

Inti: Revista de literatura hispánica

Volume 1 | Number 24


Article 16

1986

The *Agricultura cristiana* of Juan de Pineda in the Context of Renaissance Mythography and Encyclopedism

Barbara E. Kurtz

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.providence.edu/inti>

 Part of the [Fiction Commons](#), [Latin American Literature Commons](#), [Modern Literature Commons](#), and the [Poetry Commons](#)

Citas recomendadas

Kurtz, Barbara E. (Otoño-Primavera 1986) "The *Agricultura cristiana* of Juan de Pineda in the Context of Renaissance Mythography and Encyclopedism," *Inti: Revista de literatura hispánica*: No. 24, Article 16.

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.providence.edu/inti/vol1/iss24/16>

This Estudio is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@Providence. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Inti: Revista de literatura hispánica* by an authorized editor of DigitalCommons@Providence. For more information, please contact elizabeth.tietjen@providence.edu.

THE *AGRICULTURA CRISTIANA* OF JUAN DE PINEDA IN THE
CONTEXT OF RENAISSANCE MYTHOGRAPHY AND
ENCYCLOPEDIISM

Barbara E. Kurtz
University of Southern California

Juan de Pineda's *Agricultura cristiana* (Salamanca, 1589)¹ is a catechistic, encyclopedic manual the aim of which is the cultivation of the human soul, the formation and education of the Christian. Within the exceedingly loose framework of the dialogue form (which Pineda states is an imitation of the *Asclepius* of Hermes Trismegistus), the Franciscan ascete and Neoplatonist inserts material of the most disparate, and occasionally bizarre, character. A technical discussion of visual perspective, for example, stands cheek by jowl with consideration of the anti-aphrodisiac properties of the willow tree, an anatomically correct presentation of the functioning of the human body with a meditation on the spiritual significance of teeth. Pineda aims to embrace all of human knowledge, all of human learning, from the practical to the spiritual, from the theological to the scientific. The result is a curious melange, a *silva de (sumamente) varia lección* that incorporates medieval preoccupations and medieval methodology while showing sporadic signs of more modern concerns and practices.

It is interesting and worthy of special note that Pineda and his *Agricultura* are not mentioned by any of the scholars of European

mythography, such as Jean Seznec² or Don Cameron Allen,³ nor by the principal student of the Hispanic mythographic tradition, José María de Cossío.⁴ Yet Pineda deserves the attention of anyone interested in the history of the allegorical treatment of myth. He is one of the prime examples in Spanish letters (more interesting than his far better known contemporary Pérez de Moya) of a transitional moment in which the allegorization of myth, so characteristic of the Middle Ages, was yielding to the antiquarian mythography — scholarly and encyclopedic rather than ethical and Christian in its orientation — that was to supplant the old traditions and eventually to dominate the mythography of the seventeenth century.⁵ The focus of this study will be a preliminary assessment of this virtually unstudied author's methods and their historical significance within the traditions and presuppositions of the related fields of contemporaneous mythography and encyclopedism.

Although the habitual allegorical interpretation of myth was by no means exclusively or initially medieval, it was during the Middle Ages that allegoresis became the virtually universal approach to myth, the habitual paradigm of mythographic analysis,⁶ as the practical exigencies of education secured a place for pagan literature in the medieval curriculum and likewise demanded their reconciliation with or adaptation to Christian doctrine. Apologists saw in the eminent pre-Christian poets and philosophers approximations to or adumbrations of Christian truth; others saw a secular but nonetheless valuable form of *philosophia moralis*.

The commentary of the sixth-century mythographer Fulgentius, one of the most influential allegorical interpreters, can serve as an example of medieval interpretative beliefs and practices. In the *Mythologies*⁷ Fulgentius seeks to disclose the transcendent, universal truths he presumes lie hidden in the Greek tales. His interpretations generally follow a moralizing vein, with heavy reliance on etymology as a source of elucidation. His method consists essentially of declaring what the various elements of the narrative, or its very words, represent or symbolize; he does little more than give the general contours of the plot-line, which is often so condensed as to be virtually incomprehensible as narrative. Furthermore, the author displays little interest in the historical or literary value of the myths. As Leslie George Whitbread points out, *the hidden moral is everything; the fiction, a mere husk or shell of a nut*.⁸ Myth becomes in Fulgentius's hands a mere pretext for moral and philosophical excursions.⁹

Such allegorization of pagan myth was throughout the Middle Ages an established and universally applied hermeneutical method as well as an implicit assumption about the essential significance, and signification, of myth itself. Typical medieval practice, as in Fulgentius, fused retelling of

the myths with doctrinal interpretation of the meanings, ethical and/or Christian, assumed to lie *sub cortice*.

This method of interpretation had a long vogue, lasting well into the eighteenth century.¹⁰ But throughout the sixteenth century medieval practice, although still operative, was increasingly anachronistic and passé. Pineda's handling of myth well exemplifies this fluidity and transformation. In accordance with his didactic goals, Pineda presents throughout the *Agricultura* a number of moralized pagan myths: Adonis, Phaëton, Io, Prometheus, Orpheus. Of these allegorized tales, by far the longest and most complex interpretation deals with the figure and myth of Hercules, a tale which in its treatment at Pineda's hands can stand as example of the author's mythographic exposition. From this story, or series of stories, Pineda extracts allegorized, exemplary lessons in the tradition of medieval allegoresis. He echoes, for example, the typically medieval topos of the literal shell that conceals a kernel of doctrinal truth: *nosotros trataremos la corteza literal del Hércules malo, y vos desentrañaréis la doctrina espiritual del Hércules bueno...* (II, p. 107).¹¹ His method likewise echoes implicit philosophical assumptions of medieval allegorical hermeneutics:

Con esta introducción moral de la imaginaria vida de Hércules comenzaron los teólogos naturales a representar a un hombre consumado que vence a todos los monstruos de los pecados y los huella debajo de sus pies.... [A] falta de otra teología más alta, que Dios no les había revelado, componían sus doctrinas en aquellas fábulas... (II, p. 97).²

Pineda thus finds in the mythological figure a moral exemplar, a *símbolo de hombres virtuosos* (II, p. 85), and a *doctrina teológica* (II, p. 96) of virtuous steadfastness. For the elucidation or extraction of such moral doctrine the author makes typical use of etymology as expository tool: *y dice Catón que la palabra hércules es egipcia y que quiere decir empellejado, porque Oro Libio el primero, que tal nombre tuvo, trajo por corazas un cuero de león, de adonde se le pegó el nombre de Hércules o empellejado* (II, p. 92). Myth itself is for him a *compostura pura para enseñar lo que los paganos alcanzaban...* (II, p. 96), that is, a form of moral philosophy which embraces all that the pagans could attain in this realm without the enlightenment of Christian faith and Christian truth.

But there is far more at work in the *Agricultura* than such medieval allegorizing. In discussing the capture of Cerberus, for example, Pineda cites and summarizes numerous allegorizing precursors such as Gregorio Giraldi and Macrobius:

Dice Gregorio Giraldo que los antiguos poetas, que también eran los teólogos, por Hércules entendían al sol, y que le aplicaron señaladamente

doce trabajos, por significar los doce signos que vence, pasándose cada un año por ellos; y viniendo Macrobio a dar en esto, añade que el mismo nombre de Heracleo que le dieron lo significa todo, porque Eras es el aire (y por ser tenuta Juno por la región del aire le dieron este nombre) y Cífo es gloria, con la cual palabra de Heraclio se declara con cuán razón se tome por el sol, que con su claridad glorifica al aire clarificándole (II, p. 97).

He goes on in this passage to a consideration of the various moral interpretations of the episode that were offered by Suidas and Phornutus.

Pineda endlessly digresses in this fashion from the recapitulation of the story of Hercules in order to insert reviews or summaries of received opinion on the significance of the myth and its hero.¹³ In point of fact, much of his commentary on the myth of Hercules consists, not of a consideration of Hercules per se, but rather of just such a compilation of the varying formulations which the tale had received in the hands of numerous authors and commentators throughout the ages, along with clarification of what he calls the myth's *fondo histórico*. He includes much historical data, with citation of relevant historians, on the places and figures mentioned in the tale, as in the following explication of the city of Cleona:

Y así dice Virgilio del primer trabajo en su primero verso: *Prima cleonaei tolerata aermuna leonis*, que quiere decir que el primer trabajo fué la muerte que dio al león Cleoneo; y d cese Cleoneo, dice Ovidio, de la pequeña ciudad de Cleona, puesta de Plinio entre las de la provincia de Arcadia, en la Morea; y llámase también nemeo, de la selva nemea, donde andaba, y la pone Plinio entre Cleona y otra ciudad llamada Clitorio, y aun otros dicen que caía en la provincia de Acaya, donde también Plinio pone otra Cleona y el castillo Fliunte, entre los cuales dice que caía la selva nemea; y Estrabón dice que aquí se crio el león nemeo, y Pausanias concuerda con él, añadiendo que en la misma selva se mostraba la cueva del león; y confirma Diodoro el parecer destes señalando la ciudad de Micenas, puesta de Plinio en Acaya, caba la cual andaba el león (II, p. 99).

In such passages of historiographic detail Pineda displays a spirit of scientific accuracy, a concern for the *verdad histórica* (II, p. 134), scarcely to be found in his medieval predecessors.

The sources Pineda adduces in his mythographic exegesis are as varied as the interpretations offered. He cites the mythological authors one would expect, that is, those writers who had in one form or another treated the Hercules myth: Ovid (*Metamorphoseon*), Euripides (*Herakles*), Sophocles (*Trachiniae*), Pindar, Theocritus, Seneca (*Hercules Oetaeus*). Also prominent in his discussion are the standard Latin mythographers: Diodorus Siculus, Apollodorus, Hyginus, Palaephatus (the imitator of Euhemerus), Cornutus or Phornutus (whose *De natura deorum* treats

Hercules as the personification of reason), Fulgentius. Among the Renaissance interpreters, Pineda cites Boccaccio, Giglio Gregorio Giraldi, Natale Conti, and Vincenzo Cartari.¹⁴ However, much more interesting than the use of what we might call the mythographical canon is Pineda's citation of lesser known figures of the mythographic tradition. He several times cites Albericus, whose *Libellus de imaginibus deorum*, the longest section of which is devoted to Hercules, was one of the few medieval works of allegorical mythography to be printed during the Renaissance.¹⁵ He footnotes Budaeus, the sixteenth-century French Christianizer of pagan myth,¹⁶ and Georg Pictor, the German scholar-physician who was the first sixteenth-century imitator of Boccaccio.¹⁷

This impressive roster of sources is by no means conclusive proof of Pineda's scholarship; indeed, the entire question of Pineda's sources and his use of them is a problematic and intriguing one, revelatory of the author's entire approach to mythographic scholarship. It is possible, even probable, that he did not know at first hand all of the writers he cites. The popularity of mythology and mythography in this period led to the anthologizing of the mythographic canon in manuals designed to facilitate the consultation of authoritative interpretation. Seznec, for example, mentions one such handbook of 1549 that brought together texts by Albericus, Hyginus, Palaephatus, Fulgentius, Phornutus, Proclus, and Aratus¹⁸ — all of whom appear in the bibliography with which Pineda heads his work. At the least, Pineda's use of such mythographic source materials demonstrates an up-to-date knowledge of contemporary mythographers, his indefatigable culling of contemporaneous footnotes, a truly scholarly concern for completeness, and a wide-ranging, eclectic, and occasionally idiosyncratic curiosity.

Such a procedure scarcely meets modern standards of scientific scholarship, of course. However, it must always be remembered that considerations of source theft or plagiarism are, within the context of Renaissance erudition, irrelevant and anachronistic, the theft of citations being almost standard operating procedure among writers of the period. For that age, the "distillation" or "alambication" of earlier writers, the culling of sources, was an established and even respected practice.¹⁹

The Renaissance was to witness the emergence of a *positivistic program of classical investigation which would become modern mythological study*,²⁰ a program which in practice manifested itself as the encyclopedic codification of authorities and sources. Boccaccio, whom Don Cameron Allen calls *the first of the systematic mythographers*,²¹ produced in the *Genealogia deorum gentilium* an epitome of medieval allegoresis and medieval theory concerning the nature and significance of myth.²² In standard medieval fashion, the Italian writer provides a summary of a given myth and then appends to it an allegorical interpretation, generally oral or physical. Yet his attempt to impose order on the chaos of

mythological tales and their numberless variants through elaborate, minutely detailed genealogical trees signals a change in spirit, a more scholarly approach to the study of myth, than was generally evident in his predecessors. Giglio Gregorio Giraldi, the author of *De Herculis* (published in 1539), generally eschews allegorical readings in favor of an attempt to provide a biography of the hero, whom the author regards as a historical personage.²³ Natale Conti's *Mythologiae sive explicationis fabularum* (Venice, 1551?) provides a discussion of his purposes that adumbrates more modern, specifically antiquarian, concerns; in his first book, for example, he gives a history of pagan religion and rites. This more or less scholarly interest carries over into his exposition of the meanings of the myths, readings that conflate moral, physical, and historical interpretations.²⁴ Vincenzo Cartari in 1556 published his *Delle imagini de gli Dei de gli antichi*,²⁵ a milestone in such so-called antiquarian or methodological mythography: Cartari is primarily *an arranger and adjuster of what has been written and not an inventor of interpretation*.²⁶

Throughout the Renaissance, mythography was thus increasingly characterized by a nascent scientific and encyclopedic spirit. A more historical and scholarly interest in myth was in no wise ascendant among sixteenth-century mythographers, who were generally unable or unwilling to relinquish the centuries-consecrated habit of allegorical interpretation. Yet the swelling tide of antiquarianism was a telling prognostic.

In this moment of transition Pineda is a significant, and largely unheralded figure, one of the principal Spanish representatives of the emerging antiquarian mythography.²⁷ His presentation of the allegorizations or moralizations of Hercules' labors is not merely doctrinal instruction or hermeneutical method, as it was throughout the Middle Ages; his treatment is less a study of myth per se than a commentary on the commentators. In his hands, the antiquarian and historiographical interest in myth converts discussion of the tales into annotations on *antiguos y exquisitos autores* (I, p. 4), into a framework for the encyclopedic compendium of preceding mythological authors, mythographic interpreters, and historiographers. It thus comes close to being a mode of taxonomic organization of mythography and allegoresis themselves.

Pineda posits for the *Agricultura* aims which approach an encyclopedic ideal of didactic catholicity: *digo que es obra de gran variedad de muy curiosa y erudita lección [sic] y muy provechosa para los que bien le leyeren, sacada de muy antiguos y exquisitos autores, a los cuales se refiere para verificar su doctrina y ejemplos peregrinos* (I, p. 4). Within this *gran variedad* of content, however, no overarching or subtending principle of organization and selection is adduced; on the contrary, Pineda explicitly rejects any such schematicization as unappealing, hence (he implies) uncondusive to the inculcation of doctrine:

Y por eso se llamala [sic] la obra de *Diálogos familiares*, en que se representan algunos amigos que, como familiares y llanos y conversables entre sí, se avienen bien, sin pundonores de cumplimiento ceremonial y que llaman de pelillo, sino que como lo sienten así lo dicen, tomándolo todo a buena parte y dicho con buena intención, que son condiciones necesarias en la buena conversación; y por las leyes de los diálogos familiares no debieron ir las materias proseguidas, porque esa fuera ley de tratados doctrinales y que cansara a los lectores (I, p. 5).

The dialogue form he has chosen permits a familiar, flexible, and conversational handling of the material treated, not the consecutive approach of *tratados doctrinales*.

What, then, is the work's principle of selection to be? Something more structured, surely, than a meandering imitation of real-life conversation, something more organized that can insure the inclusion of all desired *doctrina y ejemplos peregrinos*. This principle, implicit in the loose, but logical, structure of this *curiosa y erudita lección*, is the analogical linkage of topics, natural, proper, and inherent to conversation itself.

Analogy is as well the hermeneutical paradigm for Pineda's vision of myth as significant and signifying doctrine: *toda verdad se lleva bien con toda verdad, así también se dice con razón que toda verdad viene de Dios y, habiendo hablado Homero doctrinal y verdaderamente, tuvo su lenguaje alguna semejanza con el divino* (II, pp. 126-27). The numinous analogy of myth and revealed truth permits and indeed mandates the use of the paradigm of the latter in the exegetical disclosure of the hidden significance of the former.

Like other Neoplatonists,²⁸ Pineda stresses the homology of the sciences and the arts, of all of knowledge itself; he cites Marsilio Ficino as his source for the conception of their analogical interdependence and correspondence, a relationship rooted in immanent divine influence: *y toda esta cadena o dependencia baja de Dios, cuyo influjo pasa por todos* (I, p. 72). This conception of universal analogy was central to both the methodology and the underlying philosophical impulse of emerging Renaissance encyclopedism, increasingly linked throughout the period with affiliated Neoplatonic and mythological visions of the cosmos which stressed the interrelationship of all branches of human knowledge.²⁹ Cesare Vasoli, in seeking the basis of *la profunda ocazione enciclopedia propria di molti ambienti culturali del tempo*, finds it in *la ferma credenza nell'unità organica dell'intero scibile; nella comune idea dell'armonia mundi e dell'universale comunicazione delle scienze...*³⁰ This analogical, organicist world view both enabled and gave impetus to the treatment of knowledge in the allegorical register, that is, the symbolic analogizing of pagan and Christian learning, as well as the encyclopedic mode that posited

that interdependence of the arts and sciences and thematized the synoptic treatment of it. If all of science, all of art, all knowledge, in short, is interrelated, how better to formulate and organize it than through a synoptic encyclopedic method rooted in a Neoplatonic *Weltanschauung* of universal analogy and a mythographic mode that finds truth everywhere, in pagan and Christian letters, in divine and secular authorities to be culled and compiled?

Paolo Cherchi, in a recent study of the encyclopedism of the sixteenth-century Italian writer Tommaso Garzoni, maintains that much Renaissance encyclopedism represents *lo sforzo de pervenire ad una clavis universalis, ad una cifra unica del sapere, ad una chiave che ci introduca immediatamente a quell "anima mundi" di origine neoplatonica....*³¹ An age which saw in myth a similar *clavis universalis*, a compendious integument of human wisdom, would find in the narratives an intrinsically affinitive vehicle for the synoptic disposition of its erudition.

In this moment of transition Pineda is a significant and largely unheralded figure, one of the principal Spanish representatives of the emerging antiquarian mythography and encyclopedism. His tireless pursuit and capture of classical and contemporaneous sources, his historical preoccupations, his weighing of conflicting evidence — all signal his transformation of medieval allegoresis and his place in the nascent scientific and encyclopedic mythography.³² For him, myth is both *doctrina espiritual* and *compostura*, both moral instruction and its composition, structure, and arrangement — both the persistence of medieval allegoresis and its nascent transformation as a branch of the emergent encyclopedic taxonomy of human knowledge.³³

NOTES

1 For this study I utilize Juan de Pineda, O. F. M., *Diálogos familiares de la Agricultura cristiana*, ed. P. Juan Meseguer Fernández, O. F. M. (Madrid: BAE, 1963). All quotations are taken from this edition and will be indicated within the text by volume and page number. On Pineda, see the preliminary study by Meseguer Fernández, I, pp. vii-cxxiii. The editor mentions several bibliographical and historical sources; see I, pp. 8-14. Pineda is discussed briefly by Otis H. Green, *Spain and the Western Tradition*, 4 vols. (Madison: U. Wisconsin P., 1968), *passim*. He is also mentioned by Karl-Ludwig Selig, "Three Spanish Libraries of Emblem Books and

Compendia," in *Essays in History and Literature Presented by Fellows of the Newberry Library to Stanley Pargellis*, ed. Heinz Bluhm (Chicago: The Newberry Library, 1965), p. 86. I am grateful to Professor Selig for bringing this reference to my attention.

2 Jean Seznec, *The Survival of the Pagan Gods*, tr. Barbara F. Sessions, 1953; rpt. Princeton: Princeton U.P., 1972.

3 Don Cameron Allen, *Mysteriously Meant* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins U. P., 1970).

4 José María de Cossío, *Fábulas mitológicas en España* (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1952).

5 On the emergence of antiquarian mythography, see Allen, Ch. VIII, "The Allegorical Interpretations of Renaissance Antiquarians."

6 The bibliography on the allegorical exegesis of myth is, of course, enormous. For essential background on allegoresis in general, see Henri de Lubac, *Exégèse médiévale*, 2 vols. in 4 (Paris: Aubier, 1959-64); Jean Pépin, *Myth et allégorie* (Paris: Aubier, 1958); and C. Spicq, *Esquisse d'une histoire de l'exégèse latine au Moyen Age* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1944). On the allegorical interpretation of myth, see, for example Allen; Lester K. Born, "Ovid and Allegory," in *Speculum*, 9 (1934), 362-79; Douglas Bush, *Mythology and the Renaissance Tradition in English Poetry*, rev. ed. (New York: W., W. Norton, 1963); Domenico Comparetti, *Vergil in the Middle Ages*, tr. E. F. M. Benecke, rpt. 1929 (New York: G. E. Stechert, 1929); J. D. Cooke, "Euhemerism: A Mediaeval Interpretation of Classical Paganism," in *Speculum*, 2 (1927), 396-410; F. Ghisalberti, "L'Ovidius Moralizatus di Pierre Bersuire," in *Studi Romanzi*, 23 (1933), 5-136; Anne Bates Hersman, *Studies in Greek Allegorical Interpretation* (Chicago: The Blue Sky Press, 1906); Edgar C. Knowlton, "Notes on Early Allegory," in *JEGP*, 29 (1930), 159-81; Frank E. Manuel, *The Eighteenth Century Confronts the Gods* (Cambridge: Harvard U. P., 1959); DeWitt T. Starnes and E. W. Talbert, *Classical Myth and Legend in Renaissance Dictionaries* (Chapel Hill: U. of North Carolina P., 1955); J. Tate, "On the History of Allegorism," in *Classical Quarterly*, 28 (1934), 105-14, and "Plato and Allegorical Interpretation," in *Classical Quarterly*, 23 (1929), 142-54, and 24 (1930), 1-10. Specific material on the fate of the pagan pantheon in the allegorical interpretations of the Middle Ages and Renaissance can be found in Allen; Bush; O. H. Green, "Fingen los poetas": Notes on the Spanish Attitude Toward Pagan Mythology, in *Estudios dedicados a Menéndez Pidal*, I (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1950), 275-88, and *Spain and the Western Tradition*, III, 190-202, 414-18, 423-25; Hans Liebschutz, *Fulgentius Metaforalis: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der antiken Mythologie im Mittelalter* (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1926); and Edgar Wind, *Pagan Mysteries in the Renaissance* (New Haven: Yale U. P., 1958), especially Ch. II, "Poetic Theology."

7 The Latin text of *The Mythologies* is available in R. Helm, *Fabii Planciadis Fulgentii opera* (Leipzig: Bibliotheca Teubneriana, 1898), 3-80. For this study I utilize the translation by Leslie George Whitbread in *Fulgentius the Mythographer* (Columbus: Ohio State U. P., 1971), pp. 39-102. Whitbread provides extensive bibliographies on Fulgentius and his works, and on the entire mythographic tradition in general.

8 Whitbread, p. 109.

9 The fable of Hercules and Antaeus, for example, is explained in the following terms: *Antaeus is explained as a form of lust, whence in Greek we say antion, contrary; he was born of the earth because lust is conceived of the flesh. Also he emerged the more agile by keeping touch with earth, for lust rises the more evilly as it shares the flesh. Also he is overcome by Hercules as by the strength of renown, for he perishes when contact with earth is denied him and when raised higher he could not draw upon his mother's aid; whereby he showed the obvious legendary character of his doings. For when virtue bears aloft the whole mind and denies it the sight of the flesh, it at once emerges victorious. Thus too he is said to have sweated hard and long in his wrestling, because it is a hard struggle when the dispute is with lust and vices....* (p. 69).

10 On the fate of the allegorical interpretation of myth during the eighteenth century, see Manuel, and Arnaldo Momigliano, *Studies in Historiography* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1966). A valuable anthology of selections and basic bibliography are provided by Burton Feldman and Robert D. Richardson, *The Rise of Modern Mythology, 1680-1860* (Bloomington: Indiana U. P., 1972).

11 On the so-called shell-kernel topos in medieval literature, see Edouard Jeauneau, "L'Usage de la notion de integumentum à travers les gloses de Guillaume de Conches," in *Archives d'hist. doct. et litt. du m. a.*, 32 (1957), 35-100; M. D. Chenu, "Involucrum: Le mythe selon les théologiens médiévaux," *ibid.*, 20 (1956), 74-79; D. W. Robertson, *A Preface to Chaucer* (Princeton: Princeton U. P., 1962), pp. 302-303, 315-17, 344-46, and "Some Medieval Literary Terminology," in *SP*, 48 (1951), 669-92.

12 Cf., I, p. 72: *Máximo Tiro debuja [sic] de sus colores naturales a la poesía, diciendo que no es sino una filosofía en tiempo antigua, y en consonancia metrificada y en argumento fabulada y en estilo escurecida, por que, según lo ya dicho, el vulgo no menospreciase la verdadera doctrina hallándola en descubierto y con facilidad.* Also I, p. 73: *Para concluir con esta doctrina poética digo, con Macrobio, que cuando los poetas hablan de sus muchos dioses sacan sus fundamentos de los manantiales de la filosofía....*

13 On the Hercules myth, see G. Karl Galinsky, *The Herakles Theme* (Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Littlefield, 1972); Marc-René Jung, *Hercule dans la littérature du XVI^e siècle* (Genève: Droz, 1966); Marcel Simon, *Hercule et le Christianisme* (Paris: Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg, 1955); and Eugene M. Waith, *The Herculean Hero in Marlowe, Chapman, Shakespeare, and Dryden* (New York: Columbia U. P., 1962), especially Ch. 2, "Heroic Man." Jung and Waith provide extensive bibliographies. On the moral interpretation of the Herculean labors, see E. Weber, *De Dione Chrysostomo Cynicorum sectatore*, in *Leipziger Studien*, 10 (1887), 79-268.

14 It is interesting that Pineda does not mention Coluccio Salutati, whose *De laboribus Herculis*, written in the early fifteenth century as a commentary on Seneca, expounds literal, natural, and moral readings of the labors. However, the omission may not be significant, since it appears that Salutati's text enjoyed only limited diffusion; see Jung, pp. 7-9.

15 In *Auctores mythographi Latini*, ed. A. van Staveren (Leyden, 1742), pp. 931-37. On Albericus, see Allen, pp. 213-14, and E. H. Wilkings, "Descriptions of Pagan Divinities from Petrarch to Chaucer," in *Speculum*, 32 (1957), 511-22.

- 16 On Budaëus, see Simon, pp. 115 ff.
- 17 On Pictor, see Allen, pp. 219-21.
- 18 Seznec, pp. 226-27.
- 19 On this practice, see Robert J. Clements, *Picta Poesis* (Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1960), pp. 70 and 184.
- 20 Allen, p. 247.
- 21 *Ibid.*, p. 214
- 22 Giovanni Boccaccio, *Genealogiae deorum gentilium libri*, ed. Vincenzo Romano (Bari: G. Laterza, 1951). On Boccaccio's treatment of mythology, see Allen, pp. 215-20; C. C. Coulter, "The Genealogy of the Gods," in *Vassar Mediaeval Studies*, ed. C. F. Fiske (New Haven: Yale U. P., 1923), pp. 317-41; E. Gilson, "Poésie et vérité dans la *Genealogia* de Boccace," in *Studi sul Boccaccio*, ed. Vittore Branca, 2 (Firenze: Sansoni, 1963), 253-82; Henri Hauvette, *Boccace* (Paris: A. Colin, 1914); Attilio Hortis, *Studi sulle opere latine de Boccaccio* (Trieste: J. Dasc, 1879); Alex Preminger, O. B. Hardison, Jr., and K. Kervante, eds., *Classical and Medieval Literary Criticism* (New York: F. Ungar, 1974); Seznec, pp. 220-24.
- 23 Lilio Gregorio Giraldi, *De deis gentium* (New York: Garland, 1976). On Giraldi, see Allen, pp. 221-24, and Seznec, *passim*.
- 24 Natalis Comes, *Mythologie*, in two vols., tr. Jean Baudouin (New York: Garland, 1976). On Conti, see Allen, pp. 225-28, and Seznec, *passim*.
- 25 Vincenzo Cartari, *Le imagini...* (New York: Garland, 1976). On Cartari, see Allen, pp. 228-33, and Seznec, *passim*.
- 26 Allen, p. 232.
- 27 It is significant in this regard that Pineda cites the antiquarian P. Apianus, author of the *Inscriptionis Sacrosanctas Vetustatis* (Ingolstadt, 1534). However, since Apian was used extensively by Cartari in the *Imagini*, the references may be second-hand. On Apian, see Allen, pp. 228-29.
- 28 The precise nature of Pineda's Neoplatonism is a question that still awaits study, like nearly everything related to this author. What can be said with complete certainty at this point is that Pineda cites Neoplatonic writers constantly throughout the *Agricultura* and that they appear prominently in the bibliography at the beginning of the text, I, pp. 8-14. Included are the standard ancient and contemporary authors: "Alcinoo, platónico," "Chalcidio, filósofo," "Macrobio," "Marsilio Ficino, platónico," "Pico Mirandulano," "Plotino, platónico," "Proclo, platónico." More intriguing is the citation of lesser known figures of the tradition. Pineda lists Cardinal Bessarion ("Besario, cardenal"), the philosopher and scholar schooled in the Byzantine Platonism of Gemistus Pletho, who was also influential for Ficino's thought. He mentions as well "Simphoriano Campegio," the Symphorien Champier of Lyons who was a leading figure in French Neoplatonism of the day and an admirer of Ficino. It is, of course, quite possible that Pineda's Neoplatonism was of the same order as his mythographic scholarship, that is, derived from the judicious "alembication" of a handful of significant source texts. Nevertheless, his decision to model the *Agricultura's* dialogue form on the *Asclepius*, as well as his tendency to cite Neoplatonic precedent at key moments of his discussion, argues for a more than marginal interest in and knowledge and utilization of Neoplatonic doctrine.
- 29 On Renaissance encyclopedism in general and its relationship to Neoplatonism in particular, see Paolo Cherchi, *Enciclopedismo e politica della riscrittura: Tommaso*

Garzoni (Pisa: Pacini, 1980); Ulrich Dierse, *Enzyklopädie* (Bonn: Bouvier Verlag Herbert Grundman, 1977), pp. 9-15; François Secret, "La tradition du 'De omnibus scibili' à la Renaissance: l'oeuvre de Paul Scaliger," in *Convivium*, 23 (1955), 492-97; Peter Sharatt, ed., *French Renaissance Studies, 1540-70: Humanism and the Encyclopedia* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh U. P., 1976), especially the essay by A. H. T. Levi "Ethica and the Encyclopedia in the Sixteenth Century," pp. 170-84; Cesare Vasoli, *L'Enciclopedia del Seicento* (Napoli: Istituto Italiano per gli Studi Filosofici, 1978). On Renaissance notions of the unity of all knowledge and universal analogy, see especially Joseph A. Mazzeo, "Metaphysical Poetry and the Poetic of Correspondence," in *JHI*, 14 (1953), 221-34, *Renaissance and Seventeenth-Century Studies* (New York: Columbia U. P., 1964), and "Universal Analogy and the Culture of the Renaissance," in *JHI*, 15 (1954), 229-304.

30 Vasoli, pp. 7 and 13

31 Cherchi, p. 34.

32 These tendencies are characteristic of the contemporaneous, and far better known *Philosophia secreta* (1585) of Juan Pérez de Moya. The complete title of this work reveals the compiler's moralizing ends: *debajo de historias fabulosas se contiene mucha doctrina provechosa a todos estudios...* Most of the tales are followed by a *Declaración* which sets out the allegorical sense of the myth. Yet the incessant citation of mythographers and historians reveals what José María de Cossío has called *una vocación que hoy limitadamente, pero en el siglo XVI con plenos títulos, podía pasar por científica* (p. 66). Baltasar de Vitoria's *Teatro de los dioses de la gentilidad* (1620) continues and strengthens these tendencies. Vitoria devotes even less attention than Pérez de Moya to the moral and allegorical significance of the myths, even more than his predecessor to the citation and summary of classical poets and mythographers.

33 A version of this paper was read at the MLA convention, Washington, D. C. (December, 1984).

CREACION