

# Dante *Worlds*

Echoes, Places, Traces

edited by  
Peter Carravetta

«L'ERMA» di BRETSCHNEIDER

Peter Carravetta (editor by)  
*Dante Worlds*  
*Places Traces Questions*

© Copyright 2018 «L'ERMA» di BRETSCHNEIDER  
Via Cassiodoro, 11 - 00193 Rome  
<http://www.lerma.it>

*Graphic design*  
«L'ERMA» di BRETSCHNEIDER

*On the cover:*  
*Permutations of the Icon* (1976-2016) By Peter Carravetta,  
Kasia Romanowska, and Andrea Fedi

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, or transmitted  
in any form or by any means without written permission of the publisher.

ISBN 978-88-913-XXX (Paperback)  
ISBN 978-88-913-XXX (PDF)

## INDEX

PREFACE.....	p.	5
Christopher S. Celenza, ECHOES OF <i>PURGATORIO XVI</i> : NOTES ON FREE WILL AND POLITICS IN THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY.....	p.	
Paolo A. Cherchi, DANTE IN THE SPANISH WORLD .....	p.	
Roberta Morosini, “ <i>THE WIDEST EXPANSE OF WATER INSIDE SHORES:</i> ” SPACE AND ITINERARIES OF DANTE’S MEDITERRANEAN WITH A NOTE ON THE VOYAGES OF MEDUSA AND HYSIPYLE .....	p.	
Andrea Fedi, DANTE “THE MASTER TRAVELER, THE MASTER GUIDE TO ITALY” IN MAURICE HEWLETT’S <i>THE ROAD IN TUSCANY</i> .....	p.	
Martino Marazzi, THE DOUBLE PRESENCE, OR, THE ITALIAN AMERICAN DANTE.....	p.	
Simone Brioni and Lorenzo Mari, POSTCOLONIAL DANTE: READING THE <i>COMMEDIA</i> IN MOGADISHU .....	p.	
Teresa Caligiure, ECHOES, TEXTS AND CONTEXTS. ASPECTS OF DANTE’S RECEPTION IN COMMUNIST ALBANIA IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY .....	p.	
Rolando Pérez, ON THE ONTOLOGY OF AESTHETIC OBJECTS: GRAHAM HARMAN’S <i>DANTE’S BROKEN HAMMER</i> .....	p.	



# PREFACE

## *Worlding*

Frate,  
Lo mondo è cieco, e tu vien ben da lui

Dante, *Purg.* XVI, 64-65.

Why, they talk Dante, write Dante,  
and think and dream Dante at this moment,  
to an excess which would be ridiculous,  
but that he deserves it.

Lord Byron, *Diary*, Jan. 29, 1821.

### I.

On the 750<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the birth of Dante Alighieri, the D'Amato Chair in Italian Studies at Stony Brook University brought together a group of scholars and thinkers from a variety of backgrounds to examine certain aspects of the large footprint the Florentine has left in Western culture. The subtitle points to that, and the present anthology lives up to it. There is no question that Dante's impact and legacy in our cultures has been registered in innumerable contexts and in the most diverse domains, from linguistics to poetics, from theology to philosophy, from political thought to psychology, from mythology to science. Even more intriguing are the places, both geohistorical and with reference to particular authors' works, where his thought resonates, triggers questions, leaves traces in ways often not immediately visible. As there are so many Dante conferences going on this year world-wide, -- indeed the six-year span between the anniversaries of his birth (1265) and of his death (1321) is booked solid, -- what made our project special is that it was *not* specifically aimed at Dante scholars or Italianists or even medievalists. Rather, the aim was to explore the "worlds" Dante impacted, affected, and -- to use an old-fashioned

word -- inspired in authors from many different cultures/nations from around the world, almost excluding Italy itself unless the reading exhibited in some measure a trans-national approach.

A few thoughts about the title of the conference, and now of this anthology, are in order to help sketch a preliminary map of the terrain explored in the nine chapters contained within these covers. Judging by their queries about the conference, many people spontaneously thought we were going to deal with the “many worlds” present in Dante’s own *oeuvre*, such as the standard discipline-based conceptions and the accepted parceling of knowledge warrant: Dante’s political, or theological, or linguistic realities, for instance, elevated metaphorically under the semantics of the notion of “world.” That made sense, and in fact a great deal of scholarly research tackles what are more properly called fields of interest, or specializations, or conversely broad aspects or topics of his poetics or politics, what in Italian would sound approximately “*mondi di Dante*.”

The fact that worlds is italicized signals a different critical outlook. For the author’s world, and worlds as we insist, cannot be separated from the world/s of the interpreter. Interpretation involves a *necessary relation*, however individually formulated and professionally formalized. If earlier generations thought the separation could be done, their results were blinkered and ultimately reflected the interpreter’s own critical, aesthetic and political ideology. Thus, the author – his/her symbols, his/her world-view, and so on -- was made “to fit,” so to speak. One need only recall half a century of Crocean criticism! A more contemporary approach would take the unavoidable generalization of the world or times in which Dante lived – generalizations which are occupational hazards of all historians and philosophers, necessary evils that beg to be handled with a grain of salt, without de-finitive judgments – and proceed to unveil what perhaps was there but was not readable owing precisely to dominant pre-constituted notions about what an author is, or can reveal him/herself to be. Typically, a work of art is *ab initio* an Open Work, as we learned half a century ago from Umberto Eco. In the language of hermeneutics, the critic or the reader dialogues with the original text, listens to it, then in various guises appropriates and recasts it. Case in point, as I will discuss in detail further down, is Teodolinda Barolini’s demonstration of how Dante’s work is *avant-la-lettre* multicultural, trans-national, indeed heterodox – and, we might add, reformist -- when these concepts were not yet even articulated in *his* times, and some did not exist for the critical consciousness until the 20<sup>th</sup> century! Or how the question of judgment was broached by Dante with such far-ranging implications that only centuries later did it come to fruition, as Christopher Celenza demonstrates.

What I meant by “Dante *worlds*” were two possible horizons of critical interaction. One was how Dante compelled other people – artists, philosophers, poets generally – to create *their own* worlds, the grand epics or allegories that may not even refer to Dante directly but for which we sort of know, and can demonstrate with the right tools, that the Florentine was either the spark or provided in part the fuel or the model (even if often anti-model) for others to re-invent the universe, to create in short an entire new or other world themselves. I was thinking, for example, and to limit myself to those who

wrote in verse, of other major visionaries like Milton, Blake, Byron, Tennyson, Nietzsche, D'Annunzio, or Pound. My view is that the best way to evaluate such a multifaceted powerful precursor (I am not being Bloomian here) is to consider how Dante creates worlds by making others create their own, if/when they are up to the challenge. One can argue, by the same logic, that Virgil spurred Dante to envision the *Comedy*, which as we know ultimately is far from the *Aeneid* (though Dante does not refrain from admitting his debt). Here the critique of direct "influence" and subtle "textual" re-writing or citationism would be of little relevance to the context I am sketching. We recall Blake's famous statement: "I will create my own system or be enslaved by another man's," perhaps to overcome his obsession with Milton and *latu-sensu* with Dante as well. The focus here is not on any likely "precursor" of Dante, but rather with those who came after, and this from a contemporary sense of a "speaking to the future," as it were, which befits prophetic spirits.

The other possibility for a novel critical interaction was somewhat more theoretically challenging. In some of the essays from the fifties collected in *Unterwegs zu Sprache* Heidegger comes up with expressions such as "language speaks" ("die Sprache spricht") and "things thing," and suggests that a disclosure of what he calls authentic being, which is hidden in the very ontological constitution of what it is we are thinking about, requires that we essay to recover it by listening, or by letting something come forth, and enter in its own inner luminosity. The entire notion of truth not as representation but as "*aletheia*," unconcealment, "svelamento" in Italian, partakes of a similar process. It also requires, insofar as we are beings-in-the-world (a coinage from *Being and Time* no longer used in his later writings), that we relate, indeed appropriate, that which is ushered forth, especially in the language of poetry, in the "work," as "opera," which is the privileged dwelling for Being itself.

Heidegger spoke of being-in-*the*-world (my emphasis) in the twenties, but by the fifties he spoke of *a* world inhabited by each of the fallen beings that go into the making of history and must work upward (typically through a poem) to regain the sense of the groundless elusive Being. As the critics in this anthology demonstrate, the emphasis remains on determining in what ways other poets, other creators of language, founders of societies, react and engage the polysemic creation of Dante, which speaks, explains, and translates at times simultaneously. And in what specific determination they rework this voice, for example, concerning the idea of justice, or exile, or community, or feeling. Outside of the quasi-mystical pursuit of Being, Heidegger does pinch a critical nerve when he notes that, paraphrased, speaking speaks, writing writes (as Derrida would go on to note *ad absurdum*), thinking about Being involves thinking about the appearance of beings, and things... call upon things. In this vein, some of Dante's ideas – something of, and in, or about, or stemming from Dante -- engage the reader even centuries afterwards, and act as mainspring to develop other ideas within the second context, or reality, of the reader (or poet, or critic). Thus, I extrapolated: the world *worlds*. The second term of the syntagm, originally a noun, is verbalized (I could not, by extension, verbalize the name, and state that: Dante *dantes!*)

By verbalizing “worlds” I am introducing a *temporal dimension* not present in the poetological myth of the almighty abstract universal Word! Insofar as Dante is creator of a world, indeed of several of them if we apply critical categories (required when we wish to emphasize specific topics: Dante as poet, Dante as philosopher, Dante as social critic), then my idea was to read the title of the conference and now of this collection as, precisely, Dante *worlds*...an active, generating, out-reaching dynamic that discloses (word dear to Heideggerians) other possibilities, engaging the listener/reader to relate to his/her, though still *other*, world/s, not necessarily Dantesque or dantesque, yet in sympathy with him, developing out of some of Dante’s concerns alternative possibilities, cut newer or contemporary pathways, give voice to what often is unspeakable, and ultimately stimulate experiments in constructing social models, political hypotheses, perhaps shape lives, refashion traditions. The missing factor in Heideggerian hermeneutics is, as I have explained elsewhere, the fact that the pursuit of Being kept the philosopher of the black forest pretty much in the stratosphere of a (decayed, by his lights) metaphysics, rarely stooping to evaluate what had happened to those lower-case beings, the living humans, that is, those who with the rest of Western Mensch may have forgotten ontological Being, and were therefore assumed to have lived alienated lives in some guise for over two millennia. But these are the beings, *gli essenti*, the living entities who make up human history. In short, what Heidegger left out (in contrast, for instance, to Sartre or Merleau-Ponty, or Ricoeur, or Dante himself for that matter), is the *ontic reality* (so acutely parsed in his earlier writings) of the human being in a concrete world, “the man in the street,” so to speak, in documentable circumstances, *el hombre de carne y hueso*, as Miguel de Unamuno used to call the intra-historic dwellers of the planet.

What will be foregrounded in the papers that follow are the human agents who, relating or correlating to some aspect of Dante’s own *lived worlds*, reacted to it or them, dialogued with it or them, and then fashioned for themselves their own perspective, having grasped something authentic across the centuries and forged something *in their own times and society*, shaped it anew, in a different tongue, both literally and metaphorically, but in a language/world nonetheless that still echoes or bears the mark of the Florentine. In this sense, we can say that by “worlding” through time and place, histories and languages, *Dante lives on!*

## II.

Dante worlds in a variety of styles and contexts, triggering challenges and foisting what will become paradigmatic examples of his fierce commitment to justice and to the truth of the human condition. For Teodolinda Barolini, Dante’s own world (understood in the sense of the social reality of the “trecento”) is already being exploded from within. She foregrounds the fact that, by placing in his *Comedy* some pagans and Muslims in limbo -- hitherto unthinkable in the Middle Ages, -- Dante lashes out a powerful critique to the reigning orthodoxy of the Church, which had provided and enforced the accepted strong-



ly dogmatic dictionary of ideas for most of Europe. Dante's question was: Why should virtuous, intelligent people be denied access to God's grace owing to their being born before Christ, and "sinful only in their culturally-induced failure to believe?" The world-picture outlook extends not only diachronically, but also horizontally, that is, geographically, as when the poet ponders why someone born "on the banks of the Indus" ought to be prevented from partaking of the gift of the Son simply because s/he did not know about it. Even more explosive, in the *Comedy*, is Dante's "saving" of Saladin, Averroes, and Avicenna. But for Dante, if there is a true "universal justice," then there should be no scandal. Less obvious to most but not to the eye of the expert is the subtle radicalism manifested, for instance, in *Inferno* 17, where Dante depicts the Christian usurers with the iconography of the money-bags typically associated, at the time, with the Jews. Radical is also the manner in which, Barolini tells us, Dante places Ethiopians closer to God, on Judgment Day, than those who, implicitly hypocritical, keep on pounding their chest wailing "Christ, Christ." These cases speak to Dante's understanding and social and moral acceptance of what today we would call a multicultural society, but against which the "establishment" in his day nurtured strong prejudices if not altogether downright hatred. It takes effort to grasp the power of the reactionary politics of his day, and the connected paranoia to protect the privileges and the power of the new emerging bourgeoisie. The theologian Guido Vernani, upon reading in Dante's *Monarchia* (I.3.9) that the Arab Averroes understood Aristotle (perhaps implying that he was on par with Aquinas?), mounted an attack on Dante in 1327, that is, six years after his death, and supported John XXII's bull to have him exhumed and ex-communicated *post mortem*! Surely this poet must have conceived and bandied some really dangerous ideas, if in the eyes of the blatantly corrupt Church hierarchy he deserved being burned at the stake, even *after* his death!

In this context, one must appreciate Barolini's note on how even Edward Said, in his *Orientalism*, failed fully to grasp the strong censure present in Dante's socio-political milieu, and how and to what degree Dante's thinking was innovative, heterodox, at times subversive, and I would add reformist. It's a motif that echoes my own reservations about some exponents of post-colonial criticism, where the generalizations are often ludicrous, as when they write that *all* European authors are culpable from the start, independently of large differences between colonialisms from different countries, and ignoring the specific motivations of individuals who may have chosen to participate *but were not* colonialists. Ironically, the sweeping attitude echoes the mantra about all Catholics being born with the stain of original sin! Such overgeneralizing critiques fail moreover to account for the *specific* dynamics of a given text, and neglect or refuse to see how some authors still managed – from *within* the given dominant discourses of power, patriarchy, capital, coercive possession, and institutionalized discrimination, -- to *fight back* nonetheless, often as maligned exiles, fugitives, escapees, and at any rate risking and sometimes losing everything but the shirts on their back. And yet they still proposed alternatives, and still insisted on showing possible modifications (for Dante, via his Pilgrim in the *Comedy*, but also directly in the treatises) in ethics, politics, inter-personal relations, touching the very stuff of the *polis*, in short...the world, at least *their* world. To those who might still

be tempted to stuff Dante into the one-size-fits-all suit of the dead white males of the Western colonial enterprise, Barolini's conclusion delivers a devastating blow to their lazy self-serving panaceas:

with his passionate and rigorous intellect, he *thought* himself out of the essentializing social constructions of his day. In the same way that he thought himself *out of* the social construction of obligatory *vendetta*, he thought himself *into* imagining a young and unallegorized female as an avatar of the divine, and he thought himself *into* imagining that people who lived virtuously but were cut off from the Christian dispensation are deserving of special honor, and may even be saved, and he thought himself *into* imagining that sexuality is a spectrum that accommodates the salvation of homosexuals as plausibly as that of heterosexuals. All this he did with his mind and the power of his imagination, and in this way, even if we have been slow to learn from him, he certainly helped to create the world we live in now. (pg....)

Christopher Celenza offers another approach to Dante's thought and works which shows, in the critical context sketched above, how he was worlding forward, so to speak. Going to the heart of the *Comedy*, Canto 16 of *Purgatory*, the critic asks: "why is it so dark in this Canto?" Because the issues confronted are two of the greatest problems that besieged societies since the beginning of time – that is, the power of the godhead and the power of the human ruler -- and vis à vis which human reason has been, well, practically blind! The response is, first: people have not made good on their unique capacity to decide on their course of action, on their freedom to make a choice. Whether in a 14<sup>th</sup> or a 21<sup>st</sup> century context, the responsibility that goes with making the right choice, with "doing the right thing" about, ultimately, anything, from deciding whether to pray or to run for public office, rests upon the proper use of reason, the light of the intellect, and should be a paramount concern, avoiding being blindsided by vices and ire and contempt. In this, Dante strikes at the very core of what it means to be human, forcing us to ask these questions again, and again, in view of *our* world as a whole, or of our specific worlds of interaction in effective reality. And, second, the just as vexing question concerning whose authority do human beings appeal to in order to organize and set norms for the community, in other words, who can legitimately claim the right to run a city or a country or, in Dante's day, a province, a principality, a commune, even a clan. Given that historically we dwell within the European/Judeo-Christian *oecumene*, the question turns upon whether religious authority is above, and therefore hierarchically determining of, secular laws. Once again we are reminded of how Dante "worlds": for the Pilgrim goes on to ask Marco Lombardo about a distinction between Church and State, implicitly a separation of powers – so dear to us Moderns and enshrined in our US Constitution and that of the majority of nation-states today – that gets reformulated this time explicitly by the end of the Canto.

Many have wondered about Dante's predilection for the age of Augustus as his paradigm for making this intra-worldly distinction. Indeed, here we must reiterate that, though there is one (planet) earth, there is certainly more than one world that signifies us

and that we need to contend with. Dante is working at the level of macrostructures, and despite the fact that the two realms, the religious and the secular, intersect and overlap in concrete reality, the point is a philosophical, indeed a methodological one. Dante is not an “imperialist” because he glorifies the Caesars, he is simply making a crucial point when, reading Mark 12:17, “give to Caesar what belongs to Caesar, and give to God what belongs to God,” he delineates a (non-religious) principle for the proper administration of the *polis* (the commune, or the kingdom), wherein the individual’s choice of creed and his/her responsibility toward the commonwealth require an awareness of two distinct realms, that the spirit and that of the body. Two dimensions of the same world? Perhaps, but the one is concerned with the other-worldly, with the eternity of the after-life, while the other is concerned with living on *this here earth as mortals*, with our cares and fears and pleasures and effectively our *worldly concerns*. Thus, Dante pulls out of our *common* Western social/religious history a precept and relaunches it in *his* day, “in a time when clarity of that distinction, in its strong modern form, would have been self-evident to a few people,” as Celenza notes. Furthermore, the critic reminds us that the metaphor of the two suns ought not be read – as religious ethicists have for centuries, -- as meaning that one is superior to the other (i.e.: the brighter star as an allegory of the Papacy, and the lesser one, the moon, representing Empire) but, rather, that they are equal (they are, in fact, called “suns”). In other words, Dante distinguishes between two equally necessary realms of power to order and guide human beings in a society, specifically his society, in the 14<sup>th</sup> century. But no one would argue that so many elements of our lives today, as yesterday, partake of a spiritual realm, while others are best understood as belonging to the sphere of the practical organization of the polis, whatever configuration it may take.

Dante’s ideas about free will and the separation of powers have metastasized over time. This serves as a reminder that the cultural unconscious of a society is potentially rich precisely owing to the often subterranean proliferation of ideas which, though unseen, are actually thriving somewhere and for someone, and at some point re-emerge, as Celenza’s cited passage by J.P.A. Pocock clearly states. I would add, borrowing from Gilles Deleuze, that they re-emerge as a rhizome which -- as is the case of the embedded ethical-political principle in the *Gospel* that had systematically been ignored for centuries (and by Church authorities no less), and is foregrounded in Canto XVI of *Purgatory* and in *Monarchia*, -- sprouts ages later again in a different country, or city-state, and in the lives of writers tried by unforeseen tragedies or even less dramatic projects, sparking new possibilities for the organization of a markedly different world.

The notion of the rhizome, or what we might less technically call subterranean lives of an author or a concept or a vision, marks the tenor of Paolo Cherchi’s essay, which foregrounds how Dante’s values re-emerge in the life and thought of Miguel de Unamuno. The great sage of Salamanca prized what he deemed the necessary dialectical co-existence of intellect and passion, the transubstantiation of earthly love into higher reasoned motifs. Dante’s tapestry of “real people,” Cherchi observes, “is accessible to all sorts of readers,” allowing them to immerse themselves “in the depth and the force of human feelings” and “the daily world” that “manifest[s] itself in the political passion so obvious in Dante’s

work.” In this sense, through the assimilation and metamorphoses of one of its most eloquent and engaging minds, Spain ‘s culture can be said to have worlded principles and passions that stemmed from the Florentine’s unbounded imagination six centuries earlier.

That he could inspire the pre-Raphaelites is also no surprise, insofar as Dante was indeed, also, a devotee of beauty, an aristocratic soul who expatiated between the *stilnovo* experience and the catalogue of adjectives unleashed to describe the angelic women, Beatrice foremost. Did Ruben Dario “betray” the original? Of course, how could it be otherwise? but that is not the point, for when the light is cast towards *a* world, therefore *another* world than Dante’s, such as present at the end of the XIX century in Latin America and Spain, why would a poet want merely to reproduce and/or slavishly imitate the original? This sort of faux argument about literary history has functioned for untold decades on the mistaken or grossly metaphysical and dogmatic axiom that there is One immanent unrepeatable Origin(al) which, paradoxically, remains and must remain untouchable! For each time someone – artist as well as critic, or reader in general – attempts to say anything about it (i.e.: “interpret it”) or, worst offence of them all, “translate” it into something else (whether literary genre, or media, or even didactic material), the irsute guardians of the Canon, or of their self-styled parthenon, quickly point the finger and emit punishing critiques and condemnations, prompt banishment from the guild.

Cherchi employs the word appropriation when remarking on the Spanish Dante, but once we move onto the terrain of the “personal” or “autobiographical” perhaps the notion loses its technical (usually negative) philological sense, and becomes more psychological, as when “writing on Dante means writing about oneself” whether it concerns art, as in the case of Unamuno, or political outlooks, as with Asturias or, especially, Ocampo. Beyond that, if we look at this issue of adopting, borrowing from, or “using” another author, from a hermeneutic perspective, from Heidegger down through Gadamer, Vatimo and many others, “appropriation” is not a threat or danger to avoid, but actually the recognition of what happens (whether we like it or not) when we relate to a text, indeed to anything within the purview of the critical consciousness. Thus the matter rests not with “whether” we can or should take in what we perceive or read with untainted clinical gloves, but “how” and with what criteria we are going to “contaminate” the object of search and research. Nevertheless, perhaps shoring up his own critique of excessive philologism, Cherchi notes that for Ocampo Dante has in fact been hampered by the erudition of the “dantologues” who box in and taxonomize his every breath: some learning is necessary to follow the reading of Dante step by step, says the writer, but an excess of it can be just suffocating. A different kind of relation is established between Dante and Jorge Luis Borges when the Argentine asks: if we have sinners in hell, and the whole poem is about God’s justice, a God who is good by antonomasia, are we to suppose that God created evil? Borges figures that the way out of the impasse, as Cherchi reads him, is for Dante to make himself a character in the story, the Pilgrim, who then goes on to judge in accordance with God’s sense of justice. In other words, God did not create evil, it was the individuals who are interviewed during the journey of the Pilgrim who have committed various kinds of unjust acts and therefore, according to the supreme law, must now

languish in hell unto eternity. In this we see what Cherchi calls a “relationship of osmosis” between the two visionaries.

Going back to Dante’s actual sociohistorical universe, again proof that he was wordling within *his* World, Roberta Morosini reads the *Comedy* as having embedded in it a whole geography of the Mediterranean. Though no sailor or explorer in the sense of the later Columbus and Vespucci, and journeying within a basically land-locked geography – Florence, Central Italy, Romagna, Northern Italy (and accepting speculations about his having travelled all the way to Paris), -- Dante was nevertheless precise in his references. As always he summoned all the knowledge available at the time about other earthly worlds situated by seacoasts and riverbanks in order to cast a network of real places and inter-relations throughout the *Comedy*, thereby legitimating a reading of what Morosini calls “an aquatic poem.” An entire new interpretive horizon is thus disclosed, ushering forth the perspective that the sea is hardly a limit or obstacle, but rather constitutes a “living space,” a metaphorical terrain for the interaction, transmission and translation of words, objects, and peoples. In Dante’s vision we are informed of actual places and people who did in fact travel the Mediterranean, from Cyprus to Marseille to Gibraltar, and who often referred of even further away locations, from India to Ethiopia. The point appears to be that the aquatic metaphor is as much an integral part of the poet’s vision as any of the over-land experiences and exploits that are described with a surveyor’s eye throughout the three canticles.

According to Morosini, the sea itself, and the Mediterranean in particular, is a panoply of many worlds of social relations, power plays, inter-ethnic and inter-religious exchanges, and ultimately a generator of master tropes concerning “human co-existence” that can fruitfully be perceived and discussed through the recently articulated critical notions of trans-nationalism, “liquidity,” and “hybridity.” More than that, Morosini’s reading exposes Dante’s understanding of Christianity as, at bottom, truly catholic, in the etymological sense. That is, it is inclusive rather than exclusive, a broad multi-layered polylogics within whose narratives the specific or individual worlds of characters – who themselves become exempla and icons of human possibilities – surface, navigate, and track a destination which is also a destiny. And they ultimately conclude either by letting the sea engulf them or, conversely, by pulling the curtain/sails around themselves.

Dante the geographer-surveyor-discoverer of his own world who prompts a re-discovery and reconfiguration of a cultural milieu also emerges, in an entirely different environment, through Andrea Fedi’s contribution. That Hewlett’s early 20<sup>th</sup> century travel *Guide to Tuscany* refers constantly to a 14<sup>th</sup> century traveler is remarkable proof of how the poet’s real-life descriptions of his environment as well as those scattered throughout his envisioned journey in the beyond multiply, diffract, coalesce, go dark, so to speak, or become rhizomes, and then resurface six centuries later to disclose sights sounds and images apt at revealing no less than “the ontological essence of Italy,” and, more philosophically, “not the envelope of the thing, but the thing itself quintessentially.” In this, Hewitt directs the reader, through Dante, to see with imaginative eyes rather than simply perceive an aesthetic object (at least as this was understood at the time), fostering an exercise in

“intellectual second sight” that in a way sees “into” the very process of creating the seen. And Dante “is full of that” second sight.

Worlding has also the effect of making a reader see reality literally through the poet’s eyes, sometimes to excess, as in the case of *ekphrastic* vignettes raised to the level of the mythical when in reality they may just be simple and not so exciting village scenes. Fedi writes that “[t]he travel writer expands upon them to transform a well-defined physical context into the stage or the background for a fictional or pseudo-historical reconstruction that has a distinctive theatrical quality.” This phenomenon, of course, does not happen with Dante’s texts only, as it is a well-known mechanism in travel literature. Fedi cites John Murray’s *Handbook for Travellers*, specifically the sections on central Italy, where recommendations are made to pack “compact editions” of some fifteen Italian authors. This bi-directionality text-space reaches “fanatical” levels when, against the background of early positivist anthropologists, Dante is elevated to the master paradigm of the “Tuscan type,” and the *arché* of the poet’s perspicuous capacity to move on advancing his ethical objectives. But in this, the poet gives life to – i.e.: wills into a world -- the very materials and features of the physical world he encounters through subtle linguistic devices, such as personification of rivers by simply subtracting the article, “as if they were persons,” for example. The landmarks are identified as familiar, giving the traveling an “interactive, reciprocal exchange,” so that one feels “as being to being, as one to whom the world at large and in detail – meadow, grove, and stream, the earth and every common sight – is either host or fellow adventurer.”

According to Fedi, the value of Hewlett’s guide to the traveler in Italy is that, for someone who preferred a singer to her song and a man to his masterpiece and, more broadly, claimed that “[I] never opened a book when I could read what I wanted on the hillside or by the river-bank,” Dante represents an exception of gargantuan proportions. For Hewlett, the Florentine takes him out of the formal literary canon and “into the field of empirical knowledge” owing to the poet’s “demonstrated ability to convey ‘the fortunes and features of his race,’ showcase a wide ‘catalogue’ of ‘physical’ and ‘spiritual sensation[s].’” Thus Dante’s worlding conjoins text and fact, foregrounding the latter in all its complexity, so as to link the knowledge of the thing seen-experienced to the understanding of the same and, as Fedi puts it, “provide the hermeneutic principles for an understanding and recounting of the experience of travel.”

Simone Brioni and Lorenzo Mari’s paper tackle the trenchant critique of modern-day racial prejudice and insidious colonial cultural politics in Italy vis à vis the immigrant writers who have survived the Somali civil war. When Garane Garané cites *Inferno* 33.79 – “O Pisa, blot of shame upon the people / of that fair land where the sound of ‘si’ is heard” -- and strategically changes the name Pisa to Italy, the Italian public is reminded that they may have missed Dante’s embedded catholic sensibility toward people of all stripes, as the papers by Barolini and Morosini in this collection also clearly show. What emerges is that approaching Dante’s world through the dilemmas and the dramas of the contemporary immigrant community almost automatically skews the question of tradition and filiation within the established Canon (not that the canon does not already con-

tain within itself multiple series of contrasting, and some yet to be unearthed, possibilities), and highlights the direct but never cause-and-effect relationship between words and things, unleashing the polysemy of the text to grasp onto an entirely other Other. Much as we saw took place with some writers in Spanish culture, but within a substantially different geopolitical context, Naruddin and Garané, write the two young authors, “are not interested in entertaining a close philological dialogue with the *Commedia*, but rather they read the text as an embedded fiction with political, social, and historical life, and use its symbolism to express the trauma of the destruction of Mogadishu.” And again, this is an invitation to discard the critical common place of a Dante bearer of “universal” messages and values outside of the *locus of their occurrence*, inasmuch as the very idea of Universal, a quintessential philosophical *meme* of Western culture, has been coopted and instrumentalized by successive hegemonic socio-political formations, both through religion and through the rise of European colonialism. Thus the distinctive traits of “universal man,” write the authors, “are the characteristics of those who occupy positions of political dominance.” This may have already been said many times over by a host of philosophers already throughout the intellectually turmoiled second half of the 20th century, but it bears repeating. And it is once again through “fiction” – perhaps here best understood in Vico’s sense, as *vera narratio* -- that reaches to ever broader circles and nooks of a global *oecumene*, that Dante’s “message” or, better, “messages” are (re)acquiring the potential of speaking for the real “globalized” worlds of today. A world that despite the tightening of borders by anachronistic nation-states and the relentless noise orchestrated by a handful of super-powerful media corporations, are clearly becoming frontierless, and within which a “post-colonial Middle Ages,” the authors argue, foregrounds an “heterogeneous borderland with multiple centers” that includes all the continents not as “peripheral” but as a multitude of centers of interaction and dislocation of, once again, individuals, real people from all walks of life. In the end, it is the worlding function, the still active and (re)generating flame of the intellect of the poet-philosopher-prophet that can, and indeed has, cast light on our world and that traces new itineraries, suggest more inclusive solutions, guard against tyrannical perspectives, and ultimately prompt strategies for our own individual *selbst-überwindung*, auto-superamento.

These points are also at the heart of Teresa Caligiure’s paper on the presence of Dante in the writers of Communist Albania. As made evident by Ismail Kadaré and Ernest Koliqi, writes Caligiure, “Albanians’ interest for Dante’s works acquires a moral, civil, political and linguistic meaning, and is closely bound to the terrible experiences of oppression, exile, escape, tortures and murders – already characterizing the precedent Turkish domination that lasted until 1912– that, during the twentieth century, marked the lives of generations of Albanians.” In her thorough reconstruction of the vicissitudes of a host of writers who, with their society, were basically prevented from participating in the broader conversation within and outside the West, starting after World War Two, we learn that Dante’s life and ideas were constant companions and interlocutors, and in fact furnished thematic motifs for literary expression, socio-political strategies for survival, and general perspectives on the relationship between politics and ethics, person-

al vocation and existential drive to survive. Almost touching are the accounts of how, through the struggles to translate him appropriately under the communist regime, and involving the diaspora located in Rome and elsewhere – where we learn that translations can be as political and as dangerous as any other more explicit revolutionary writing, -- together with the efforts to teach the *Comedy* (“one of the favourite texts in Albanian schoolbooks”) wherever and whenever possible, Dante was basically “naturalized” as an Albanian writer, impacting on the at first hidden and then explicit creation of a national canon. From this perspective, the worlding becomes, to borrow from Nelson Goodman, “worldmaking” within a country’s tattered cultural history, Albania having had such a tragic course since the Renaissance.

What counts here is the “relationship among worlds” as much as what specifically has been “appropriated” across the linguistic and cultural divide. This situation inevitably locates in the Florentine’s exiliac experience the generating impulse and in the Albanian authors regenerating topos. Caligiure writes that “[t]he work and the character of the exiled Dante become[s] a paradigm of moral and political freedom, of speaking out, of the very role of the poet. Dante’s exile becomes a symbol mirroring the existential and historical condition of political internees, based on the pain experienced for one’s homeland devastated by violence.” Here once again only certain aspects are latched onto precisely owing to a different context where exile as *peregrinatio Dei* and its eschatological aspects are less relevant than “the political and pragmatic aspects of Dante’s exile, associating the nightmare of the dictatorship with the visions of Dantean *Inferno*.” Alternatively, in the verses of Visar Zhiti, for example, Dantean metaphors are echoed and developed, such as that of the lifeblood become a sewer. Zhiti does appeal to “universal values,” but from “below,” as it were, and the entreat is to a commitment to truth, to telling loudly and clearly the “inconvenient political message,” with reference to Peter’s invective in *Paradiso* 27: “make sure they hear this / from your mouth, not hiding what I do not hide.”

In the case of the presence and impact of Dante in the Italian immigrant community, a very complex topic if there ever was one, Martino Marazzi points out that the poet is present everywhere from the very start, but this time not so much to disclose “new worlds,” since they were already relocated in a new world, i.e., the United States, but to find ways to understand it, to engage it, to work and live in it, while struggling to redraw the contours of their now splintered cultural identity. The Italian American Dante forcefully brings out the elephant in the room when discussing culture and class. As Marazzi sees it, Dante is “a cultural product largely overlooked, and whose characteristics, I think, speak about the dignity of the popular culture of one of the huddled masses somehow shedding light on the poet himself, adopted as a beacon of both poetic and actual rebirth not by philologists, literati and Brahmins of all sorts, but for the most part by the pick-and-shovel, industrial workers of the New World.” Overlooked: and that is precisely the point. Dante enjoyed a great revival and appreciation among what came to be called “the Harvard Italophiles” by the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, a well-known cultural phenomenon among *dantisti* and the *litterati*. Yet during this same time frame, with the arrival of tens of thousands of wretched and uncouth subproletarians from the hinterland of (mostly)



Southern Italy, even the American bourgeoisie pinched its nose and developed a severe case of “italophobia,” as John Paul Russo once wrote. Nevertheless, among the immigrants, and particularly among those who could read and write, Dante was very present: imitated, parodied, idolized, satirized. Certainly he was invoked among those involved in the early labor union struggles and scuffles. The first generation soon became bilingual and so linguistically the wordling splayed in thousand directions like a wave against jagged rocks. In fact, rewording and paraphrasing may be the appropriate terms here. Though not explicitly Marazzi’s focus, there is a whole long chapter in trans-national and diasporic cultural relations *through* Dante that has yet to be written, as they involved the connection between two more broadly understood national canons and the issue of who decides about the inclusion and the exclusions, and at that on the basis of what criteria, what underlying self-legitimizing ideology or, worse, class prejudice. I do recall in past years some colleagues literally resenting that such low-class ignoramus would even dare mention and claim as their own, “in terra straniera,” the great ones, Dante foremost among the various Columbus, Michelangelo, Verdi and so on.

Easier to grasp is the characterization that emerges with the second generation, which Marazzi contends begins with Pietro Di Donato, and whose “telling definition” is Dante “as brother,” in this instance of the bricklayers. This also could have far-ranging implications, for we have not, for once, a Dante “padre” of anything, whether of the language or of the political unity of Italy, but rather a brother, a companion, someone to tussle with at times, but also to lean on or joke with as a fellow traveler and expatriate, in any case, an equal yet excellent partner. This speaks to a sense of “existential intimacy” that is demonstrably de-politicized, de-theologized, de-mythologized in the speech patterns of two generations which, if we allow for the deeply-seated sense of distrust of the immigrant, cherished and cultivated no ultimate beliefs about the *madre patria*, in fact they were not really so naïve as to not know where they had landed, where they stood in relation to the vaunted glory of their Origin, and whose self-validating pride of provenance, even if at times publicly exaggerated, was not believed to be meaningful or taken seriously by academics and educators. This conversation with Dante, especially after the Second World War, was usually hushed or humbled or episodic.

Marazzi sketches a preliminary map of how this wordling may be handled by pointing out that the Italian American Dante is “an aspiring autocephalous figure,” whose “features are largely independent from the rules and language of Dante scholarship.” Of course, Dante emerges an “an identitarian sign,” though I would expand that to the level of “figura.” In any case, as he writes, it would still be “inclusive and open-ended.” And finally, again, the most revealing aspect, Dante as “a senior fellow for a journey into a different secularized world” wherein, to refer to Goodman once again, the challenge for the humble is to determine the weight, the ordering, the process of deletion (or unwitting ignoring) and supplementation. To put it in terms of another philosopher, there is always an irreducible “deformation” in the encounter or “appropriation” that occurs when worlds meet, what Gianni Vattimo theorized as *Verwindung*, an unavoidable distortion which cannot but be both, a twisting or modifying and a grafting onto something (often

entirely) other, such as the new author's specific work bearing the marks of this process.

The last essay included in this collection is by bilingual poet and philosopher Rolando Perez, who agreed to contribute a text to replace one of the original speakers, Robert Harvey, who declined to submit his paper on account of copyright issues with authors he was citing. Perez begins by delving into Graham Harman's *Dante's Broken Hammer*, whose first point is that Dante is ultimately a phenomenologist, but with some caveats. First, unlike Husserl's phenomenology, for which "every mental act aims at some object, whether it be an act of perception, judgment, love, or hate," for Dante, what relates to the object and brings it forth in its essential being is love. In other words, whereas for Husserl love is just one among many possible objects to engage the thetic consciousness, for Dante love surges to the level of a theoretical *primum mobile*. Now Dante obviously could not use the metalanguage of modern phenomenology, but the process is the same, and the cited verses 22-27 of *Purgatorio* 18, make it evident, especially if we read them in Mark Musa's version, one tercet at a time:

From what is real your apprehensive power  
extracts an image it displays within you,  
forcing your mind [*animo*] to be attentive to it."

Here we see the passage from a naturalistic perception (v 22), to a focus on its givenness as an image (for we do not physically enter or touch the object, but register just what we see of it, its *eidōs*) (v 23), then proceed to bracketing it (Husserl's *epoché*), removing all extraneous considerations (v 24). In the next set, we read:

and if, attentive [*rivolto*], it inclines toward this,  
that inclination is love: Nature it is  
which is through pleasure [*piacer*] bound anew in you.

Now "attentive" [Mandelbaum: "so turned"] denotes an act of will, an active reflecting that assesses and realizes what the mind (or Husserl's consciousness, or Dante's soul) has before it, available to the understanding, which is the inclination itself [Mandelbaum: "proclivity"], the "bending" [*piegare*] or altering force itself, what we call love. It is not yet determined, it's a potential, but here the poet adds his theoretical presupposition, which is its being a "natural kind", something that obtains in all humans. This is further strengthened by adding a feature, already present in Aristotle (and later in Freud and Merleau-Ponty), namely "pleasure" [*piacere*] (which strangely Mandelbaum renders with "beauty.") Pleasure is the goal of good living in the *polis*, yet also the visible end of the larger domain of desire, so Dante's notion of love is never theoretically removed from the body in the flesh and from the deeper pulsion of want. As Perez points out, for Harman love is intentional, and it can be directed to an ideal object, such as Beatrice, but also toward "perverse objects." That of course is a big theme in Dante, as in the same Canto, in the 16th parsed by Celenza, and elsewhere, to the point of becoming part of the infrastructure of *Purga-*

*torio* itself. The key is figuring out, through our *libero arbitrio*, what is good, insufficient, or misplaced (evil) love. The point here, however, is not ethical but epistemological: how do we know what produces pleasure? Harman proceeds to vv 49-54 to underscore that, according to Dante, we ultimately know “substantial form” through a “force distinctly its own,” in brief, through “its effects” (v 53). And this makes it a good candidate for Object Oriented Ontology.

In order to evaluate how this recent poetological current is crucial to the re-interpreted Dante, Perez reminds us of the basic tenets of Western metaphysics (but still mindful of the crucial difference between Plato and Aristotle) driven by *ousia*, until with Descartes the search for “ultimate reality” is practically terminated and the focus, for the next three centuries turns to: “How do I know what I know?”, or: “What are ‘the contents of *my* mind?’” And here we pick up the reason for Perez’ interest in Harman’s Dante: rather than just a mere “return” to metaphysics with its hierarchy of beings, and going even around the ego-psychology that eventually stemmed from Descartes, Perez claims we need to replace it with a “flat ontology,” that is, by positing the hitherto privileged human being as being “alongside” other inanimate objects. Here the author makes recourse to the post-Husserlian phenomenology of Martin Heidegger, for whom there exist two modalities of being-there: “present-at-hand” and “ready-to-hand.” Briefly, objects (and this includes the perception of persons) present-at-hand are things which are abstract, in the sense that we do not think of their “whatness” in conceptual ways, and they eventually become “invisible,” we might say, taken for granted in the world. Yet objects become ready-to-hand when we actually use them, when they become “equipment,” and though they may withdraw from access as “real objects,” they partake of a “holistic system” of being-there’s (*Dasein*) relation to its world. However, the sensual qualities of such an object become “obtrusively visible to us” the moment “some event occurs that makes it visible.” And this tension “between real object and sensual qualities ‘is the most prominent source of aesthetic experience’.”

This is where the metaphor of the broken hammer in Harman’s title is finally explained. We are led through a tour de force that starts with the relation between Dante and the troubadours and the matter of the “reality” of the beloved, which is predicated on the “appearance” of the lover’s object and its untouchability. Then we move on to the *Vita Nuova*, and the Dante-Beatrice relation as a “broken” relation, insofar as it is her death that inspires him to compose “what has never been written in rhyme of any woman.” Through the rest of the essay the critic connects, in a critically creative manner, Harman’s relaunching of Ortega y Gasset’s theory of metaphor (which is counter-foisted against, as it is substantially different from, the Kant-Husserl trunk of understanding how we get to know what we know), and returns to the initial position of revaluation of the aesthetic in a sort of “horizontal” plane where it is the “relation” with the sensual object that determines the aesthetic import. This is even more so the case when the object itself is “gone,” missing or dead, and its image must be re-activated, re-created, experienced we might say, metaphorically, as a living “I.” The conclusion is that the metaphors bring out the “attachment” to an object, whether real or imagined. Interestingly, Perez notes,

for Harman this leads to an admission, perhaps best characterized as an existential disclosure, of a re-created world that he himself had felt and lived in the past. Specifically, his first encounter with Dante, when he was an undergraduate, and the love relation that then ensued. Perhaps at that time he swore that one day he would say something about Dante's broken love-world in a way no one had before? Perhaps. But though Perez seems to believe that Harman has ultimately succeeded in opening up a new or different interpretive approach to Dante, he does end by suggesting, with Humean flair, that the object-oriented ontology of attachment could have also been practiced to enter more amenable worlds in other authors.

## CONTRIBUTOR BIONOTES

**Teodolinda Barolini** is Lorenzo Da Ponte Professor of Italian, Columbia University. She is the author of *Dante's Poets* (1984; Italian trans. 1993), *The Undivine Comedy: Detheologizing Dante* (1992; Italian trans. 2003), *Dante and the Origins of Italian Literary Culture* (2006; Italian trans. 2012). Her commentary to Dante's lyric poetry, *Rime giovanili e della 'Vita Nuova'* (2009), appeared in English as *Dante's Lyric Poetry: Poems of Youth and of the 'Vita Nuova'* (2014). Editor of Columbia's *Digital Dante* website, Barolini has written the first digital canto-by-canto commentary to the *Commedia*, the *Commento Baroliniano*. Barolini is a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, American Philosophical Society, and Medieval Academy of America, and a Corresponding Member of the Accademia Olimpica (Vicenza). She served as the fifteenth President of the Dante Society of America.

**Simone Brioni** is Assistant Professor at the Department of English, Stony Brook University. Using postcolonial theory, his work analyses the literary and cinematographic representation of migrations and Italian colonialism. His articles have been published in edited volumes and peer-reviewed journals including *Altrettalia*, *Cinergie*, *Écritures*, *Incontri*, *Science Fiction Studies*, *Studi Culturali*, and *The Journal of Italian Cinema and Media Studies*. His most recent publication is the monograph *The Somali Within: Language, Race and Belonging in 'Minor' Italian Literature* (Oxford: Legenda, 2015).

**Teresa Caligiure**, PhD in Medieval Italian Literature, is a research fellow of the Institute for Jewish Philosophy and Religion at the University of Hamburg. She was a senior fellow of the Maimonides Center for Advanced Studies, also at the University of Hamburg and a postdoctoral research fellow at the Humanities Faculty of the University of Calabria, where she taught 'Language Skills'. Her research interests are focused on Petrarch's moral and philosophical works, Dante's *Commedia* and travel literature.

**Peter Carravetta** is Professor of Philosophy at Stony Brook University. He has published several books, including *Prefaces to the Diaphora. Rhetorics, Allegory, and the Interpretation of Postmodernity* (Purdue UP, 1991), *Del Postmoderno. Critica e cultura in America all'alba del duemila* (Bompiani, 2009), and *The Elusive Hermes. Method, Discourse, Interpreting* (Davies Group Publishing, 2013). Translator of G. Vattimo & P.A. Rovatti's *Weak Thought* (SUNY P 2012), he is also author of seven books of poetry, including *The Sun and Other Things* (Guernica, 1998), *L'infinito (poesie scelte 1972-2012)* (Campanotto, 2013), and *The Other Lives* (Guernica, 2014). He is presently working on a book on Humanism in the post-humanist age.

**Christopher Celenza** is Dean of Georgetown College at Georgetown University, where he is also Professor of History and Classics. His most recent books are *Petrarch: Everywhere a Wanderer* (London: Reaktion 2017) and *The Intellectual World of the Italian Renaissance: Language, Philosophy, and the Search for Meaning* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018).

**Paolo Cherchi** is an Emeritus Professor of the University of Chicago, where he taught from 1965 to 2003. His main interests are in Medieval and Renaissance Romance literatures. He has taught Italian Literature at the Università di Ferrara (2003-2009). Among his publications are *Capitoli di critica Cervantina* (Roma, 1977); *Enciclopedia e politica della riscrittura: Tommaso Garzoni* (Pisa, 1981); *Andreas and the Ambiguity of Courtly Love* (Toronto, 1994); *Polimatia di riuso - Mezzo secolo di plagio (1539-1589)* (Roma, 1998); *L'onestade e l'onesto raccontare del Decameron* (Fiesole, 2004); *Verso la chiusura. Saggio sul Canzoniere di Petrarca* (Bologna, 2008). *La rosa dei venti. Una mappa della critica contemporanea*, Roma, 2011). He has edited the *Opere* of Tommaso Garzoni (Ravenna, 1994) e la *Piazza universale* (Torino, 1996). He has translated from Catalan into Italian *Tirant lo Blanch* (Torino, 2013). His last book is *Il tramonto dell'onestade* (Rome, 2016).

**Andrea Fedi** is Associate Professor of Italian and Cultural Studies and Undergraduate Program Director of the Department of Cultural Studies and Comparative Literature at Stony Brook University. He received his PhD in Italian Studies from the University of Toronto. At SBU he has served as Faculty Director of two Undergraduate Colleges (Arts, Culture, and Humanities; Global Studies), and as Director of the Language Learning and Research Center. His research interests include travel literature, history of technology and the digital humanities. On Maurice Hewlett's representation of Tuscany he published a chapter included in *Narrare la storia: dal documento al racconto* (Mondadori, 2007).

**Martino Marazzi** teaches Italian Literature at the University of Milan and has been Tiro a Segno Visiting Professor in Italian American Culture at New York University, and a Fellow of the Italian Academy for Advanced Studies in America at Columbia University. His most recent books are *Danteum. Studi sul Dante imperiale del Novecento* (Cesati 2015); *Voices of Italian America. A History of Early Italian American Literature with a Critical Anthology* (paperback: Fordham UP 2012); *A occhi aperti. Letteratura dell'emigrazione e mito americano* (FrancoAngeli 2011). He is also the author of a novel, *La finta* (Nerosubianco 2015), and of two collections of short stories: *La fine del Purgatorio* and *Filogenesi* (both with Sedizioni: 2008 and 2010). He has conducted research in the field of Italian immigrant culture, and has published essays on Dante criticism and reception, on Tasso, and on various Italian works and authors of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century (from Cavour and *Pinocchio* to Saba and Calvino).

**Lorenzo Mari** is Postdoctoral Researcher at the University of Insubria. He holds a Ph.D. in Comparative and Postcolonial Literature from the University of Bologna. In 2015 he was recipient of a “Fernand Braudel” post-doc fellowship at the LabEx THALIM/ARIAS (CNRS/Paris 3). Currently, his research focuses on postcolonial African literature – namely, from Somalia, Nigeria and South Africa – as well as on Italian postcolonial culture. In 2011 he was awarded the 1<sup>st</sup> AISCLI Postgraduate Essay Prize for his paper “Chaos as a Matter of Frame: Ridley Scott’s *Black Hawk Down* (2001) and Nuruddin Farah’s *Links* (2004)”. In 2014, he co-edited an anthology of essays, titled *Subaltermità Italiane* [Italian Subalternties], together with Gabriele Proglgio and Valeria Deplano.

**Roberta Morosini**, is Professor of Romance Studies at Wake Forest University. Her research interests range from the study of Dante, Petrarch and Boccaccio, to Christian-Muslim relations in the Middle Ages, from travel literature to Mediterranean Studies. She has published *Mediterraneosis* 2007; *Penelopi in viaggio*, 2010; *Boccaccio geografo*, 2010; *Alexander Romance in Italy*, 2011; *Christian-Muslim Relationships in Medieval Romance*, 2012; *Sindbad mediterraneo*, 2013; and “Naufragio con spettatore (a bordo). Petrarca ‘nocchiere’ della sua nave,” 2017. She has recently launched the new publishing series “Mediterranean Circularities” for L’Erma di Bretschneider, in which appears her book *Dante, il Profeta e il Libro. La leggenda del toro dalla Commedia a Filippino Lippi, tra sussurri di colomba ed echi di Bisanzio* (2018). She is the editor of the forthcoming *What a difference a sea makes* (Quaderni d’Italianistica 2018) and has just completed the book *Racconti e immagini del mare salato. Spazi, itinerari e attraversamenti di donne e dee del Mediterraneo, da Dante a Petrarca*.

**Rolando Pérez** is Professor of Spanish and Latin American Literature and Philosophy at Hunter College/CUNY. He has published numerous articles on the relation between philosophy and literature. His academic books include *Severo Sarduy and the Religion of the Text* (1988), *On An(archy) and Schizanalysis* (1990), *Severo Sarduy and the Neo-Baroque Image of Thought in the Visual Arts* (2011); with Prof. Nuria Morgado, *Filosofía y culturas hispánicas: nuevas perspectivas*, (2016), and *Agorapoetics: Poetics after Postmodernism* (2017). Pérez has also published books of creative prose and poetry; and his work has been anthologized in *The Norton Anthology of Latino Literature* (2011). 2017 saw the publication of *La comedia eléctrica*, a translation of *The Electric Comedy* (2000), a post-modern version, as it were, of Dante’s *Divine Comedy*. He is currently working on a book on philosophy and literature, entitled *Philo-lit: Doing Philosophy with Spanish/American Literature*.