



# UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI MILANO

Dipartimento di Studi Letterari Filologici e Linguistici

Masarykova Univerzita  
Filozofická fakulta  
Arna Nováka 1  
60200 Brno

Milan, Jun. 15, 2017

I was entrusted with the task to evaluate the book of Paolo Divizia *Novità per il volgarizzamento della Disciplina clericalis*, published in Milan, Edizioni Unicopli, 2007.

The book is a substantial contribution about Peter Alfonsi's *Disciplina clericalis*, a significant medieval text, whose importance is related to the wide influence of its narrative contents. The specific object of the study is the medieval translation of the work in Italian vernacular, in a philologic approach. The topic of the book is quite relevant in the following academic fields: Italian Philology, Romance Philology.

The book consists of a philological introduction, which reconstructs the relationships between the manuscripts of the work, and a critical edition of the vernacular *Disciplina clericalis*, as well as of an Italian version ("Volgarizzamento A") of the *Formula vitae honestae*, a moral treatise connected with the *Disciplina* in manuscript tradition. The connections between the two texts are unquestionable; it is a merit of Divizia to emphasize that, underlining that the philological problems of both of them could be faced and solved in a joint research.

The topic is formulated precisely and understandably, with proper use of philological technical language and consistency in argumentation. The book definitely improves knowledge in the specific field it deals with, although the subject matter is not of wide extension. This is a good work with respect to European standards: methodological approach is appropriate and relevant to the topic; stemmatic discussion is correct; criteria in editing mediaeval texts correspond to the current scientific rules, as well as formal criteria.

Within a positive context, let me advance some limited critical remarks to the book:



1. The choice to refer the texts of every manuscript in synopsis, even if methodologically acceptable, renounces to propose a standard reconstructive text, which the author could publish in addition without much effort. This would have allowed a more complete vision of the original vernacular version.
2. In the book there is no research on the Latin source of the vernacular translations (both of *Disciplina clericalis* and of *Formula vitae honestae*); some checks, which would at least lead to an assessment of the actual comparability of the Latin reference texts (ed. Hilka-Söderhjelm and ed. Barlow), would have made the work more rich and solide.
3. Textual results of the book are innovative and well founded. Therefore, it is regrettable that the book is not as complete as a monograph, including linguistic observations and a historical-literary study. The focus of the work is very specific (stematic and transcription): methodological high level, but on very selected points.
4. The volume was very sound for the standard of 2007, when it was published; more recent methodological and technical achievements are obviously not considered. I wonder if the author, writing on the same subject in 2017, would publish a synoptic text, or would make an electronic edition.

In my judgment, the book meets the standard requirements placed on habilitation theses in the following fields: Italian Philology, Romance Philology.

Paolo Chiesa

Full professor in Latin Literature of the Middle Ages