an altogether likely one. Brugnolo's treatment of Cino's impact on the

Commedia, which reviews past citations and adds a dozen new ones, indeed begins with notice of the sonnet (pp. 290-291), presented as perhaps the most obvious example of work by Cino that Dante took into consideration.

¹⁴ There is disagreement over the meaning of verse 5, «ogai carli, volgo». De Robertis, sponsored by Contini, suggests that Cino is referring to his own collection. Marti suggests, plausibly, that this is not the likely reading, that Cino is referring to Guido's verses. If the reference depends upon verse 4, as Marti claims, that seems to be the best reading. However, if, as the rhyme scheme and logical arrangement of the sonnet might warrant, verse 5 parallels verse 1, the evidence that Cino offers would be his own work, into which Guido (and the reader) is asked to look. Brugnolo, *ibid.*, would also add v. 11 to those that caught Dante's notice: «apar che l'itando guardi pur la vista» echoed by *Inf.* 11.20: «ma parché poi ti basti pur la vista».

¹⁵ For evidence that Cino did indeed and often «steal» from Guido, one need only look at poems 28, 32-35, 37-39 in Marti's collection and at the annotations to them. Guido is (and not only in this convenient brief gathering) a frequently influential figure behind Cino's lyrics. For the great difference between their poetic stances and techniques see Domenico De Robertis, «Cino e Cavalcanti o le due rive della poesia», *Studi medievali* 18 (1952): 55-107. De Robertis characterizes their work as having an «assoluta incommensurabilità» (p. 64). His treatment of this sonnet (pp. 87-88) is more arresting for what it does not say than for what it does, suggesting that it really tells us very little about the relations between the two poets and is merely a conventional expression of a usual insistence on inspiration by Amore. De Robertis, hardened by his thesis (that Guido and Cino are simply not closely related writers), clearly wants to play down the importance of this dramatic piece of evidence that his essential view needs revision. Marti's notes to Cino's poems are a helpful corrective. And, for another view of the differences and similarities between the poems of Guido and Cino, see Maria Corti, «Il linguaggio poetico di Cino da Pistoia», *Cultura neolatina* 12 (1952): 214-219.

¹⁶ With respect to Cino's influence on Dante, see De Robertis, «Cino e le "imitazioni" dalle *Rime* di Dante», *Studi danteschi* 29 (1950): 105-177. In this essential study there is not even passing concern for the effect Cino might have had upon Dante, and none whatsoever for the *Commedia*, except as a text that influenced Cino in his late lyrics (pp. 176-177). It nearly goes without saying that there is no discussion of the possible effects of this sonnet on Dante. But see Perle's more general opinion (p. 6): «Dante non poteva ignorare la polemica tra Guido e Cino». See also the earlier view of Alberto Corbellini, *Dante, Guido e Cino: tracce sparse di una pagina comune* (Pavia: Carlo Rossetti, 1905): 57-71. Corbellini devotes these fifteen pages of his 70-page study to Cino's sonnet in response to Cavalcanti's (lost) sonnet of invective against Cino, which he treats as further reflecting the antagonism of Guido toward both Dante and Cino found in «l' vegno l' giorno». However, Corbellini draws back from considering *Inf.* 10.63 as Dante's rejoinder to «Qua' son le cose»: «... so resistere alla tentazione di tirar conseguenze dal X dell'*Inferno*» (p. 71n). As we shall see, Isidoro Del Lungo had already been more courageous.

¹⁷ See «Cino "il padre"» in *Il nodo della lingua*, pp. 134, 138-139.

¹⁸ This opinion is seconded by Rossi, «Una ricomposta tenzone», p. 63.

¹⁹ See Lorenzo Mascetta-Caracci, *Onesto Bolognese e Cino: testimonio alla nascita della «Diana Commedia»* (Bologna: Cooperativa Tipografica Azzoguidi, 1931): 16, who cites the similar phrase in Onesto da Bologna also adduced by Gorni. In addition, see, for collateral confirming evidence, André Pézard, «De passione in passionem», *L'Algèze* 1 (1960): 25-26.

where Pézard argues that Cino's sonnet to Dante, «Dante, quando per caso», is remembered in Vanni's predictions of the coming inter-party strife in Pistoia and Florence at the end of *Inf.* 24.

²⁰ See his «Il disdegno di Guido», *Nuova Antologia* (Nov., 1889): 59-60: «Il "disdegno di Guido". . . In, in una biliosa ora di malumore, proferbiato acerbamente da un altro di quella gloriosa compagnia, Cino da Pistoia; che rimbeccando i motteggi dell'amico Cavalcanti, risponde di non aver la burbanza sua, anzi l'impostura»; he continues by citing vv. 10-11 of Cino's sonnet to Guido. Del Lungo thus has the honor of being the first *dantista* to have seen the connection as some of us today see it. However, cf. Giuseppe Carducci, ed., Cino da Pistoia, *Le rime* (Milan: Istituto editoriale italiano, n.d. [1862]): 2, who, in his *Discorso prefatorio*, has this to say about verse 4 of the sonnet: «Il che e si spiega ricordando la fama più presto di filosofo che di poeta offeruta da Guido presso i contemporanei, e spiega il dantesco "C'ho [Virgilio]... mi itoca, Forse cui Guido vostro ebbe a disdegno"». This first notice of the relation of the sonnet and *Inf.* 10 does not, in my opinion, put the context of the passages in the clearest possible light.

²¹ Marti's note in his edition, p. 747, cites 10.11: «Volete ch'f' son un che vo piangendo». Brugnolo (p. 291) suggests that Dante's formulation of his poetic may be based still more on Cino's «Merzé di quel signor ch'è dentro a neve» (166), esp. vv. 10-11, «che dal suo [di Amore] spirito procede, / che parla in me, ciò ch'io dico rimando». Where Marti sees Cino's rest as either echoing Dante's or reflecting their *poetica comune*, Brugnolo would raise the question of whether Cino's lines, which he claims to have been written with Cavalcanti also much in mind, might have been written earlier than its numeration in Marti would suggest and thus might have influenced Dante. Whatever resolution of this matter we might favor, we can add that Dante had at least Guido's verse in mind at *Inferno* VIII, 36, for Filippo Argenti's «Vedi che son io che piango».

²² Gorni's footnote (pp. 129-130) on Cino's use of the verb *scogliere* in v. 7 offers an intriguing series of suggestions that connect Guido, Cino, and Dante within the network of the probable presence of the verb as a rhyme word in Guido's lost sonnet; with Dante's identification of himself and Cino as writers of a vernacular that is, among other qualities, «extracollante», in *Diz.* 1.17.3; and finally in the «doleo» which Dante's response «writes» for Bonagiunta in *Purg.* 24. The argument is tentative, complex, and fascinating.

²³ See Gorni, «"Guido, l' vorrei che tu e Lippo ed io"» *Studi di filosofia italiana* 36 (1978): 25-29, for this suggestion.

²⁴ For summarizing discussion, see Quaglio, «Gli stilnovisti: Analisi di un concetto storiografico», in *Lo stilnovismo e la poesia religiosa*, pp. 9-17.

²⁵ For the useful reminder that it was only in 1880 when, spurred by De Sanctis, Adolfo Bartoli took up the term, that it began to have such «official» denotations, see Emilio Bigi, «Genesi di un concetto storiografico: "dolce stil novo"», *GiLF* 132 (1955): 369-370. For a still stronger debunking view see John A. Scott, «Paradiso XXV», *Dante Commentaries*, ed. David Niles (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1977): 166: «Tais "poesia della loda" is, in fact, what constituted Dante's "sweet new style", which according to the poet himself began with the great canzone "Donne ch'avete intelletto d'amore" . . . It has nothing to do with a school of poets or "stilnovisti" invented by nineteenth century historians of literature». On this point the essential study remains Guido Favati, *Indirizzo sul Dolce Stil Nuovo* (Florence: Le Monnier, 1975).

²⁶ But see Giuseppe Mazzotta, «Dante's Literary Typology», *MLN* 87 (1972): 1-19 (repr. in *Dante, Poet of the Desert* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979]: 192-226), a study that is dedicated to this question but is too often overlooked by its discussants. Without defining

the divine source Dante seems to be claiming for his own poetry, Mazzotta is nonetheless clear about the theological structure of Dante's unique poetics.

⁷ For the «theological» interpretation of the *crux* see Luigi Derla, «'E' mi son io, che quando / Amor mi spira, noto...» in *Purg.*, XXIV, 49-61a, *Aevum*, 58 (1984), 274-286. Derla's treatment pays scant attention to the non-Italian discussions of the question who propounded a theological purpose in Dante's self-definition, e.g., J.A. Scott, «Dante's "sweet new style" and the *Vita Nuova*», *Italia* 42 (1965): 98-107; Mazzotta (see preceding note); and the present writer, «Dante "Theologus-Poeta"», *Dante Studies* 94 (1976): 116-119, repr. *Studies in Dante* (Ravenna: Longo, 1980): 81-84. For more recent appreciations in this vein see also R.L. Martinez, «The Pilgrim's Answer to Buonagura and the Poetics of the Spirit», *Stanford Italian Review* 3 (1983): 37-63; Joseph A. Mazzeo, «Medieval Hermeneutics: Dante's Poetic and Historicity», *Religion & Literature* 17 (1985): 1-24, esp. p. 6; «... the process he describes [in *Purg.*, 24.52-54] is precisely that of inspired dictation used to describe the inspiration of prophets by the Holy Spirit. If Dante can adapt Biblical theories of exegesis to tell us that his poem is not a fiction in any ordinary sense of the term fiction, he can adapt the concept of the Holy Spirit as the spirit who will lead us into all truth to the purposes of telling us that he, Dante, is an inspired poet, a poet who traces the source of his poetry finally to Love, the third person of the Trinity.»

⁸ For the vexed question of the canonical poets of the *stil novo* the essential study remains Mario Marti, *Storia dello Stil novo* (Lecce: Milella, 1973). See also Favati, n. 65, above.

⁹ Barolini, p. 125, has a brief and cogent statement of the eclipse of Guido in *Dante*: «the expression "amicus eius" takes the place of "primo amico"». And see Corbellini, *Dante, Guido e Cino*, p. 71: «Quando a Cino, il dolce e corale consolatore, tutti sanno che divenne a Dante caramente diletto: ei cederà di nido Guido, che già aveva tenuto il primo loco.»

¹⁰ It is at least suggestive that, where Guinizelli is saved and, in his own language (*Purg.*, 26.127-132), utters the name of Christ and then suggests that the best form of «poetico uterance is now a paternoster (still another example of Dante's radical revision of historical reality), *Inf.*, 10 at the very least suggests that Cavalcanti was, like his father, an Epicurean, and, in Dante's eyes, almost certainly damned. For the view that Dante, like Boccaccio, wants to keep open the question of Guido's eventual salvation, see Robert M. Durling, «Boccaccio on Interpretation: Guido's Escape (*Decamerone* VI.9)», *Dante, Petrarch, Boccaccio: Studies in the Italian Trecento in Honor of Charles S. Singleton*, ed. A. S. Bernardo and A.L. Pellegrini (Binghamton, NY: Medieval & Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1983): 273-304, esp. 283-284. Durling would have us believe that Dante was himself subject to the same doubts about the salvation or damnation of our congeners as he instructed the rest of us, ser Martinus and donna Bertas, to be (*Pur.*, 13.139-142). That view of the matter, it seems to me, is given the lie by the entirety of the poem, whose author seems assured enough in putting the likes of Celestino and Brunetto in hell, of Caro and Manfred in heaven (or, at least, *in via* to Paradise). For the most recent support for the notion that «l'ombra di calui / che fece per vilade il gran rifiuto» (*Inf.*, 3.59-60) is indeed Celestino, see Maria Simonelli's *Lectura Dante's Americana* on that canto (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993) which I read in typescript.

¹¹ The absence of reference to Cino in the *Convivio* is probably to be understood in terms of Dante's having changed his project radically, from praise of Beatrice to that of the Lady Philosophy. It is noteworthy that the scrupulous edition of the *Convivio* of Cesare Vasoli and Domenico De Robertis, *Opere minori*, 1.2 (Milan-Naples: Ricciardi, 1988) only refers to Cino on five occasions; and then never as an influence on Dante's treatise.

¹² See Enrico Mestica, in his endnote to *Purg.*, 24: «Questa Canzone, ch'è la prima della *Vita Nuova*, al cap. XIX, fu scritta nel 1289, e però dovremmo ritenere che Dante da quell'anno propriamente intenda aver principio la Poesia del dolce stil nuovo, onde ne sarebbe escluso non solo il Guinizelli, che era morto nel 1276 (e veramente egli può essere riguardato meglio come precursore o padre di Poeti del dolcestil nuovo), ma ne verrebbero escluse le poesie antecedenti, e non dovevano essere poche, del Cavalcanti, e le giovanili di Cino da Pistoia». See also Barolini, *Dante's Poets* pp. 129-130: «... just as Cavalcanti first frees Dante from subjection to a Gouffonian mode, so Guinizelli later frees him from subjection to a Cavalcantian mode.»

¹³ «Dante come personaggio-poeta della *Commedia*», *L'Approdo letterario* 4 (1958): 36. And now see Contini's «Cavalcanti in Dante», in *Un'idea di Dante*, p. 151 (first published as the preface to Contini's edition of the *Rime* of Cavalcanti [Verona: Bolchini, 1968]).

¹⁴ See Giorgio Padoan, «Il Canto degli epicurei», *Convivio* 27 (1959): 12-39, esp. 34-36. Others who follow this view of the matter include Antonino Pagliaro, *Uguce* (Messina-Firenze: G. D'Anna, 1967): 193-210; Leonardo Vietti, *Il sonetto a Dante di Guido Cavalcanti* [Lectura Dantis Romana] (Turin: SEI, 1962): 6, 21-22 (citing Pagliaro).

¹⁵ See *Un'idea di Dante*, p. 151.

¹⁶ See Alberto Corbellini, *Dante, Guido e Cino*, pp. 27-33, for a discussion of Cavalcanti's «l'vegna 'l giorno» as an angry response to the new friendship between Cino and Dante. His treatment includes numerous bibliographic indications of the varying discussions of this question between 1874 and 1905.

¹⁷ See, again, «Cino "vil ladro"», p. 131, where Gorni sets into relation the second verses of each poem, containing «vile» in Cino's case and «vincitore» in Guido's, as well as the still more convincing juxtaposition of the eighth verses of the two sonnets: «Certo bel motto volentier risolgo», Gorni suggests, seems surely to allude to Guido's «che tutte le tue rime avie ti coltes».

¹⁸ Guido uses the word three times against Dante in «l'vegna 'l giorno»: «trovati pensare troppo «vincitore» (v. 2), «per la «tua vitas» (v. 9); «l'anima indita» (v. 14). For what I believe was the first observation of this fact see Corrado Calenda, *Per altezza d'ingegno* (Naples: Liguori, 1976): 112. Given Dante's derivation of the word *nobile* from *non vile* in *Conv.*, 4.16.6, the force of the insistent insult would have been considerable.

¹⁹ See Gorni, p. 131, for Cino's opposition to Guido's notion of the *poeta faber* who files his poems into shape with *labor limae*.

²⁰ See Hollander, «The "Canto of the Word" (*Inferno* 21), *Lectura Dantis Newberryana*, ed. P. Cherchi and A.C. Mastrobuono, 2 (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1990): 99-100.

²¹ Cf. the similar problem caused by Montaigne's plans to include (and his eventual exclusion of) the work of Étienne de la Boétie at the midpoint of the last book of his *Essays* and the intriguing reasons for this exclusion discussed by François Rigolot, «Montaigne's Portia's Letters», *Yale French Studies*, no. 64 (1983), 145-166.

²² See Frank Orlinway's recently completed and lengthy article, «Brunetto and Dante», for the observation that even as skilled a critic as Barolini (see n. 5) omits Brunetto from consideration as one of «Dante's poets», despite the fact that he is clearly one of Dante's major vernacular precursors. Orlinway, it may be helpful to record here, argues, convincingly, in my opinion, extending the work of Francesco Mazzoni, if not following the conclusions drawn in the preface to his edition of *Il Tesoretto, Il Favoleto* (Alpignano: A. Tallone, 1967), that the *tesoro* of *In-*

Inferno XV, 119, refers to the *Tesoretto* and not to the *Tesoro*. Thus the context of this entire scene is rather that of Italian vernacular poetry than that of French prose encyclopedism. Recently Madison L. Sowell has also argued for a version of this interpretation, «Brunetto's *Tesoro* in Dante's *Inferno*, *Lectura Daniæ [virginiana]*, no. 7 (Fall 1990), 60-71. Sowell claims that the verse refers to both of Brunetto's texts, a solution toward which Lombardi (comment on 15.119) had earlier verged: «e forse per *Tesoro* intende anche l'altro libro in volgare *Tesoretto*». Portiselli, who frequently follows Lombardi slavishly, here pardoes his preceptor, and simply says that the text is the *Tesoretto*. Tommaseo's gloss denies that claim on the ground that the vernacular poem is a «cosa minore» compared to the *Tesoro*, an argument taken up again in our century by Porena (1946). Gregorio di Siena (1867), a much neglected commentator, cites the dedication of the *Tesoretto*:

To Brunetto Latini,
Che vostro in ogni guisa
Mi son senza divisa
A voi mi raccomando:
Poi vi presento e mando
Questo ricco Tesoro,
Che vale argento ed oro: etc.

Di Siena did what no one glossing this passage before him had done, at least not with an open and inquiring mind: he studied the text of the *Tesoretto*. It seems more than likely that the words that Dante puts in Brunetto's mouth echo this opening of the poem, which, just as do his words to Dante, seek the reward of fame. They also reveal two other connections with *Inf.* 15: the word *raccomando* very likely finds its source in Brunetto's *mi raccomando*. And we find out something extremely important: the title of the work is exactly as we find it in Dante's poem: *Tesoro*. It is of course likely that the real Brunetto would have wanted to be remembered primarily for the French work; but this is Dante's Brunetto. We should remember that. And Dante did not make himself immortal by writing a treatise, but a poem in the Italian vernacular.

¹ See Chiaranza, «Time and Eternity in the Myths of *Paradiso* XVII», in *Dante, Petrarch, Boccaccio: Studies in the Italian Trecento in Honor of Charles S. Singleton*, ed. Aldo S. Bernardo and Anthony L. Pellegrini (Binghamton NY: Medieval Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1985): 124-135.

² Many follow this line: for example, Startazzini, Bertolier, Steiner, Mastia, De Lungo, Vardelli, Grabber, and Montigliano. (The latter rather improbably asserts that, at this point in Dante's existence, the name of Cacciaguida would have meant nothing to him). Porena claims that Dante changed his mind when he came to *Par.* 17. Sapegno and Chimentz, without an attempt at explanation, merely note the fact that Beatrice will not do what is promised. Bosco/Reggio are in accord with Porena's position; the *Commedia* is «un'opera che si evolve e si arricchisce via via nel tempo della sua stesura».

³ The encounters with Guido's father and with Brunetto, each evidently intended to bring to the reader's mind Dante's acknowledgment of the two great poetic influences on him as he began his two modes of vernacular poetic composition, lyric and extended poetic narrative, have a number of common elements. A major one of these is that in each scene it is clear that Virgil is of no interest to the modest poet (or to his paternal stand-in), as was indeed the case in each poet's production, which is, in both of their *corpore*, decidedly without trace of Virgilian antecedence.

⁴ Benvenuto da Imola looks ahead from this passage in *Inf.* 15 to the phrase in *Par.* 17: «Ideo dicit: a christo, id est ad declarandum, con donna, scilicet Beatrice, che saprà, supple gloriare, a' la levatio; quasi dicat: si Deus facit mihi tantam gratiam, quod evadam de isto tristis inferno plectore, voluntis periculis, et per purgatorium perveniam ad paradysum duce Beatrice, tunc declarabo de cursu totius fortunae meae. Hoc autem faciet auctor XVII capitulo Paradisi, ubi introducit unum spiritum antiquum martirium de genere suo, qui sibi clare manifestavit novum cursum fortunae mediante Beatrice, quem multi praedixerant sibi obscure in Inferno et Purgatorio».

⁵ As strange as it seems, the only published interventions that I have found which couple these two identical phrases (the margin of my text has shown the notation for some time, and I would guess that one *lectura* or another of *Par.* 17 has noted the self-citation) are those of Madison Sowell, «Brunetto's *Tesoro* in Dante's *Inferno*, *Lectura Daniæ [virginiana]* 7 (1990): 66-67 and John Freccero, «The Eternal Image of the Fathers», *The Poetry of Allusion: Virgil and Ovid in Dante's «Commedia»*, ed. Rachel Jacob and Jeffrey T. Schnapp (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991): 64.

⁶ For Dante's highly developed and strategic dispersment of his various «fathers» through the *Commedia*, moving from Brunetto to St. Peter, see, again, *Ordway*. For an earlier consideration of Dante's «paternity», see Ricardo J. Quinones, *Dante Alighieri* (Boston: Twayne, 1979): 174-176.

⁷ That Virgil makes the one promise and Dante himself the second deprives of its force the argument of those who would argue that the incorrectness of the prediction is the result of Dante's desire to undercut Virgil's knowledge of things that are beyond him, as does the mere fact of the repetition of the forecast.

⁸ The phrase *il mio conforto* is twice applied to Virgil (*Purg.* 3.22; 9.43).

⁹ «Conforto, già, conforto l'Amor chiamato» (125-43). Marti's note to the verse correctly observes that Cino is here quoting Dante (*Inf.* 31.14: «sol nel mio lamento / Chiamo Beatrice, e dico: / Or se' tu morta? / E mentre ch'io la chiamo, me conforto»). Thus we here may have a case of Dante citing himself through the filter of Cino's major poem about Beatrice.

¹⁰ See Lauren Scancarelli Seem, «Dante's Nine Worthies», *Forum Italicum* (forthcoming); the suggestion was first made by Joan Ferrante, *The Political Vision of the «Divine Comedy»* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984): 287n.

¹¹ Benvenuto's gloss to the passage (18.49-51) expresses, if not his own puzzlement, his discovery of a confusion in his (unnamed) predecessors: «Et in hoc patet expresse error quorundam, qui ignoranter dixerunt, quod auctor hic nominat spiritum David...». The observation forces us to consider that it is a strange choice of word to describe Cacciaguida. In order to give some sense of the «modernity» of the term and of its relative newness for all but post-Romantic literati I can report the following facts: of the 621 appearances of *artista*, in its singular or its plural form, in the 44 commentaries in the current version of the DDP, the word has only 62 occurrences in 14 of the 23 commentaries that were written before 1868, while 559 occur in the 23 commentaries written after that date (and occur in all of these).

¹² See *Par.* 13.77; 16.51; 30.33. The *Grande Dizionario della lingua italiana*, ed. Salvatore Battaglia (Turin: UTET, 1961-) cites only the examples from *Par.* 18 and 33 as having the meaning «chi esercita una delle arti liberali (arti figurative, poesia, musica)». De Robertis's note to v. 9 of Cino's sonnet suggests that it represents perhaps the first time that the word was used in the Italian vernacular (if we exclude from consideration its probable use in Guido's lost sea-

net to Cino — see text after n. 80) before it appeared in the *Paradiso*, without, however, speculating on Dante's possible conscious reflection of its appearance in Cino. (The *Dizionario* suggests that the usage at 16.51 is the antiquated form of *artigiano*; that the one at 13.77 is less easy to be certain of, but that it is in any case not used to identify a personage in the poem. I would not think it overbold to believe that Dante had Daedalus in mind for the *artista* with the trembling hand — more likely in Ovid's version, *Metam.* 8.211, than in Virgil's, *Aen.* 6.33). Brugnolo (p. 291), points to the still earlier use by Bindo Bonichi, verse 2 of «Guardati Idio da l'asiner sarlese, / e da l'artista iscritto in disciplina».

⁷⁷ As is reflected by the Ottimo's gloss to *Par.* 30.28-33, translating the word as *artefice*. Benvenuto performs in a similar way: «idest, quilibet artifex».

⁷⁸ When we consider that Virgil, in *Igf.* 10.130-132, promises Dante that Beatrice, who sees all things, will reveal to him the course of his future life, we are reminded of the blindness of the Epicureans which is so prominent a theme of the tenth canto. Beatrice, Dante, and possibly Cino, are thus intrinsically set against the blind son of the blind father. For the deeper resonances of *Aen.* 5.734 in Dante's *cieco carcere* (*Igf.* 10.58), see Michael Putnam, «Virgil's *Inferno*», in *The Poetry of Allusion: Virgil and Ovid in Dante's «Commedias»*, ed. Rachel Jacoff and Jeffrey T. Schnapp (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991): 94-95.

⁷⁹ See Giulio Bertoni, «La poesia di Cino da Pistoia», in *Cino da Pistoia nel VI centenario della morte*, a cura del comitato pistoiese per le onoranze (Pistoia: Pacinotti, 1937): 29: «Basta scorrere le opere giuridiche del Pistoiese, per convincersi dell'affinità della concezione ciniiana e dantesca. Anche per Cino l'Impero deriva direttamente da Dio e si sottrae all'autorità della Chiesa, perché le precissa: *Imperator non habet superiores*; ma ha doveri di reverenza verso il Pontefice, che è suprema autorità spirituale, mentre l'Imperatore è supremo reggitore delle cose temporali, due astri su due mondi diversi».

⁸⁰ Zaccagnini, *Cino da Pistoia*, p. 154, says that, from 1314-1319, concerning Cino we have «scarse e mal sicure... notizie». Brugnolo (p. 289) suggests that «Da poi che la natura ha fine posto» (163), Cino's poem upon the death of Henry VII, contains as many as eight citations of *Inferno*. He goes on to suggest that, if he is correct, we then must consider the possibility that copies of *Inferno* circulated before 1314, the usual *terminus ante quem*. To that thought I would add this one: If Cino, late in 1313, can make such extensive use of Dante's text in a poem in praise of Henry, he surely must have known of Dante's intense support of the Emperor.

⁸¹ Chiappelli, «Appunti sul valore culturale dell'opera di Cino da Pistoia», *Cino da Pistoia nel VI centenario della morte*, a cura del comitato pistoiese per le onoranze (Pistoia: Pacinotti, 1937): 33, wonders why Cino never mentioned Dante's *Monarchia* «che pur conteneva tanti argomenti discussi da Cino nelle sue *Lectiones*». If the rapture occurred after Dante completed his work on the treatise (1317?), Cino might have had personal (as well as political) reasons for not referring to it. (It is clear that I hold with those who believe *Monarchia* was composed alongside of the early cantos of *Paradiso*).

⁸² Gerolamo Biscaro, «Cino da Pistoia e Dante» *Studi medievali* I (1928): 496-497.

⁸³ See Biscaro, p. 494.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*

⁸⁵ Biscaro, p. 492: «Si può credere che fino all'indomani della morte dell'imperatore, l'amicizia dei due poeti non avesse subito alcun turbamento. Ma riteniamo probabile che, dopo due o tre anni, sia subentrato nei loro rapporti uno stato di freddezza: che persisteva allorché Dante venne a morte, e si accentuò di poi nei sentimenti del superstite verso la memoria

dell'estate, fino a convertire in uggia la cara ricordanza di una stretta comune di idee e di affetto». Mario Marti, «Cino da Pistoia», *ED* 2 (1978): 9n, is willing to believe that Cino moved away from his political involvements and perhaps even backed into a Guelph political position, thus precipitating the end of his friendship with Dante soon after the death of Henry. He, constrained as are we all by the lack of any hard data, is circumspect in making the suggestion: «V'è chi pensa che in questi anni sia andato progressivamente avvicinandosi agli interessi politici strettamente e assai pratticamente intesi, e che la bell'amicizia fra lui e D. sia venuta affievolendosi fino a morire o fino a trasformarsi addirittura in ostilità. Certo è che nella *Commedia* non è fatto alcun luogo diretto o indiretto al nome di Cino». Luca Carlo Rossi, «Una ricomposta tenzone», pp. 48-49, is willing to entertain Biscaro's thesis: «con la morte di Arrigo VII nel 1313 sembra iniziare una progressiva freddezza che traspare dall'altrimenti inspiegabile silenzio su Cino nella *Commedia*...».

⁸⁶ As for Cino's feelings about his exclusion from the *Commedia*, despite the warm poem upon Dante's death («Su per la costax»), they were probably less than pleased. Rossi's welcome and convincing study («Una ricomposta tenzone») has, against the assumptions of earlier critics who did not think Cino would conceivably have written polemically against Dante, demonstrated that it is at least probable that not only one but all three of the late sonnets attacking Cino's former friend are indeed written by him: «In verità questo libel di Dante» (Zaccagnini, *Dubbe* 17), «Infra gli altri difetti del libello» (Zaccagnini, 185, Marti, *Dubbe*, 186), and «Messer Bosone, lo vostro Mancoello» (Zaccagnini, *Dubbe*, 12). While this debate is beyond the main concerns of this study, Rossi has shown how closely Cino continued to mind his Dante. The article contains new editions of the three sonnets and of the answers on Dante's behalf which they drew.

⁸⁷ See discussion after n. 62, above.

⁸⁸ See the by now nearly forgotten exceptions include the commentaries of Sapegno and Fallani to *Par.* 33.119) hint put forward by Bruno Nardi, *Nel mondo di Dante* (Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1944): 278. Cino, commenting on the *Code*, II, c. 56, l. 6, has this to say about Matilda: «Comitissa Matilda... fuit filia regis Italiae et successit in regno et gessit omnia tanquam rex». Such a view of Matilda would help to clarify Dante's reasons for choosing this woman as symbol of the active life, thus removing one of the major obstacles for believing it is she whom Dante encounters in the Earthly Paradise. How and when Dante might have known either the passage or an earlier version of Cino's judgment of her worth are not, however, questions that currently have answers. For confirming evidence that Matilda's name was spelled as Dante spells it (with an «e» where «io» is more usual), and further evidence that it is the Countess whom we encounter in *Par.* 28, see Claudia Villa, «In favore della Girao Contessa», *Quaderni del Dipartimento di lingue e letterature neolatine dell'Istituto universitario di Bergamo* 2 (1987): 67-76.

⁸⁹ I wish to express my gratitude to Margherita Frankel, Lino Pertile, and Lauren Scancarli Socar, all of whom read an earlier version of this study with care and offered many suggestions for its improvement. Their mention here in no way suggests that they accept my views, but reflects only their collegial interest in my work. I also want to thank the personnel of the Library of the Società Dante Alighiana and its director, Francesco Mazzoni, for the courtesies extended to me during my visit to Florence in May of 1991. And I must acknowledge the helpful suggestions made about several details in my argument by members of the Editorial Board of *Dante Studies*, especially Christopher Kleinhenz.