Foreword

Among the tasks traditionally undertaken by researchers in early modern literary studies have been these: how questions related to ethics, political and natural philosophy, medicine, theology, and jurisprudence were adapted to, and absorbed by, early modern fiction; the approach of Renaissance philosophers to literary production or to the ability of literary works to reflect contemporary philosophical inquiry or classical ideas; and the study of poetics, understood as a branch of speculative philosophy during the late-fifteenth and the sixteenth century. The inverse, that is, the defense and use of fiction by early modern thinkers viewed from the standpoint of the history of philosophy, or the impact of classical, medieval, and Renaissance literature on the aforementioned subdomains of philosophy, has been restricted to a handful of names and problems, and these have not been developed in line with the vast amount of material ripe for analysis.

The aim of this volume is not to offer a comprehensive overview of the multifarious aspects of fiction and its implications for early modern philosophy, but to be an invitation, from the standpoint of the history of philosophy, to survey some of the fundamental problems of the field, using six case-studies written by some of the finest international scholars in their respective areas of Renaissance studies. Although perhaps not evident at a first reading, these six studies are linked by common concerns such as the theoretical relationship between (literary) history, rhetoric, poetics, and philosophy; the tensions between *res*, *verba*, and *imago*; and the concept of *enargeia*. They have been arranged according to the chronology of the corpus each one considers.

The first study in this volume, "Some Remarks on Renaissance Mythophilia. The Medical Poetics of Wonder: Girolamo Fracastoro and His Environment," outlines how Aristotle's *Metaphysics* α 2 982b11–21 proved useful to a large number of philosophers between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries for reflecting on the relationship between philosophy and poetry. This approach serves not only to introduce a complex set of problems in a succinct manner, but also is key to explaining Girolamo Fracastoro's views on the relationship between poetry and philosophy at the very threshold of the development of Renaissance systematic poetics. The study includes, as an appendix, the first critical and annotated edition,

together with a translation into English, of chapter 21 of Galeotto Marzio's *De doctrina promiscua* (*ca.* 1490).

In the second essay, "Poliziano as a Philosopher, or the Craft of Thinking between Fiction and History," Guido Giglioni offers a discussion that complements the first study. In his analysis, professor Giglioni examines the literary production, pedagogical work, and constellation of theoretical concerns of Angelo Poliziano; these are ordered in terms of the concept of 'moral imagination' coined by Edmund Burke in 1790 and recently studied by David Bromwich. Giglioni traces the premises of this concept back to the end of the Florentine *Quattrocento,* and, beginning there, masterfully sheds light on the relationship of Poliziano to Homer's works, to the reception of Aristotle's *Poetics,* and to the composition of texts as renowned as *Orpheus, Ambra,* or *Lamia.* Giglioni's basic thesis is that "the narrative component in poetry—the *mythos*—is no ancillary operation, for it represents the very mechanism through which ideas are transformed into examples." From here, he develops the tensions between fiction's rationalized function and the fictionalization of reality, or, expressed in other terms, the creative opposition between *fabella* and *res*; between "the philosophical dream of reason enhanced through the use of irony and imagination" and the thing-in-itself, as Poliziano views them.

The third study, Anna Laura Puliafito's "Between *Res* and *Verba*: The Use of Myth in Francesco Patrizi's *Dialoghi della Retorica* (Venice 1562)," is concerned with some of the philosophical fables inspired by the classical tradition, which Francesco Patrizi da Cherso incorporated into his *Dialoghi della retorica.* As professor Puliafito introduces us to the arguments of these fables, we progressively discover the importance in Patrizi of fiction for establishing a practical formulation of his own theory of the four modalities of linguistic production; that is, what is directed at reason, at pleasure, at the emotions, and at awakening either wonder (*meraviglia*) or *stupor*. The philosophical centrality of this fourth modality is precisely what provides a rhetorical environment for philosophy, we might say. From this centrality Patrizi's *Dialogues* take on a new dimension: their narrative stratification in distinct layers functions as a metaphor for the hermeneutical stratification which involves all philosophical fiction; precisely that place where wonder and stupor, as intellectual passions, are reserved for readers with sufficient philosophical education to comprehend their ultimate significance.

In "Jean Bodin and the Romance of Demonology," Eric MacPhail to some extent takes the theoretical exercise of professor Puliafito's study one step further. MacPhail compares Alonso Quijano's position in his dispute with the Canon of Toledo—where he blurs the line between historical acts and legendary acts—with

Jean Bodin's unbiased approach to fables of witchcraft and lycanthropy in *De la Démonomanie des Sorciers.* MacPhail, with immense skill, shows how relationships—hitherto mostly unseen—between fiction, history, legend, myth, rumor, and sacred history, were intentionally muddled, with a similar confusion of the principle of authority, in order to create a space, not so much for skepticism as for speculative and philosophical freedom, in France at the end of the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth centuries. In fact, at the close of his study Macphail puts forward Montaigne as the theoretical nexus into which this whole current flows. Montaigne not only created his own literary genre in order to free himself from straight-jackets and generic formulae, but also superimposed a blurring of distinctions upon those extrinsic categories that attempted to establish a dichotomy between what is true and what is false—a single reality and intrinsic plausibility, that of his own thought. Thus MacPhail leaves us just one step away from the Cartesian *cogito.*

Early modern ideas of femininity and gender roles are the primary focus of Sandra Plastina's essay: "Mythological Epic And Chivalric Fiction In Moderata Fonte's And Lucrezia Marinella's Poems." Going beyond the common, recurring themes claiming preeminence for the female gender written by men—such as Cornelius Agrippa—, Plastina offers a fresco upon which are painted concepts of gender drawn from a remarkable number of epic poems and treatises on war written by women during the *Cinquecento.* Professor Plastina's penetrating commentary on the works of Laura Terracina, Chiara Matraiani, Margherita Sarrocchi, Moderata Fonte, and Lucrezia Marinella shows that their writings can be seen not simply as an assimilation of, or a chafing against, common themes and formulae inherited from Ariosto and Tasso, in the case of the epic, but as the life-experience and artistic re-creation of the feminine, which contains unexpected variety and richness in continuous tension with the male audience's expectations. Professor Plastina depicts these authors as meeting an immense literary challenge, and the implicit and explicit boundaries between *imitatio* and *aemulatio,* as they sought an original voice capable of appealing to both sexes.

In the final essay of this volume, "Insights on Original Narrative Fiction in the Political Emblematics of Diego de Saavedra Fajardo, Andrés Mendo, and Francisco Garau," Antonio Bernat and John T. Cull analyze three volumes of emblems written during the Spanish Baroque period: *Idea de un príncipe político cristiano representada en cien empresas*, by Diego de Saavedra Fajardo (1642), the *Príncipe perfecto y ministros ajustados*, by the Jesuit Andrés Mendo (1662), and the *Tercera parte del sabio instruido de la naturaleza*, by his fellow Jesuit Francisco Garau (1700). These are presented as treatises of political philosophy, yet also contain

important ideas about how to articulate narrative fiction. Through a description of methods of composition, the use of sources, and the concept of the emblem as *enargeia,* professors Bernat and Cull unpack the theoretical ideas that are present from the first essay of our volume; namely, the function of fiction and of pictorial composition as forms of attention and as a manifestation of the dichotomy between philosophy and literature.

In closing, I would like to thank the Renaissance Society of America for the opportunity of presenting the works now gathered in this volume in two panels at their 63rd Annual Convention (Chicago, March 31st, 2017). The quality of the discussions during and after the presentations has been a motivation to provide a collection of texts worthy of expectations. I would also like to express my gratitude to the authors for agreeing to participate in both panels and for traveling to Chicago, in some cases not in the most favorable circumstances. Special thanks should go to Professor Giglioni, who could not attend in person in Chicago, but who has participated in this volume with a conference paper presented at the Seminar *Pico and Poliziano in Late Medieval Florence* (University College London, May 15th, 2017). Finally, this volume would not have been possible without the generosity, expertise, humanity, and superhuman patience of Professors Pérez Chico and López de Lizaga, the chief editors of *Análisis*. To all of them, my warmest thanks.

Jorge Ledo
Independent scholar