

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY - ITALIAN ACADEMY FOR ADVANCED STUDIES IN AMERICA

PROJECT TITLE: PATHOS FORMULAS AND ABSTRACTION IN G.F. STRAPAROLA AND G.B. BASILE FAIRY TALES

EZIO PUGLIA

*\*\*BACKGROUND PAPER \*\*PLEASE DO NOT CIRCULATE\*\**

## Emerging interiorities: the fictional world of the Renaissance and Baroque fairy tale

When you know that there is no design,  
you know also that there is no chance: for  
it is only where there is a world of design  
that the word “chance” has a meaning.

Nietzsche

*This paper and the accompanying talk are concerned with very diverse problems that I have been studying in the last couple of years. I will spare you most of the theoretical and textual details of my research, but it is necessary to introduce here a certain number of essential concepts and historical notions (please be patient).*

*First of all, though, I have to assert plainly why fairy tales deserve our attention. This is due to a simple reason: since the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century they have been used as a powerful medium for social reproduction in Western societies. A medium that was shaped, of course, to be affecting children in particular. Maybe not all of you know that fairy tales had to be deeply reworked both to convey moral values and to conform to the modern image of childhood, whose most prominent feature is the thorough separation from adulthood. Especially 19<sup>th</sup>- and early 20<sup>th</sup>-century pedagogy recognized fairy tales as strategic and influential means by which an array of ethical principles,*

*desires, social roles and behaviors could be transmitted to the generations to come<sup>1</sup>. Here I am going to inquire into the earliest phase of the history of the modern fairy tale, when these narratives display at the same time propensity and resistance to moral (re)interpretation. Yet, in the process of their “normalization”, they kept conveying old values and desires for centuries<sup>2</sup>. What values? What desires? These are not idle questions. For the exact comprehension of Early-Modern fairy tales is crucial to grasp the extent of the later modifications to which they were subjected. In such an inquiry, Straparola and Basile are our principal and almost only witnesses.*

*First, I address general problems that can produce misunderstandings about the nature of Renaissance and Baroque fairy tales; secondly, I give some contextual information which is relevant to my argument; thirdly, I focus on the fictional world represented in Straparola’s and Basile’s fairy tales, and more specifically on narrative characters and their emotions. I will show that the architecture of Straparola’s and Basile’s fictional world is perfectly attuned to the “animic”<sup>3</sup> world described, for instance, by Giordano Bruno’s writings on magic. This attunement will help us grasp the historical specificity of Straparola’s and Basile’s narratives, to rethink their position in the context of Renaissance and Baroque culture, and also to question some of the most influential theoretical interpretations of fairy tales in general. At last, I will propose some provisional conclusions and indicate possible further developments for my research on these topics.*

---

<sup>1</sup> The power assigned to fairy tales reveals itself sharply when we consider that, at the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, many pedagogues were advising against fairy-tale telling to (lower-class?) children. In their view, fairy tales were noxious because they would feed desires and longings that life cannot satisfy. Thus, the genre had to be “purified” to suit the new pedagogical ideology. At any rate, the “subjectifying power” of the fairy tale, as we would say today, has been carefully taken into account even after the popularization of the new collective media (especially cinema and television). As the (maybe excessively) pronounced decency of Disney’s animation movies testifies.

<sup>2</sup> The process of normalization begins at least in Late-17<sup>th</sup>-century France (a decisive turning point in the history of the fairy tale, as I will show later), where we can observe a process of Christianization of folktales, which is parallel to a general “Depaganization” (and cultural and linguistic homogenization) of the Country. Consider as well that, during the same period, the so-called colportage literature (a literature that was composed *for* the people by clerics and professional writers, and that peddlers were selling very cheaply across the countryside) was thoroughly surveilled by the police.

<sup>3</sup> Marshall Sahlins calls “animic” the common ground shared by animistic, totemic and analogic ontologies. All three of them are opposed to scientific naturalism, that, according to Sahlins, relies on a thorough separation between human and nonhuman worlds.



**Prologo** In 1953 H.P. L'Orange traced the history of the gesture which an ancient iconographic tradition associated with the orator (or Christ) speaking. According to L'Orange, this gesture was misunderstood in the Middle Ages, and came to be interpreted regularly (up to our time, as far as I know) as a "gesture of silent benediction (the *benedictio Latina* or *benedictio Graeca*)". Here it is not relevant whether L'Orange's *specific* hypothesis is acceptable; nor am I interested in assessing the explanation W.J. Ong provided, namely connecting such a presumed misunderstanding with the transition from a "predominantly oral culture to the more silent manuscript culture" (the latter having become unable to grasp the significance of the conventions of the former). Even though one of the main problems with which many studies about fairy tales are concerned is exactly the relation between written tales and oral tradition, I began my paper quoting L'Orange just because it exemplifies perfectly a *general* problem we encounter when dealing with a distant past or culture: the fact that we need to fight endlessly against many retrospective (or projective) fallacies, which are able to mislead our inquiries, concealing problematic notions beneath obviousness and ostensible clarity.

**Figura** When we investigate the Renaissance and Baroque fairy tale, the first of these retrospective fallacies contaminate the concept of the fairy tale itself. We should try not to project our own views (whichever they may be) on texts written when the fairy tale, as a literary genre, did not exist. How

Giovanni Francesco Straparola (1480?-1558?), Giambattista Basile (1556?-1632) and their various audiences perceived the tales is an open question. Moreover, the two authors, who were the first to write (anew) certain narratives that later on started to be called *fiabe*, did not perceive the tales in the same way. Straparola does not even differentiate between *novella* (roughly the “realistic” tale in the style of Boccaccio), *favola* (Aesopian animal tale) and *fiaba* (the magic or fairy tale): he calls all these different types of stories simply *favole* (*Le piacevoli notti ovvero libro delle favole ed enimmi*, 1550-1553<sup>4</sup>), as Boccaccio himself did in the XIV book of his *Genealogia deorum gentilium* (1363-1366). In *Le piacevoli notti*, there are also narratives mixing *fiaba* and *novella*, which testifies to the vagueness of Straparola’s concept of the fairy tale. Instead, when Basile writes *cunto* (*Lo cunto de li cunti ovvero lo Trattenimento de’ Peccerille*, 1634-1636<sup>5</sup>), he indicates precisely a type of narrative involving magic, ogres, fairies, wonders, and other *impossibilia*<sup>6</sup>. The fact that Basile clearly identified a typological form in the narratives he was collecting and reworking is not enough either to assess his

---

<sup>4</sup> *Le piacevoli notti* includes 74 *favole* (and riddles), but only 13 of them are fairy tales. The book was a best seller in spite of the fact that it was included in the *Index Librorum Prohibitorum* of 1590, 1596 and 1600 (many details and entire stories, though, were suppressed). Between 1550 and 1608, it had more than 20 editions in Venice alone, i.e. more than the *Decameron* had during the same time span in the whole of Europe. Its audience was arguably composed by merchants, second-rate bureaucrats, and small, provincial aristocrats. The book was translated into French as early as 1560, and in the following fifty years it was republished at least 12 times. *Le piacevoli notti* had an undeniable influence on the French fairy tale tradition.

<sup>5</sup> *Lo cunto de li cunti*, or *Pentamerone*, is a collection of 49 fairy tales. The 50<sup>th</sup> fairy tale functions as a frame for the other tales; that is, the 50<sup>th</sup> tale is the tale inside which the other tales are told. The *Pentamerone* was printed only after the death of Basile. During his lifetime, the book was just being performed as a sort of theatrical text for the entertainment of the various courts and academies Basile frequented. Being written in Neapolitan dialect, for more than a century the *Pentamerone* had only a local circulation. It could reach a national public only starting from 1747, when it was translated into Tuscan for the first time. The translation was a great success, and several editions followed in the years to come. In this (terrible) translation it was read and used by Carlo Gozzi, one of the most influential Italian writers, on a European scale, of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century its scope widened enormously, especially through Germany, where a full translation appeared in 1846. In Late-18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup>-century pre-Romantic and Romantic German *milieux*, fairy tale was an absolutely central issue. Amongst the writers who composed and/or reflected upon fairy tales, we find Wieland, Musäus, Goethe, Tieck, Novalis, Hoffmann, Brentano, Arnim, and of course the Brothers Grimm. Through Brentano, *Lo cunto* started circulating in Romantic literary circles well before its translation, and became both a primary source and a long lasting polemic target of the Brothers Grimm (for whom Basile would have betrayed the essence of the oral tradition).

<sup>6</sup> As a proof of this awareness, consider that Basile includes in his collection five stories that appeared in *Le piacevoli notti* (III, 1; V, 2; VII, 5; X, 3; XI, 1), all of which belong indisputably to what we call the fairy-tale genre.

personal views about them (what *Entertainment for Little Ones* actually means remains unclear<sup>7</sup>), or to say that he is the father of the fairy-tale genre. On the contrary, the fairy-tale *figura*, to borrow Walter Benjamin's terms, was created in France, roughly between 1690 and 1704, thanks to the work of Mme d'Aulnoy and Mlle Lhéritier, alongside many other ladies frequenting *les salons à la mode* of the time, and most of all Charles Perrault, whose *Contes de ma mère l'Oye* (1697) set the standard of the new genre<sup>8</sup>. It is due mainly to Perrault, for instance, if fairy tales started being perceived as stories where “the playful [...] surrounding has been chosen *only to allow* the stories to penetrate the mind more pleasantly”, in order to convey a “praiseworthy and instructive moral”, particularly suitable for children (*Preface to the Contes en vers*, 1695; italics mine). An idea that was thoroughly developed by the Brothers Grimm and Hans Christian Andersen<sup>9</sup>. For Perrault, the ideological center of the fairy tale was steadily occupied by its moral. So much so that when no trace of whatever moral content in the tales he collected could be found, he modified the story and

---

<sup>7</sup> Giovanni Getto stresses that the audience of the *Pentamerone* was not composed of children, but he does not even try to propose an interpretation of the subtitle. According to Dieter Richter, who agrees with Getto about the audience, *Trattenimento de' Peccerille* refers to the fact that Basile's sources were actually tales for children. On the contrary, Nancy Canepa reckons that the audience of the tales was much more socially hybrid than the courtly one Getto and Richter imagine. Children might have been part of it, although the tales were “decidedly *not* for little ones”. The subtitle, then, would mirror the hybridity of the audience, and should be read as an allusion “to the languages and genres of popular culture that merge in *Lo cunto*”. Furthermore, it would also be a call for a “metaphorically fresh and childlike audience”. In his most recent monograph about the *Pentamerone*, Michele Rak says that the meaning of *Trattenimento de' Peccerille* remains “cryptic”. However, he still seems to believe that it is a sort of disclaimer intended to reassure the audience: the formula would mean “there is no reference to bystanders or current events”.

<sup>8</sup> In 1690 D'Aulnoy's *Histoire d'Hyppolite* was released, and 1704 is the publication date of the first volume of Galland's version of *Les Mille et une nuits*, which is the proof that the freshly created *figura* was perfectly recognizable and usable. Galland, in fact, molded the stories into a shape compliant with the fundamentals of the new genre. From 1696 an enormous amount of fairy tales was composed and published, first invading the salons and the editorial market of France, and then spreading, from there, to the rest of Europe during the following decades. The history of the fairy-tale genre confirms, once more, the absolute centrality of France and/or England for the development of literary genres in Western and westernized cultures. Surprisingly, Ruth Bottigheimer, one of the most influential contemporary scholars of the fairy tale, can still talk of Straparola's narratives as specimens of a “new genre”. Even if Bottigheimer was talking about Basile, her view would have to be resolutely rejected. The difference between a conceptual model and a genre, in fact, cannot be easily erased.

<sup>9</sup> Novalis held a completely opposite view: “Nothing is more contrary to the spirit of a fairy tale than a moral destiny, a lawful relation” (*Das Allgemeine Brouillon*, fragm. 883).

adapted it to the moral “truth” he wanted to illustrate. Such an operation is very far from the one in which Straparola and Basile engaged. Certainly, they felt that the tales with which they were dealing had a hidden meaning. Yet, this meaning is not unveiled and is hardly of a moral nature. More precisely, if sometimes it can be interpreted as having moral connotations, these connotations remain ambiguous. In Straparola the hidden meaning is mostly an enigma that the listeners or the readers have to interpret by themselves; therefore, every fairy tale is similar, in this respect, to the riddle concluding each of them. In *The Pentamerone* the meaning of the stories is concealed through a complicated kaleidoscope effect: Basile frames every tale with an ideological introduction and a proverbial conclusion; yet, most times, the proverb and the introduction are in mutual contrast; and both of them are puzzlingly unrelated to the story itself.

**Popolo, bambini, selvaggi** The retrospective fallacy relates not only to literary categorization but also to the entire field of force to which our idea of the fairy tale belongs. In fact, at least in the last two centuries, Western culture has been constantly associating fairy tales with (a) an image of childhood and (b) an image of popular culture, often overlapping the two<sup>10</sup>. (a) On the one hand, in the 16<sup>th</sup> and Early-17<sup>th</sup> centuries, the hegemonic image of childhood was so different from our own that the social attitudes toward children would seem disturbing to most of us<sup>11</sup>; on the other hand, the implicit recipients of written fairy tales *were not* supposed to be children until the composition of Brothers Grimm’s *Kinder- und Hausmärchen*, whose long publishing process (1812-1857) coincides with the birth of children’s literature. (b) De Certeau famously wrote that popular culture began to be studied when its danger was eliminated, when it was censored and dying. Only in its afterlife popular culture could appear as a paradise lost untouched by history. Maybe it is not superfluous to add that this

---

<sup>10</sup> A typical 19<sup>th</sup>- and Early-20<sup>th</sup>-century discursive constellation binds together *children, the people* and *savages*, seeing the last two as “childish” and needy of education, and judging the first as being closer than adults (of the middle and upper classes) to an idealized Nature.

<sup>11</sup> The autobiography of Thomas Platter the Elder (1499-1582) is an outstanding (and quite upsetting) document about the life of a child in Early-16<sup>th</sup>-century Europe: he had to start working very soon (apprenticeship was a customary practice extremely widespread at that time); and he was largely left to his own devices. However, among the upper classes, a new educational attention towards childhood was moving its first, tentative steps, as testified by Erasmus’ *De civilitate morum puerilium* (1530) and by some evolutions of private space in the Late-14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> centuries.

view is deeply connected to long lasting critical perspectives about fairy tales. Extending themselves well beyond the limit of the so called “folkloricist approach”, these perspectives looked for the restoration of original ur-fairy tales; that is, they tried to extract the pure essence of the folktale from hybrid, modular, malleable historical compositions, transforming them into untrustworthy witnesses of a disappeared language, a sort of Indo-European root of the literary lexicon.

*Certainly, popular culture as a concept is key in order to understand Straparola’s and Basile’s narratives. We know that the stories the two writers collected come from a popular tradition, and also that they were in some way associated with children<sup>12</sup>; we can presume that the stories were circulating orally across the peninsula; we might imagine the means of such a circulation. What these stories actually looked like, though, is really hard to say. Therefore, we cannot trace a straightforward relation between the written tales and the oral tradition. This situation makes it difficult both to appreciate the extent and the quality of the reworking of folktales by Straparola and Basile, and to find unquestionable textual proofs about the actual influence of the former upon the latter. At any rate, tracing a connection between the written tales and the popular culture from which they come remains an unavoidable task. The connection I will propose hereinafter may seem sinuous and quite daring to some of you: please consider my research as still in progress.*

---

<sup>12</sup> One can find an early mention about folktales and their association with childhood in the third book of Petrarca’s *Invective contra medicum* (1352-1353): “Audires, credo libentius fabellas, quas post cenam ante focum de orco et lamiis audire soles, sed annis certe iam non puer, si potes, adsuesce melioribus”. About a decade later (1363-1366), Boccaccio surely echoes Petrarca’s *Invective* when he writes: “[...] Nullam esse usquam tam delirantem aniculam, circa foculum domestici laris una cum vigilantibus ybernis noctibus fabellas orci, seu fatarum, vel lammiarum, et huiusmodi, ex quibus sepissime inventa conficiunt, fingentem atque recitantem, que sub pretexto relatorum non sentiat aliquem iuxta vires sui modici intellectus sensum minime quandoque ridendum, per quem velit autem terrorem incutere parvulis, aut oblectare puellas, aut senses ludere, aut saltem Fortune vires ostendere” (*Genealogia deorum gentilium* XIV, 10). Writing “fabellae, etiam quae aniles putantur, non rudimentum modo sed et instrumentum quandoque philosophiae sunt”, Angelo Poliziano (*Lamia*, 1492) seems to propose again Boccaccio’s hermeneutic ideas. Yet the attitude seems to have changed: Poliziano is more inclined than Boccaccio to bestow a “serious” meaning to folktales. In the following lines Poliziano reports his personal experience with stories about the *lamiac* (female child-eaters), that his grandmother was telling him in his youth. By the way, it is worth noticing that, in all these testimonies, the association of folktales and childhood is not conclusive, because of the intellectual perspective from which the three writers speak.

**Il mondo alla rovescia** I cannot linger much on the popular culture of 16<sup>th</sup>- and Early-17<sup>th</sup>-century Italy. The least that can be said is it was still safe and sound, incessantly deserving the subsuming, repressive and eradicating attentions of the ecclesiastic authorities, in particular starting from the second half of the 16<sup>th</sup> century<sup>13</sup>. We could actually say that the so called popular culture, at that time, was the rule and not the exception. Many fears, assumptions and beliefs had been orally handed down over generations. Even though our knowledge of them is fragmented and uncertain, we must suppose that they formed the connective tissue of society as a whole. Moreover, the so called “civilizing process” was still at its beginning. The members of the new upper classes (with the court as their ideological center) were still struggling against themselves, in order to conform to an ideal image of manhood. They were struggling not only for self-restraint – against the direct and violent expression of affects (against emotional *outbound* forces) – but also for their individual freedom – against fortune, the necessity of destiny, astral influences, and so on (against cosmological *inbound* forces). The danger these inbound forces were representing was constantly present in everyday life, and the recurrent famines and diseases would remind people about them.

**Erbe mediche** Most likely, popular culture is a misleading concept. In fact, it is only an abstract label indicating the theoretical outcome of mutual contrasts between groups or individuals. In the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries, there was nothing like a *homogeneous* popular culture opposed to a multifarious “learned culture”. Popular culture was utterly uneven (geographically, sociologically, politically, etc.). Its contents may be fading remnants of the past, but also burgeoning activities (possibly) open to the future: for instance, compared to official medicine, popular medicine was startlingly advanced in the 16<sup>th</sup> century: the illiterate country-women capable of healing with herbs were incomprehensible

---

<sup>13</sup> Straparola’s and Basile’s magic tales bear textual traces of this process. The mentions of God and the devil, in fact, appear as truly artificial additions even at a quick glance, being absolutely unnecessary for the development of the plots. For instance: “Regnava nella provincia di Bettinia una spezie di uomini, i quali dal mezzo in su tenevano la forma di creatura umana, ancor che le loro orecchie e corna di animale fusseno. Ma dal mezzo in giu’ avevano le membra di pelosa capra, con un poco di coda torta a guisa di coda di porco, e nominavansi satiri [...]. La reina col mezzo loro si imaginò di dar a Costanzo [the protagonist] la morte; ma non le venne fatto: perciò che l’ingannatore sovente rimane ingannato, così permettendo la divina provvidenza e la somma giustizia” (*PNVI*, 1).

enigmas for the inquisitors, who believed that these women had such a knowledge of the *archana naturae* that they could only be inspired by the devil (*daemone... docta*). Moreover, there is a reciprocal movement between the low and the high level of culture: Aby Warburg has demonstrated the role that ancient and pagan divination, astrology and wonders played in the cultural struggle for Reformation, also in the inner circle surrounding Luther (who was himself decidedly superstitious). I recall, in addition, that at the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century the philosopher John Locke was still convinced of the effectiveness of astral influences upon medicinal herbs.

**Un mugnaio** There is other important evidence about the movement between upper and lower cultures. Carlo Ginzburg found invaluable documents about the cosmological views of a 16<sup>th</sup>-century miller from Montereale, near Pordenone (North-Eastern Italy). His name was Domenico Scandella (1532-1601), alias Menocchio, and he was tried for heresy. During the trial, Menocchio exposed such an elaborate theoretical system that the inquisitors were startled, and could not believe that he had conceived of these ideas by himself (exactly as they were incredulous towards the medicine women). On the one hand, Menocchio's cosmology echoes "ancient and distant myths"<sup>14</sup>, and reflects elements taken from an oral pre-Christian tradition deeply rooted into the European countryside; on the other hand, the terms he uses are infused with Christianity and Neoplatonism, and his "metaphysics is mixed with astrology and theology with the doctrine of four temperaments". It is apparent that he believed in something similar to the elemental spirits of nature, that we can find in Paracelsus' *Liber de Nymphis...* (1569) and elsewhere. Moreover, his materialism ("I believe that it is impossible to make anything without matter, and even God could not have made anything without matter"), his views about human nature ("we are composed of the four elements, participate of the seven planets"), and the composite structure of a self (that extends beyond one's interiority<sup>15</sup> and is exposed to any kind of external, physical influences) sound very similar to Giordano Bruno's. In short, Menocchio's materialistic cosmology uncovers "surprising similarities between basic

---

<sup>14</sup> Ginzburg mentions the Vedas, Kalmyks' cosmogonies, and the beliefs of Altai shepherds.

<sup>15</sup> "[...] Intellect, memory, will, thought, belief, faith, and hope [...] are like souls through which works are to be done [...]. The spirit is separated from man, has the same will of man, and sustains this man".

currents in the peasant culture [...] and those in the most progressive circles of sixteenth-century culture". Certainly, Menocchio's views were more "scientific", *in potentia*, that the doctrines imposed by the Counter-Reformation through torture and burnings.

**Legature** Let's consider briefly two Latin treatises by Bruno: *De magia* (1589) and *De vinculis in genere* (1591). The world Bruno describes is wholly material, wholly animated (*si non omnia corpora composita sunt animalia, omnia tamen animata intelligere oportet*) and perpetually transforming (*mutatio est continua*). Everything is permeated by the spirit (*spiritus*) or soul (*anima... ipsius natura ubique tota et continua*), which is everywhere indissolubly connected with universal matter (*indissolubilem habet nexum ad universalem materia*). "Whence it follows", writes Bruno, "that the vacuum does not exist as a bodiless space: vacuum is a sort of space where diverse bodies follow one another and move"<sup>16</sup>. The seamless universal soul, however, merges with the multifarious worldly substances (with water, earth, air, fire and compound bodies). Thus, it multiplies itself into a crowd of spirits and demons (*daemones*), which are capable of penetrating human bodies and minds (*penetratio circa corpora et immissio cogitationum*). Depending on their specific nature, these demons are more or less pure, but they are not completely incorporeal (*non esse omnino incorporeos*): at most, they are spiritual substances, extremely thin living bodies (*spiritalis substantias, hoc est subtilissimi corporis animalia*). It is true that the spiritual substance of the world (*anima mundi*) pairs and unites all things together: through it, says Bruno, everything opens up to everything else (*omnia copulat unitque omnibus; unde ab omnibus datur aditus ad omnia*). Yet, the spiritual substance does not diffuse evenly: some entities naturally attract each other; some others naturally repel each other. According to Bruno (and Neoplatonism), the force that ties the worldly matter together is love (*amor*) or longing (*cupido*). There are sympathies between the elements (between stars and plants, stones and limbs, melodies and affect, and so on); so that *bonds* (*vincula*), on which magical operations rely, can hold only when they harmonize with these sympathetic lines.

---

<sup>16</sup> "Hinc sequitur conclusio vacuum non esse utpote quod sit spacium sine corpore, sed vacuum esse utpote spacium in quo diversa corpora sibi succedant et moveantur".

Ultimately, a *vinculum* is an active link of love or longing that connects sympathetic entities through the spiritual substance pervading the world. Bruno says that these *bonds* are dazzling (they are described as *fulgor*), but he also says that they are latent (*latens est quod... obvincit*). This is not an inconsistency. Stressing their splendor and their latency, Bruno means that their spiritual substance is pure and that they make their way into more opaque matter exactly as light (the purest spirit) penetrates deeply into darkness without losing its own nature. The important thing to point out here is that this spiritual *fulgor* is still *physical*. Consequently, the latency of what binds does not break the *immanence* of Bruno's materialistic world. The substance of *bonds* is just too thin (or too bright) to be actually seen. The surface of things opens up only to reveal new physical surfaces, as in a sort of microscopic vision.

**Metamorfosi, simpatie, segnature** I have to repeat that this magical interpretation of the world is not unique to Giordano Bruno. One can find similar views in Campanella or Paracelsus, Ficino or Giambattista della Porta<sup>17</sup>; one can find them as well, perhaps in a fragmented form, across the spectrum of popular beliefs, by which our fairy tales were (at least) partially influenced. Now, beyond the well-known attunements of fairy-tale themes and motifs to specific magical beliefs, we should recognize that the fictional world of Straparola's and Basile's narratives is very similar, in its general outline, to the one described by Renaissance works on magic and underlying animic popular beliefs of the time. The fictional world that our two authors staged, in fact, is entirely animated, and every fictional being or object is ready for any kind of metamorphosis (*mutatio est continua*)<sup>18</sup>. The

---

<sup>17</sup> I recall that, like Basile, both Campanella and Della Porta spent a good part of their life in Naples. Della Porta was also the founder of the Accademia degli Oziosi, of whom Basile was a member (nickname: *pigro*, lazy). Michele Rak points out that Basile knew beyond all doubt at least Della Porta's *Della celeste fisionomia* (1616), where the polymath corroborates the belief that a mother's unsatisfied desire can leave a mark on her unborn child. Basile refers several times to this belief (*CCI*, 1; *II*, 1; *II*, 9; *III*, 10; *IV*, 3 and elsewhere).

<sup>18</sup> The importance, the artistic quality and the number of metamorphoses is no doubt much higher in Basile than in Straparola. Metamorphoses, in fact, were particularly congenial to Baroque taste. They were also a convenient means, in the framework of Marinistic poetics (whose prominent purpose was raising *meraviglia* through complicated stylistic squiggles), to show one's rhetorical skills. What is more, Basile was an exceptionally skilled writer, incomparably more skilled than Straparola. Having said this, it is out of question that metamorphosis *in se* is a fundamental feature of the proto-fairy-tale fictional world, even beyond our two authors.

separation between the kingdoms of nature, life and death, words and things, is definitely porous. There is no firm distinction between the organic and the inorganic, or between animals, plants and human beings. All of them can suddenly become active and move, speak, love: a human character can be irresistibly attracted by an armoire (*PNI*, 4), a myrtle (*CCI*, 2), a piece of marble stained with blood (*CCIV*, 9); a doll can fall in love with a poor lady (*PNV*, 2), and so on. As Bruno would say, in the fairy tale everything opens up to everything else: the same matter merges fictional beings on an even surface of immanence (there is no disparity of levels in the fictional world: the opposition natural/preternatural does not make sense). On the surface of immanence, the development of the plot weaves the very fabric of the world in accordance with sympathies and interconnections that nothing can break. Any sort of signatures, in the sense of Paracelsus or Della Porta, mark the world and the creatures: birth under a lucky star, or kinship to an animal, a wizard, a plant, always appear outwardly: three brothers kissed by fortune have a star on their foreheads (*PNIV*, 3); Biancabella, sister of a grass snake, was born with a golden necklace showing through her skin (*PN III*, 3); a mother, who during her pregnancy steals and eats some parsley from the garden of an ogre, give birth to a child with a lock of parsley on her chest (*CCII*, 1); two brothers that nothing can set apart are so resembling that it is impossible to distinguish them (*CC I*, 7; *I*, 9); we could continue indefinitely.

**Intensità I** In such a world, then, bodyless space does not exist (*non esse... spacium sine corpore*): the representative elements complement each other, and there is no pre-existing space beyond the one which movement itself produces. Furthermore, movement is never unbound: every action stems necessarily from a circulation of emotional intensities (*cupidines*), that flow through highly unstable fictional beings, binding them to each other along the line traced by their destiny. Constantly transforming, the fictional world reaches its balance and crystallizes, so to say, only when the tale comes to an end. One of the consequences of this state of affairs is that the individuality of fairy-tale characters is delusional. Not only because of the stylistic abstraction of every fictional being; not only because “human” characters completely lack interiority and can easily transform into animals, plants and objects; but especially because every distinct fictional being is decentered in favor of the

circulation of immanent worldly forces. These forces, tying together utterly diverse fictional beings, and expressing themselves as emotional intensities and necessary chains of events, are the true protagonists of Renaissance and Baroque fairy tales.

**Superfici** Most of the interpretations proposed in the last paragraph are not new. In 1947, Max Lüthi famously described the fictional world of the fairy tale as one-dimensional, depthless, lacking spatial perspective, and marked by its “abstractness”, in the sense of Wilhelm Worringer. Following the influential art historian, Lüthi interpreted the flat figures of the fairy tale as isolated, set apart from any geographical, historical and human environment<sup>19</sup>. On account of such an absolute isolation, though, these figures would be able to merge with any other, through a system of “invisible *universal interconnections*”. Many of Lüthi’s ideas sound still convincing and deserve the consideration from which they benefit to this day. However, one of the main problems with his theories is that they rely on a preliminary separation between action and representative elements, between time and space. An assumption that pairs with his notion of the fairy tale as an unchanging, ahistorical narrative typology. Therefore, a) he missed the specificity of historical fairy tales, such as the Renaissance and Baroque ones, and their relation with the contemporary context; b) he was unable to see that his theory of “*universal interconnections*” is far from being universal: in Straparola’s and Basile’s fairy tales, “*universal interconnections*” do not unfold *between* preexisting isolated figures; they are rather intensities that create (shallow) forms in the very moment they pass through them, whilst heading to their necessary achievement.

---

<sup>19</sup> Cf., for instance, the following lines of Worringer’s *Abstraktion und Einfühlung* (1907), which are a sort of summary of many ideas that Lüthi developed in his books: “A crucial consequence of [abstract] artistic volition was, on the one hand, the approximation of the representation to a plane, and on the other, strict suppression of the representation of space and exclusive rendering of the single form”. Beyond Lüthi, one can find numerous allusions to the flatness of the fairy-tale fictional world in literary studies. It is not rare, in addition, that these references come together with mentions of ornamental art. Italo Calvino, for instance, described *I tre cedri* (CC V, 9) as “an arabesque of multicolor metamorphoses originating from each other as in the motif of a Persian carpet”.

**Interiorità** Independently from Lüthi, in a text written between 1911 and 1915 but unpublished until 1977, Georgy Lukács as well remarked the shallowness and ornamental abstraction of the characters of the fairy tale. He wrote: “in the fairy tale even the deepest life comes to the surface, so much so that [...] life in general becomes superficial. [...] The fairy tale is purely ornamental, depthless and anti-metaphysical par excellence”. Lukács is certainly right in deconstructing the opposition between interiority and exteriority: the uneasiness in describing interiority is quite a pervasive feature in fairy tales. Nevertheless, in the history of the genre we can observe an evolution. In Perrault’s *Contes* human characters are certainly “deeper” and more “humanly accomplished” than their Italian ancestors. Therefore, Lukács’ assertion seems particularly true when applied to Renaissance and Baroque fairy tales. Their characteristic, all-encompassing immanence, indeed, seems to exclude interiority from the horizon of the fictional world. In Straparola’s and Basile’s stories, interiority can only manifest itself through external features and actions (goodness as beauty, envy as plotting or killing, desire as grabbing, and so forth). More precisely, even when interiority appears as such (and it rarely does), it cannot be controlled or contained, but it has to burst into the outer world. For instance, if Biancabella’s stepmother is able to hide her own hate against her stepdaughter, after just a few days she commands her murder (*PV*III, 3). Secrecy is impossible; or rather *it is* possible, but it has to be a physical one, it has to be immanent to a world of fictional bodies. The only duplicity the Renaissance and Baroque fairy-tale world seems to tolerate is that of the disguise, the duplicity of a metamorphosed being: i.e. a *superficial* duplicity. Once again, Bruno’s notion of *latency* comes to mind, helping us understand the specific shallowness of Straparola’s and Basile’s characters.

**Persone e cose** Most probably, in the act of interpreting the early tradition of written fairy tales, it would be better to relinquish the concept of a character altogether. Indeed, as early as 1928 Vladimir Propp had deconstructed the opposition between the character and the other representative elements of the fairy tale. Hence the celebrated theory of the interchangeability of the “actants” having an equal function: a fairy occupying the position of the helper, for instance, can be replaced by a pair of magic boots fulfilling the same function. In his *Mythologiques*, Lévi-Strauss tried to eliminate even the concept of “actant”, and Fredric Jameson argued that Lévi-Strauss’ procedure was

possible only because of the nature of the narrative with which the latter was dealing: “These are evidently preindividualistic narratives; that is, they emerge from a social world in which the psychological subject has not yet been constituted as such, and therefore in which later categories of the subject, such as the ‘character’, are not relevant. Hence, the bewildering fluidity of these narrative strings, in which human characters are ceaselessly transformed into animals and objects and back again [...]”. I think there is no need to stress how much these words sound appealing from the perspective presented here. Even though we are not dealing with “preindividualistic narratives”, we cannot read the Renaissance and Baroque fairy tales (or inquire into folk fairy tales as Propp did) without questioning the relevance of the category of the character. In fact, as Warburg would say, in the fairy tale there is no distance (or detachment), either between an internal self (an interiority) and its spatial (corporeal) extension, or between subject and object. As if “subject” and “object” merged into one body (*Anverleiben*)<sup>20</sup>. In Straparola’s and Basile’s narratives, “subject” and “object” merge thanks to an immanent material spirit that lights them up with life and action, and then leaves, sending them back into nonexistence. As a consequence, things seem more than mere objects, whilst human characters look like puppets moved by external influences<sup>21</sup>. Moreover, human characters seem always about to transform or disappear; their contours are indefinite, unstable, in bold contrast with the sharpness of objects (the fairy tales have an apparent predilection for metals and minerals). The invincible desire of Tebaldo for his daughter Doralice, for instance (*PNI*, 4), rages because of a ring; Genese meets the same Doralice – who has fled her father’s lust – thanks to his compelling desire to possess an armoire. Instead, when Tebaldo manages to find Doralice, in the palace of

---

<sup>20</sup> In a note dated August 28, 1896, Warburg wrote: “Acquiring the sense of distance between subject and object is the task of the so-called culture and the criterion of the progress of humankind. The true goal of a history of culture would be describing, for every period, the relative stage of such a realization”.

<sup>21</sup> Such an inconsistency of the characters of Straparola’s and Basile’s fairy tales could not escape notice. Indeed, two exceptional interpreters of Renaissance and Baroque Italian literature as Giancarlo Mazzacurati and Giovanni Getto highlighted this point perfectly. Mazzacurati says that probably is not legitimate to call “characters” the human figures of Straparola. They seem to him totally other-directed, and he calls them, beautifully, “acephalous statues”. According to Getto, the human beings in the *Pentamerone* are eminently “passive”: they behave automatically, are only “gears” in a “system of forces”.

Genese, she does not recognize her father; and the day after he can show up again at the palace, presenting himself as an astrologer, without anyone recognizing him. Elsewhere in the *Piacevoli Notti*, the father does not recognize his daughter (III, 1), the husband his beloved wife (III, 3), and so on. In *Il mercante* (CCI, 7), Cienzo kills a dragon, saves Menechella, and then goes away. A peasant takes his place, and Menechella marries him without realizing that the peasant *is not* the dragon killer. In *Il corvo* (CCIV, 9), a marble stone sprinkled with the blood of a raven seduces a king, Milluccio, to the point that the rest of the world disappears for him and he resembles “a marble statue making love with that other marble”. The “subject” longs to become one with the “object”.

**Intensità II** As discussed, the principal emotional intensity binding together the fictional being is love or longing. Though, in the world of the fairy tale, love and longing are always embodied. So that they are more precisely described, from a subjective point of view, as an inbound *desire to possess*. It does not make any difference if a character desires to possess a stone or a plant, an animal or a prince. In any case, love and longing stick onto exterior traits, produce outward movement and seek material satisfaction. Therefore, in Renaissance and Baroque fairy tales, love is definitely at odds with the “spectral” *amor cortese*. The desire to possess is a *bond*, a mysterious force that springs from the world itself, and has enough strength to refashion it. Indeed, the characters remain passive, and cannot even struggle against “their” desires: they can just express (or rather *be expressed by*) them. Often, what breaks the narrative balance, and precipitates the events to their necessary accomplishment, is exactly a desire to possess. Tebaldo is “ignited by the beauty” (*accesso della bellezza*) of Doralice (PNI, 4); the pig king threatens to destroy everything around if he does not obtain the girls he wants (PNII, 1); Bellisandra “falls, almost dead, into the arms of her mother”, because her yearning for a horse has been momentarily impeded (PNIII, 2); in *Pentamerone*’s frame, a doll is given to Tadeo’s wife, and the doll, like “Cupid on Didon’s lap”, “puts fire in her chest”, kindling “such a burning desire to listen to stories that [she] could not resist [it]”; Narduccio, struck by the beauty of Belluccia, almost dies and has to marry her at any cost (CCIII, 6); as soon as he is told about a horse, a trousseau, a palace, the king of Fiumelargo (*ch’era de cellevriello figliarulo che subeto se ‘mpregnava*) wants to possess them, so much so that he is ready to sacrifice

his favorite (*CC III*, 7); Liviella is so intensely bewitched (*'ncantata*) by some merchandise that she is kidnapped without realizing it (*CC IV*, 9). To be sure, longing is not the only emotional intensity that runs across the fictional world. This is also because of basic narratological reasons: these narratives require the presence of an opposite force to be overcome. One could write an entire volume about envy in the *Pentamerone*<sup>22</sup>, where it is repeatedly compared to a strong wind (one of Basile's most cherished metaphors). Jealousy, hate or discord are also to be found in both collections; yet, these divisive forces are unable to oppose the necessary development of love or longing. Most importantly, exactly like love, divisive emotional intensities are independent of the self, and suddenly seize the characters, as it were, against their will. We could provide many examples of this state of affairs. Let me put forward just a paradigmatic one: in the *Piacevoli notti* (*III*, 4), two stepbrothers love each other so much that they cannot be apart: "But discord [...] seeing their ardent love, and being not able to stand such a fondness, one day interposed itself [...]"<sup>23</sup>. For the sake of precision, I have to say that, compared to Straparola, Basile insists more on the power of fortune, sometimes personifying it. It is mostly fortune that, taking one form or another, pushes the characters to behave according to its blind progression. By now it should be clearer why the moral interpretation of fairy tales, in Basile's collection, meets insuperable difficulties; why every moral content (when actually present) sounds false and inconsistent. We cannot help guessing the smile of irony on the mouth of the writer.

*By the way, a certain cognitive approach to literary texts, which focuses on the reconstruction of the intentionalities embedded in fiction, and which the works of Lisa Zunshine or Uri Marcolin exemplify, is scarcely applicable to written fairy tales of the early period. It is not by chance that cognitive literary critics cherish modernist narratives, such as Virginia Woolf's Mrs. Dalloway, whose "psychological realism" relies upon the highly implausible premise of the "transparent mind". To be*

---

<sup>22</sup> The importance of envy in the *Pentamerone* seems also to be a meaningful textual trace of the audience to which the collection was originally addressed: people frequenting the courts.

<sup>23</sup> In *Le piacevoli notti*, the specific psychology embedded in the *fiabe* emerges sharply, by contrast, when compared to the one displayed by the protagonists of certain *novelle* (for instance *PV VII*, 2 and *VII*, 4). Here Straparola praises a control over emotions that never appears, for good reasons, in his fairy tales.

sure, in order to understand the complex aesthetic responses triggered by an early fairy tale in neuroscientific terms, it is way more promising to look for embodied simulation effects. Yet, given the imaginative quality of the fictional worlds we are dealing with (and the number of blanks that dot them)<sup>24</sup>, inner embodied imitations or empathetic engagements with the “human” and “nonhuman” actions performed in similar narratives could appear peculiar and maybe surprising. I leave this question open.

**Influenze astrali** To sum it up: the vital energy animating the characters does not come from an internal source but crosses objects, animals, plants and human beings, binding them together. If the protagonist of a narrative stands out because of his capacity to act, then we must recognize that the true protagonist of fairy tales is a sort of circulating spirit “separated from man”, as Menocchio would say. This spirit only complies with its own “logic”, which is absolutely blind and obscure to men. Nevertheless, its development is necessary and unstoppable: it can appear as destiny or fortune (*tyche*) or an astral influence (“we... participate of the seven planets”, said Menocchio)<sup>25</sup>; and its emissaries are fairies and speaking animals, magical objects and emotional intensities. Fortune and the influence of stars are omnipresent both in Straparola’s and Basile’s fairy tales. Even though in Straparola they remain mostly in the background as a pervading necessity affecting the chain of events, yet fortune and the stars show up outspokenly several times: Fortunio (III, 4) and Costantino Fortunato (XI, 1), for instance, are both creatures of destiny. We could say the same about Costanza (IV, 1), born when nobody was expecting her: she is “pursued by the envious and unstable fortune”

---

<sup>24</sup> In literary theory, blanks are roughly the blind spots of a fictional world, that is, those spatiotemporal elements whose imaginative content remains indeterminate because the text does not provide enough information to create intersubjective mental images.

<sup>25</sup> Sometimes Providence is mentioned as well, but its role is marginal. From a narratological point of view, it looks like an avoidable addition; whilst from an historical point of view such an addition was absolutely necessary. Possibly, though, Providence was already present in the popular sources, mirroring the fusion of Christianity with a pre-Christian substratum. At any rate, in written narratives, the position of Providence is once again similar to the one God plays in Bruno’s cosmology: God is the ultimate reason of everything, a sort of all-encompassing Aristotelian unmoved mover, that always stays still whilst the demons and the spirits and the planets bustle around in everyday life. One has to be reminded of its existence or it would be forgotten.

until she arrives in the “famous city called Costanza”, where she ends up marrying the king. In the *Piacevoli notti* (V, II), one can also find a Renaissance *topos* concerning the relationship between the stars and mankind: “So powerful, so great and so acute the human intellect is, that it exceeds and overcomes all the human forces of the world. Therefore, legitimately it is said that the wise man masters the stars (*E però meritamente dicessi l’uomo savio signoreggiare le stelle*)”<sup>26</sup>. How unfortunate that the following lines read: “Whence I remember a story (*favola*), by which you will easily understand how a poor little girl, helped by fortune (*dalla fortuna sovenuta*), became the wife of a rich and powerful king”. There is no need to add that the poor little girl, Adamantina, does not do anything to be helped by fortune, except falling in love with a doll *cacadenari* that loves her in return. Regarding the *Pentamerone*, it is impossible to summarize here the role of fortune and the stars: considering the great number of occurrences, and the problematic pattern emerging from their mutual interplay, they have to be considered as major themes in Basile’s collection. On the one hand, there is the role fortune and the stars play in the fairy tales, where blind forces tie together the events into necessary chains; on the other hand, fortune and the stars play an important role in the ideological parts of the collection (introductions and proverbs). Here Basile shows an utterly ambiguous attitude: he repeats that “the wise man masters the stars” (*l’ommo sapio dommena le stelle*; V, 6), but he also stunningly concludes his *Gatta cenerentola* with the sentence: “crazy is the one who thwarts the stars” (*pazzo è chi contrasta co’ le stelle*; I, 6); he mentions twice the widespread allegorical image (codified also by Ripa’s *Iconology* [1593-1624]) of the man grabbing Fortune by the hair (I, 7; II, 9); nevertheless, in *La colomba* (II, 7), the fairy Filadoro tells Nardo (who had asked her to marry him): “A certain combination of the stars impedes this solution; but this influence (*sto infruscio*) will soon be over and we will be happy”. Sometimes (II, 2), Basile claims a “moral fate” (often in contrast with the plot of the tale to which the introduction in question refers); sometimes (I, 1; V, 3), he acknowledges that fortune acts as a blind force that saves and destroys randomly. He

---

<sup>26</sup> “Vir sapiens dominabitur astris” was a sentence attributed to Ptolemy and was the epigraph of divinatory astrology. It’s no coincidence, then, if we find it also in Paracelsus: “The wise man can rule and master [*Regieren und Meystern*] the star and not the other way round [...]” (*De natura rerum*, IX: *De signatura rerum naturalium*).

blames and makes fun of the astrologers and of those who believe in them (*La coppella*); yet, as it were, he puts his book under the aegis of Zoroaster (the presumed author of the *Chaldean Oracles*), who appears in the very first lines of the *Pentamerone*. Compared to Straparola, Basile seems to have gained a certain distance in relation to the forces of destiny, and therefore to the world of the fairy tale itself. Probably, he can speak so openly about them exactly because of such a distance. Nevertheless, despite the intellectual detachment from the reality of cosmic influences, the stars continue to be feared<sup>27</sup>. So that Basile could have said about celestial forces what Mme du Deffand would declare about ghosts a century or so later – when asked if she believed in ghosts, she answered: “Non, mais j’en ai peur”.

**Sopravvivenze** Aby Warburg and Jean Seznec, amongst others, have shown that the beliefs in the compelling forces of destiny and astral influences were ways by which the survival or renewal of ancient paganism manifested itself during the Renaissance. One needs just to leaf through the second chapter of Seznec’s *La survivance des dieux antiques* to realize both the cultural importance of astrology in Early-Modern Europe and the dangers involved in supposing the existence of celestial influences on humankind. According to Warburg, simplifying tremendously his views on this point, the liberation from late-pagan prejudices was obtained thanks to the help of antiquity itself: the “*monstra* of imagination” were not only an obstacle to overcome; they were also repositories of reusable (phobic) energy, bearers of rhythmic structures, and vital guides (*Lebensführern*) in the struggle for the expansion of the *Denkraum der Besonnenheit* (a thought-space detached from both

---

<sup>27</sup> After what we have said hitherto about Basile, we can formulate a new hypothesis concerning the meaning of the *Pentamerone* subtitle, *Entertainment for Little Ones*. Probably part of Basile’s sources were tales for children. Yet, the word ‘children’, here, seems also to have a metaphorical sense. The tales may be said to be “for children”, because they stage characters that are incapable to face up to emotions and to the forces of destiny; exactly as it would happen to children from an adult, civilized and modern point of view. If it is the case, Basile would mean by “peccerille” something similar to what Erasmus meant in his influential *Civilitate morum puerilium* (12 editions in 1530 alone). Through the young dedicatee, Henry of Burgundy, Erasmus addresses everyone, implicitly asserting that even an 11-year-old child can perform good manners, and therefore equating bad-mannered men to little ones unable to control themselves. Such a way to interpret “peccerille” would comply with Poggio Bracciolini’s idea that “the dangers threatening man from without (the forces of destiny) are strongest so long as man’s true self has not yet been completely formed, i.e., so long as he is still in childhood or early youth”.

the “not-I” and the violence of passions). Analyzing Straparola’s and Basile’s fairy tales we should keep in mind the tensions characterizing their contemporary cultural background. Indeed, the remnants of a disappeared world were to be found in these fairy tales: they were symbolic places where modernity could face the *monstra* of imagination. Yet, beyond dragons and sirens, satyrs and nymphs, the true *monstrum* to overcome is an other-directed self<sup>28</sup>. This self too seems to come from a distant past, considering that the other-directed psychologies of fairy-tale characters, who are constantly driven by emotional intensities crossing them, bear a strong resemblance with the psychology of the Homeric characters described by Eric R. Dodds. In this ancient model of the self, in fact, certain passions (for example *ate*, infatuation) seize the subject from outside: they are understandable as “psychic interventions” by the Gods and as agents of the *moirai* (incarnations of destiny). The submission of Straparola’s and Basile’s fairy-tale characters to external cosmic and emotional forces allows us to see how the history of Western fairy tales illustrates the struggle for the conquest of a new self. The Renaissance and Baroque fairy tales are fundamental means for the comprehension of the historical transition leading to the emergence of a new consciousness of interiority as separated from outer influences. However, something has survived, in modern subjectivities, of the inbound influences that are so important in proto-fairy tales.

*We can think about the psycho- and sociogenetic power of the fairy tale in terms of discursive contents (in a Foucauldian sense) and abstract relations of power, as Jack Zipes does. Yet, we can also take into account the conditioning capacity of certain gestures, emotions, desires; that is, of narrative equivalents of Warburgian pathos formulas<sup>29</sup>, that appear in early fairy tales and are at a*

---

<sup>28</sup> Cassirer argued that the humanists rose up against the tyranny of the stars mainly for moral reasons. The history of the fairy tale, and more generally the evolution of literary characters in the Italian narrative tradition, are evidence to the fact that the confrontation with the stars was far from being won at the end of the 16<sup>th</sup>-century.

<sup>29</sup> It is difficult to summarize here what a pathos formula is in the context of Warburg’s work, and how such a concept could be applied to narrative (I discussed this topic quite extensively elsewhere). Let’s just say that, according to Warburg, an array of recurring gestural formulas used for the aesthetic rendering of emotions migrate across art history. These formulas, which are transmitted only half consciously, can be decontextualized and acquire different meaning during their migration. Warburg could recognize Perseus holding the head of Medusa, for instance, in a Renaissance medal representing “the grasp of Fortune by the hair”. Even though I did not introduce it before (as it would have required a

*later time intercepted and diverted by the bourgeoisie in its attempt to control social reproduction through education. Actually, it is possible to describe this process of interception and diversion quite precisely. Looking at the different kinds of manipulations to which fairy tales were subjected by Perrault and the Brothers Grimm, it would even be possible to trace a sort of transition from a “disciplinary” to a “governmental” way to convey moral values.*

*In this process, the compelling desire to possess objects and reified persons was ready to acquire different meanings and values in accord with the new social context. This is a topic that deserves further investigation. On the one hand, because it is obviously related with the rise of capitalism (especially if we agree with Werner Sombart on the role luxury goods played in such a rise); on the other, because it affects, on an imaginary level, the relationship between the subject and the object. It is not my intention to overestimate the importance of fairy tales. Yet, we have to take them into account, if we want to inquire into the historical formation of modern subjectivity. Indeed, the latter could establish itself only by removing the possibility of external influences, that is, removing phenomena that break the separation between the inner and outer worlds.*

*Removing them, however, does not mean getting rid of them. In the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries, the desire to possess went through the eye of good manners, the new social and behavioral conventions the upper classes were imposing ever more stringently on themselves. Among the same upper classes, fairy tales had the greatest success. Was it for the sake of escapism? Was it a way to exorcise one’s beliefs and fantasies by qualifying them as “childish”? Most likely. Nevertheless, in this process, many desires, pathos formulas and unbeknown value polarities have sunk underneath self-restraint and bienséance, becoming a subterranean river crossing history and affecting the development of Western societies.*

---

long detour), the concept of the pathos formula underlies the argument of this paper, and especially my approach to literary genres and themes.

## NOTES

### Esordio

*A powerful medium for social reproduction* Cf. J. ZIPES (1983), *Fairy Tales and the Art of Subversion. The Classical Genre for Children and the Process of Civilization*, New York 1991;  *fairy tales had to be deeply reworked* Cf. Z. SHAVIT, “The Concept of Childhood and Children’s Folktales: Text case - *Little Red Riding Hood*”, in M. TATAR (ed.), *The Classic Fairy Tales*, New York-London 1990; *19<sup>th</sup>- and early 20<sup>th</sup>-century pedagogy* D. RICHTER (1987), *Il bambino estraneo. La nascita dell’immagine dell’infanzia nel mondo borghese*, Roma 2010; *the process of normalization* M. SORIANO, *Les Contes de Perrault: culture savante et tradition populaire*, Paris 1968; E. LE ROY LADURIE, *Les Paysans de Languedoc*, Paris 1966; M. SORIANO, J. LE GOFF, E. LE ROY LADURIE, A. BURGUIERE, “Les Contes de Perrault”, *Annales*, 25.3 (1970): 633-653; R. MANDROU, *De la culture populaire au 17 et 18 siècles: la Bibliothèque Bleue de Troyes*, Paris 1964; *animic* M. SAHLINS, “On the Ontological Scheme of *Beyond Nature and Culture*”, *Hau: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*, 4.1 (2014): 281-290.

### Prologo

H.P. L’ORANGE (1953), *Studies in the Iconography of Cosmic Kinship in the Ancient World*, New Rochelle-New York 1982; W.J. ONG, “From Allegory to Diagram in the Renaissance Mind: A Study in the Significance of the Allegorical Tableau”, *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 17.4 (1959): 423-440.

### Figura

*Le piacevoli notti’s footnote* G.F. STRAPAROLA, *Le piacevoli notti*, Bari 1927 (G. Rua ed.) and Roma 2000 (D. Pirovano ed.); G. MAZZACURATI, *Conflitti di culture nel Cinquecento*, Napoli 1977; ID., “La narrativa di G.F. Straparola: sociologia e struttura del protagonista fiabesco”, *Studi mediolatini e volgari*, 17 (1969): 49-88; D. PIROVANO, “Una storia editoriale cinquecentesca: *Le piacevoli notti* di Giovan Francesco Straparola”, *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana*, 177 (2000): 540-569; ID., “Per l’edizione delle *Piacevoli Notti* di Giovan Francesco Straparola”, *Filologia e critica*, 24 (2001):

60-93; *the Pentamerone's footnote* G.B. BASILE, *Lo cunto de li cunti* (M. Rak ed.), Milano 1986; L. VINCENTI, *Brentano*, Torino 1928; A. JOLLES, *I travestimenti della letteratura. Saggi critici e teorici (1897-1932)*, Milano 2003; *Entertainment for Little Ones* G. GETTO, *Barocco in prosa e in poesia*, Milano 1969; D. RICHTER, *op. cit.*; N. CANEPA, "Entertainment for Little Ones? Basile's *Lo cunto de li cunti* and the Childhood of the Literary Fairy Tale", *Marvels & Tales*, 17.1 (2003): 37-54; M. RAK, *Logica della fiaba*, Milano 2005; ID., *Da cenerentola a cappuccetto rosso*, Milano 2007; *the fairy tale figura was created in France* W. BENJAMIN (1928), *Il dramma barocco tedesco*, Torino 1999; M.E. STORER, *La Mode des contes de fées (1685-1700)*, Paris 1928; **Bottigheimer** R. BOTTIGHEIMER, *Magic Tales and Fairy Tales Magic from Ancient Egypt to Italian Renaissance*, New York 2014; *the difference between a conceptual model and a genre* C. GUILLÉN (1985), *L'uno e il molteplice. Introduzione alla letteratura comparata*, Bologna 2008; F. MORETTI, "Conjectures on World Literature", *New Left Review*, 1 (2000): 54-68; ID., *La letteratura vista da lontano*, Torino 2005; *the Brothers Grimm and Hans Christian Andersen* cf. J. ZIPES, *op. cit.*; *Perrault modified the story* cf. M. SORIANO, *op. cit.*

#### Popolo, bambini, selvaggi

*Overlapping the two* D. RICHTER, *op. cit.*; G. BOAS (1966), *The Cult of Childhood*, Dallas 1990; *the social attitudes toward children* PH. ARIES, *L'Enfant et la vie familiale sous l'Ancien Régime*, Paris 1960; *the evolution of private space* R.A. GOLDTHWAITE, "The Florentine Palace as Domestic Architecture", *The American Historical Review*, 77.4 (1972): 977-1012; *De Certeau famously wrote* M. DE CERTEAU, *La Culture au pluriel*, Paris 1974; *the folkloricist approach* Cf. S. THOMPSON, *The Folktale*, New York 1951; *hybrid, modular, malleable historical compositions* E. PUGLIA, *Pour une écologie du conte merveilleux*, forthcoming.

#### Intermezzo I

*The means of such a circulation* M. RAK, *Da cenerentola a cappuccetto rosso*, cit.

#### Il mondo alla rovescia

*Popular culture of 16<sup>th</sup>- and Early-17<sup>th</sup>-century Italy* Cf. at least P. BURKE, *Popular Culture in Early modern Europe*, New York 1978; P. CAMPORESI, "Cultura popolare e cultura d'élite fra Medioevo

e Rinascimento”, in C. Vivanti, *Storia d'Italia. Annali 4. Intellettuali al potere*, Torino 1981; *the civilizing process* N. ELIAS (1939), *The civilizing process*, Oxford 1997; *freedom against fortune* E. CASSIRER (1927), *The individual and the cosmos in Renaissance philosophy*, New York 1963; A. WARBURG (1966), *La rinascita del paganesimo antico. Contributi alla storia della cultura*, Milano 1980; J. SEZNEC (1940), *La survivance des dieux antiques*, Paris 1993; *famines and diseases* J. DELUMEAU, *La peur en Occident (XIV<sup>e</sup>-XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècles). Une citée assiégée*, Paris 1978.

### Erbe mediche

*A homogeneous popular culture* M. DE CERTEAU, *op. cit.*; *the illiterate country-women* P. CAMPORESI, *op. cit.*; A. WARBURG (1920), “Divinazione antica pagana in testi ed immagini dell’età di Lutero”, in ID., *op. cit.*; *John Locke* K. THOMAS, *Religion and the Decline of Magic*, London 1971.

### Un mugnaio

C. GINZBURG (1976), *The Cheese and the Worms. The Cosmos of a Sixteenth-Century Miller*, Baltimore-London 1980.

### Legature

G. BRUNO (1589; 1591), *La magia. Le legature*, Milano 2000.

### Metamorfosi, simpatie, segnature

*Michele Rak*: G. BASILE, *op. cit.*; *the well-known attunements with specific magical contents* Cf. at least V. PROPP (1946), *Le radici storiche dei racconti di fate*, Torino 1985; *preternatural [not supernatural]* L. DASTON, “Marvelous Facts and Miraculous Evidence in Early Modern Europe”, in P.G. Platt (ed.), *Wonders, Marvels and Monsters in Early Modern Culture*, Newark 1999; *signatures* Cf. G. AGAMBEN, *Signatura Rerum. Sul metodo*, Torino 2008.

### Intensità I

cf. E. PUGLIA, *op. cit.*

### Superfici

M. LÜTHI (1947), *The European Folktale: Form and Nature*, Bloomington-Indianapolis 1982; W. WORRINGER (1908), *Abstraction and Empathy: A Contribution to the Psychology of Style*, Chicago

1997; *the [ornamental] flatness of fairy tales* Cf. S. CALABRESE, *Glia arabeschi della fiaba*, Pisa 1984; I. CALVINO, *Sulla fiaba*, Torino 1988.

### Interiorità

G. LUKÁCS (1977), *Scritti sul Romance*, Palermo 1995.

### Persone e cose

V. PROPP (1928), *Morfologia della fiaba*, Torino 1980; C. LÉVI-STRAUSS (1964), *Mythologiques I. Le cru et le cuit*, Paris 2009; *[on the relationship between Propp and Lévi-Strauss]* F. JESI, “Sul mito e la fiaba”, in G. Cusatelli, *Tutto è fiaba. Atti del convegno internazionale di studio sulla fiaba*, Milano 1980; F. JAMESON, *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*, Ithaca 1981; *Anverleiben* A. WARBURG, *Frammenti sull’espressione*, Pisa 2011; D. FREEDBERG, “Gombrich and Warburg: Making and Matching, Grasping and Comprehending”, in S. Moser-Ernst (ed.), *Art and the Mind - Ernst H. Gombrich*, Göttingen 2018 [Thanks to Christoph Frank for bringing this article to my attention]; *Giancarlo Mazzacurati and Giovanni Getto* G. MAZZACURATI, “La narrativa di G.F. Straparola”, cit.; G. GETTO, *op. cit.*

### Intensità II

*the spectral amor cortese* See G. AGAMBEN, *Stanze. La parola e il fantasma nella cultura occidentale*, Torino 1977.

### Intermezzo II

L. ZUNSHINE, *Why We Read Fiction: Theory of the Mind and the Novel*, Columbus 2006; U. MARGOLIN, “Cognitive Science, the Thinking Mind and Literary Narrative”, in D. Herman (ed.), *Narrative Theory and the Cognitive Science*, Stanford 2003; *cognitive literary critics cherish modernist narratives* Cf. H.C. WOJCIEHOWSKI and V. GALLESE, “How Stories Make Us Feel: Toward an Embodied Narratology”, *California Italian Studies*, 2.1 (2011); *transparent minds* D. COHN, *Transparent Minds: Narrative Modes for Presenting Consciousness in Fiction*, Princeton 1978; *blanks* W. ISER (1976), *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*, Baltimore 1978; *embodied simulation* Cf. H.C. WOJCIEHOWSKI and V. GALLESE, *art. cit.*; D. FREEDBERG and

V. GALLESE, "Motion, Emotion and Empathy in Esthetic Experience", *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 11.5 (2007): 197-203.

#### Influenze astrali

*A sentence attributed to Ptolemy* E. GARIN, *Dal Rinascimento all'Illuminismo*, Pisa 1970; *Poggio Bracciolini's idea* E. CASSIRER, *op. cit.*

#### Sopravvivenze

*According to Warburg* A. WARBURG (1925), "L'effetto della *Sphaera barbarica* sui tentativi di orientamento cosmici dell'Occidente", in ID., *Per monstra ad sphaeram*, Milano 2009; ID., (1929), *Mnemosyne. L'atlante delle immagini*, Torino 2003; *the psychologies of the Homeric characters* E.R. DODDS (1951), *The Greeks and the Irrational*, Berkley 1997.

#### Coda

J. ZIPES, *op. cit.*; *pathos formulas* G. DIDI-HUBERMAN, *L'image survivante: histoire de l'art et temps des fantômes selon Aby Warburg*, Paris 2002; G. AGAMBEN, *Ninfè*, Torino 2007; *pathos formulas and narrative* Cf. A. JOLLES, *op. cit.*, and also E. PUGLIA, "Verso un'archeologia tematica: lo sguardo delle cose", *Between*, 4.7 (2014); *disciplinary and governmental* M. FOUCAULT, *Dits et Ecrits II, 1976-1988*, Paris 2001; *luxury goods* W. SOMBART (1922), *Luxury and Capitalism*, Ann Arbor 1967.