statuS Quaestionis
language text culture

Bryan Brazeau
The University of Warwick

"Take me Down to the Paradise City": An Ecocritical Approach to Paradise Spaces in Italian Renaissance Epic

Abstract

In 1966, A. Bartlett Giammatti noted that most earthly paradises in Renaissance Epic are dangerous imitations of the healing space of Eden as represented in Dante's *Divine Comedy*, and are usually found wanting by some higher standard. This article revisits paradise spaces in the Renaissance epics of Ariosto and Tasso from a perspective informed by human geography and ecocriticism. How are these spaces informed by the broader "epic" geographies of the works that contain them? What can their deceptive designs and perceptible affordances (whether true or false) tell us about their authors' and the genre's underlying ecological values? The article demonstrates how such liminal heterotopic spaces are not only temporally or spatially inaccessible, but indeed also demonstrate an early modern version of the "Tragedy of the Commons" while excluding characters unable to escape their own selfhood.

1. *Introduction*

As Alessandro Scafi (2014, 100-5) has illustrated, the location of paradise has continually shifted from east to west in the western geographical imaginary; from the notion of a walled island to an inaccessible mountaintop; and – during the Reformation and the ascendancy of Ptolemaic co-ordinate based mapping – from a distant yet accessible site to a lost locale distant in time. Earthly paradises are also crucial sites in Renaissance epic. Prior to Scafi's work, the most significant treatment of paradise spaces in the western imaginary was A. Bartlett Giamatti's *The Earthly Paradise and the Renaissance Epic* (1966, [repr.] 1989). Though reflecting an earlier critical moment, its central thesis merits a re-evaluation in light of recent ecocritical approaches to early modern

literature. As Ken Hiltner (2011, 4) has more recently argued, although such sites do not explicitly discuss the environment or feature extensive descriptions of nature, we should not for this reason simply dismiss their concern for literal landscapes. This essay revisits paradisial spaces in Ludovico Ariosto's *Orlando furioso* and Torquato Tasso's *Gerusalemme liberata* to explore the latent ecological values inherent in their depictions of the physical world. The essay will consider how such paradisial spaces illustrate a tension between built and natural environments; how such spaces stand in opposition to the poems' dynastic and imperialist narratives by serving as heterotopias of deviation and crisis; and ultimately, how the physical and psychological appropriation of such spaces demonstrates an early modern version of the economic problem known as the "Tragedy of the Commons." Such paradisial spaces reveal themselves not only to be temporally or spatially inaccessible, but also subjectively inaccessible to characters unable to escape their own selfhood.

2. *Ecocriticism and Early Modern Literature*

While "green" readings of literary texts date back at least to the 1980s, it is only in the past few decades that ecocriticism has gained significant momentum as a theoretical approach in literary studies.[1] Much of the work on early modern literature has focused on canonical authors in the English tradition such as William Shakespeare, Edmund Spenser, and John Milton, omitting the rich Italian literary traditions from which many of these authors drew.[2] Yet, in Italian Studies, ecocriticism has been a rather late arrival and has primarily focused on nineteenth- and twentieth-century cultural production, frequently ignoring early modern literature. Illustrative examples of the modern bias of Italian ecocriticism can easily be found in a range of important edited collections on

1 Notable examples are Berger Jr.'s title essay in *Second World and Green World* (1988) and Buell 1996.

2 General ecocritical studies on early modern English literature include Watson 2006; Borlik 2010; Hiltner 2011; and Knight 2014. For a significant review of works published prior to 2007, see Raber 2007, 151-71. On individual authors, see Hiltner 2006; and McColley 2007. Shakespeare has been, by far, the preferred author of ecocritical readings with a bibliography that is too vast to mention here. Recent works include Estok 2011; Brucker and Brayton 2011; and Brayton 2012.

the subject, such as in Benvegnù and Gilebbi (2022); Iovino, Cesaretti, and Past (2018); Iovino (2016); Verdicchio (2016); Armerio and Hall (2010); and Barron and Re (2003) – to mention a few.

Attention to the ecological has not, however, been lacking in non-literary fields. Although Appuhn's excellent monograph, *A Forest on the Sea: Environmental Expertise in Renaissance Venice* (2009), examines the relationship between early modern Venice's need for timber, forestry management, and policies of resource conservation, it does not discuss literary texts, adopting instead an approach akin to what D'Arcy Wood (2008, 3) has described as: "eco-historicism: the study of climate and environment as objects of knowledge and desire, analyzed through 'thick' description of specific episodes of ecological micro-contact."[3] Similarly, attention to the ecological has recently extended to early modern Italian thought, such as the work of Lollini (2022), who explores eco-theology in the work of Giordano Bruno.

Ecocriticism, on the other hand, may be defined as "literary criticism informed by ecological awareness" that studies "the relationship between literature and the physical environment."[4] This relationship may take many forms. For example, ecocritics may study the impact of local environmental issues on an author's literary production, or consider how a text fosters ecological awareness in its audience. Of course, such interactions are not, however, exclusive to the modern world; indeed, by turning serious interpretive and critical attention to how early modern literary texts articulate their relationship with the natural world and with physical space, new readings of such works and their relationship to the natural world become possible. As such, this essay proposes to extend the excellent work of ecocriticism in nineteenth- and twentieth-century Italian Studies to the early modern period, using an ecocritical lens to consider how both Ariosto and Tasso use paradise spaces to depict human appropriation of the physical environment.

One of the most familiar intersections between literature and the physical environment is the creation narrative of Eden in *Genesis*. While mankind is created in a paradisial space and given dominion over the natural world, Adam and Eve's disobedience leads to their expulsion from Paradise in 1:3 and humanity's

3 Appuhn 2009; D'Arcy Wood 2008, 3.

4 Here, I have combined two introductory definitions of the field from Marshall and Glotfelty 1994.

failed attempt to restore this originary unity with the tower of Babel in 1:11. For poets and readers in Renaissance Europe, the story of this earthly paradise and its loss was well known, as was the projection and hope of a recovered Eden in the new world.[5] Yet, Renaissance epics are populated far more frequently by false and illusory paradises than by truly edenic spaces. For Giamatti (1989), Dante's depiction of Eden in *Purgatorio* XXVII-XXXIII represents a way-station illustrating the transfer from the worldly poetic guidance of Virgil to the spiritual and theological guidance of Beatrice (Ibid.: 102). Yet, as he notes, there is a marked shift in the depiction of such spaces in Renaissance epics. After Dante, green paradisial spaces often become deceptive gardens where instead of Matelda, the *genius loci* of Dante's Eden, they feature a deceptive resident sorceress. While such Renaissance paradises portend an escape from martial or dynastic duty along with the healing offered by *Purgatorio*'s vision of Eden, they are ultimately "found wanting by some higher standard [Dante's Eden]" (Ibid.: 118-9). These spaces are also often dangerous prisons, from which wayward knights must be rescued. Indeed, much like the garden retreats of Ariosto's and Tasso's patrons, they represent a built environment that masquerades as an idyllic vision of the natural world.

3.1 *Paradise as Heterotopia*

The *delizie Estensi* were a series of hunting palaces and country estates frequented by Ferrarese nobles in the periods when Ariosto and Tasso were writing their epics. Among the most famous of these was the *delizia* on Belvedere island in the Po river, which featured a beautiful palace and sumptuous gardens where Tasso staged his pastoral play, *Aminta*, in 1573. The Belvedere has long been recognized as possible inspiration for both Alcina's and Armida's gardens of earthly delights.[6] Less emphasis, however, has been placed on the nature of these gardens as a built environment. Agostino Steuco da Gubbio, a sixteenth-century Augustinian monk, biblical commentator, and polymath

5 For Giamatti (1989, 3-7), the term "paradise" may denote a conception of the afterlife, a prelapsarian golden age, a projected utopian future when such an age returns, a protected garden space, or a combination of these.

6 See, for example, Venturi 1979; Visentini 2005; Marchesi 2011; Yoch 1982; Galli Stampino 2005, 1-51.

creates an explicit parallel between the Belvedere gardens and the garden of Eden in his 1535 commentary on *Genesis, Cosmopoeia* (1535). He writes that both spaces are filled with flowering trees and all species of animals, and that the Paradise of God in Eden was just like this princely paradise today (Ibid.: 135). Yet, Steuco also recognizes a key difference: while the Belvedere gardens were built by the will of the prince, Eden was created by the will of God. Yet, the Belvedere gardens today allow one to understand how Eden may have been before the fall. In other words, such built environments come to serve as a stand-in for a lost state of mankind's union of nature.

Steuco's analogy also highlights a tension that would come to characterize both Alcina's and Armida's gardens. Much like the *delizia di Belvedere*, these paradisial spaces present false ecologies: built environments that are imitations of the natural world created by resident sorceresses. Before arriving at Alcina's palace, Ruggiero is warned by Astolfo that many of the trees, rivers, and wild animals he will encounter are transformations of the witch's former paramours (Ariosto 1974, [repr.] 1982, 6.51). In Tasso's case, the depiction of Armida's island is riddled with mimetic anxiety; early in the canto, the narrator underlines how this space is an artificial human creation that closely mimics nature, but where "the art that makes it never seems like art" ["l'arte che tutto fa, nulla si scopre"] (Tasso 2009/1971, [repr.] 1993, 16.9.viii).[7] Ecocritical reflections on these episodes become difficult as the "natural world" we encounter is a simulacrum built by Alcina's or Armida's magic, and thus inseparable from the broader metaphorical and allegorical significance of these episodes. One might, however, consider branching out beyond the earthly paradises discussed by Giamatti to consider other protected green spaces in Ariosto's and Tasso's poems that share paradisial features but are characterized by a natural as opposed to a built environment.

Michel Foucault's idea of "heterotopia" is relevant here insofar as it brings together the physical features of paradise spaces with their social function. As we will see, it is also a useful concept when thinking about Renaissance earthly paradises as it brings together the false paradises of Armida and Alcina with the

7 English text from Tasso 2009; Italian text from Tasso 1971, [repr.] 1993. As several scholars have noted, Tasso's depiction of art that imitates nature so well reflects the poet's own anxieties concerning the mimetic nature of poetry and the role of beauty in human art. See Gough 2001, 530-1; Fuchs 2004, 30; and Migiel 1987, 161-2.

protected natural spaces we will later discuss. In a 1967 text published in 1984 prior to the author's death, and later translated into English in 1986, Foucault suggests the heterotopia as distinct from the more familiar concept of utopia, which he defines as: "sites with no real place [...] that have a general relation of direct or inverted analogy with the real space of Society." Heterotopias, on the other hand, are (Foucault 1986, 24):

> places that do exist and that are formed in the very founding of society – which are something like counter-sites, a kind of effectively enacted utopia in which [...] all the other real sites that can be found within the culture, are simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted. Places of this kind are outside of all places, even though it may be possible to indicate their location in reality.

Foucault provides a wide range of examples, classifying heterotopias into two main categories: crisis heterotopias – privileged, sacred, or forbidden spaces reserved for those who are traversing a state of crisis with relation to the social environment in which they live (examples include the boarding school or a honeymoon trip) – and heterotopias of deviation – spaces that house those whose behavior deviates from social norms (examples include prisons and psychiatric clinics). In both cases, heterotopias have the power to unite and juxtapose several incompatible spatial elements in a single space. Foucault gives the example of the ancient Persian Paradise garden: "a sacred space" that brought together vegetation from various parts of the world into a single microcosm (Ibid.: 25). Another principle of heterotopias is that they always presuppose a "system of opening and closing that both isolates them and makes them penetrable." These spaces either include compulsory entry, as in the case of a prison, or require submission to a set of purification rituals (Ibid.: 26).

Foucault's notion of heterotopia helps consolidate what is often perceived as an opposition in the earthly paradises we encounter in Renaissance epics. While a critic such as Giamatti emphasized the deceptive nature of these gardens as false paradises that secretly threaten ruin and oblivion for their lascivious inmates, the idea of heterotopia allows us to see that gardens and prisons share a number of physical features and stand in analogous relationships to society. Similarly, Alcina's and Armida's islands function as both paradisial gardens and prisons that prevent their heroes from escaping and stand in antagonistic relation to the martial plots of Ariosto's and Tasso's poems. The lens of heterotopia also refracts the social function that such spaces serve. Al-

cina's and Armida's "heterotopias of deviation" create highly gendered spaces designed for young male paladins drawn to sites where – to reference the Guns N' Roses song mentioned in the title of this essay – "the grass is green and the girls are pretty." As we have seen, though, such spaces do not readily lend themselves to ecocritical readings as they are primarily a built environment: an artificial construction of their resident sorceress. Yet, the *Furioso* and the *Liberata* also feature other examples of paradisial green spaces that are based in a natural environment. While the artificial paradises discussed above function as heterotopias of deviation, the natural paradises that this essay will discuss function instead as heterotopias of crisis.

Much like the earthly paradises of Alcina and Armida, Angelica and Medoro's pastoral interlude in Canto 19 of the *Furioso* and Erminia's time among the shepherds in Cantos 6 and 7 of the *Liberata* also offer physical, psychological, and generic refuge from the epic narrative. These episodes represent important counterpoints to the deceptive earthly paradises of Alcina and Armida; while the latter are illusory spaces, the *loci amoeni* frequented by Erminia and Angelica are real landscapes that also appear to be haunted by Dante's depiction of Eden, ultimately revealing themselves to be deceptive paradises of a very different nature. Moreover, both of these sites feature characters who are either passing through a crisis with relation to the society in which they live – such as the union of Angelica, princess of Cathay, with Medoro, a humble shepherd boy – or a crisis with relation to their role in the poem's broader narrative – such as Erminia, a pagan enamored of a Christian knight, Tancredi, who was once her captor.

3.2 *The "Tragedy of the Commons" in Ariosto's* Orlando furioso

In Canto 19 of the *Furioso*, Angelica, fleeing from the desires of prurient paladins discovers the wounded body of Medoro. The two are given shelter by an elderly shepherd couple, and while Angelica tends to his wounds, the two fall in love, holding a rustic wedding ceremony before consummating their relationship. In the words of Jane Tylus, this episode provides Angelica with a "more integral identity as she becomes an actively desiring protagonist, rather than solely an object of desire" (Tylus 1993b, 101). Such thematics of healing and the restitution of an integral subjective identity in a *locus amoenus* suggest

a site similar to Dante's Eden in *Purgatorio* XVIII-XXXIII.[8] Further evidence of this association appears when we examine descriptions of the landscape. The forest into which Medoro and Cloridano take refuge at the end of Canto 18, and where Angelica will later find Medoro's body is described as "an ancient wood [...] thickly planted with shady trees and shrubs; it formed a labyrinth of narrow paths" ["una selva antica, / d'ombrose piante spessa e di virgulti, / che, come labirinto, entro s'intrica / di stretti calli" (Ariosto 1974, 18.192)].

This ancient forest is reminiscent of the labyrinthine "selva antica," into which Dante wanders and loses his way in *Purgatorio* XXVIII before finding Eden, suggesting a modeling of the Angelica-Medoro episode on Dante's vision of the earthly paradise. Ariosto emphasizes the wilderness of this space; it seems to only be inhabited by wild beasts, and indeed, even when Angelica meets the shepherd and his family, the narrator notes that he had built his humble cottage here quite recently (Ibid.: 19.27). The wilderness of this landscape is contrasted with Angelica and Medoro's interactions with the natural world. As they spend their days exploring green meadows, riverbanks, and even a cave – which, Ariosto notes, was not dissimilar from the cave that harbored Aeneas and Dido – the lovers carve their names into any shady tree or yielding stones they encounter (Ibid.: 19.36):

8 English text from Dante 2003, Italian text from Dante 1972. The motif of healing is present throughout the pilgrim's time in Eden where, as Matelda claims in *Purg*. XVIII.142-4, "the root of humankind was innocent, / [where] it is always spring, with every fruit in season. / This is the nectar of which the ancients tell" ["Qui fu innocente l'umana radice; / qui primavera sempre e ogne frutto; / nettare è questo di che ciascun dice"]. The pilgrim is reunited with Beatrice in Canto XXX who will chastise him for loving her mortal self, prompting the pilgrim's contrition, confession, and remission of sin in an example that emulates the sacrament of penance. Dante is immersed in the river Lethe in *Purg*. XXXI.91-9, removing all memory of sin, and later [*Purg*. XXXIII.27-9] in the river Eünoe to restore the memory of his good works and the promise of salvation, preparing him for his journey through Paradiso. As Giamatti (1989, 109) notes, this process emulates the pilgrim's progress throughout the Commedia: "In his progress upward through the poem, the pilgrim has been moving backward, in a sense, toward that state of radical purity and innocence which Adam and Eve possessed before the Fall." The garden encapsulates what Giamatti (Ibid.: 112) views as the doctrine of *Purgatorio*: "a place where you recognize and profit by past errors; where under the eyes of God but completely through your own will, you develop the potentialities to become a total human being."

Amid so many pleasures, whenever she saw a tree which afforded shade to a spring or limpid stream, she would hasten to carve it with a knife or pin; she did the same to any rock unless it was too hard. A thousand times out of doors, and another thousand indoors, all over the walls, Angelica's and Medoro's names were inscribed, bound together in various ways with different knots.

[Fra piacer tanti, ovunque un arbor dritto
vedesse ombrare o fonte o rivo puro,
v'avea spillo o coltel subito fitto;
così, se v'era alcun sasso men duro:
et era fuori in mille luoghi scritto,
e così in casa in altritanti il muro,
Angelica e Medoro, in varii modi
legati insieme di diversi nodi.]

Again, in this stanza, Ariosto underlines the untouched nature of this space, noting the refreshment provided by the shade of tall trees and pure streams. This depiction of natural beauty is juxtaposed with acts of inscription that transform this previously wild space into a memorial park commemorating the couple's love. The natural world in this episode initially appears as a space set apart from human action and warfare, but is rapidly appropriated by Angelica and Medoro's writing as a bespoke personal paradise.

While such writing on trees and appropriation of natural space are not unique to the *Furioso*, Ariosto's transformation of the topos breaks from the tradition and illustrates the environmental problem posed by humankind's appropriation of the natural world. The motif of writing on trees has a long history in pastoral literature; lovelorn shepherds would carve the names of their absent beloveds into the bark of a tree to console themselves or commemorate a past love.[9] As Lee (1977, 12) has noted, Ariosto's most immediate models for this topos were a madrigal in the second book of Matteo Maria Boiardo's *Amorum Libri* (1499) – where the poet wishes that a tree on which he carved sad verses would grow to efface his words – and the fifth chapter of Jacopo

9 This rich tradition, as Lee (1977, 9-12) notes, goes back to Theocritus's eighteenth *Idyll*, being imitated in Virgil's tenth Eclogue, the fifth letter of Ovid's *Heroides*, and in Propertius's *Elegies* prior to its appearance in many late-fifteenth and sixteenth-century Italian texts and its later European manifestations. The motif was so ubiquitous in pastoral literature that it was mocked by Shakespeare in Act 2, Scene 1 of *As You Like It*.

Sannazaro's *Arcadia* (1504) – in which the elderly shepherd Opico leads the group to a pleasant site where he carved the name of his beloved in his younger days; now, he tells the shepherds he expects that the letters will have grown along with the tree, and prays to the gods that they conserve them for his beloved's glory.[10] In both of these examples, the motif of writing on trees serves to reflect on the passage of time; the trees are presented as living objects that interact with the inscriptions carved upon them, either by effacing these or magnifying them with their growth. Both Boiardo's and Sannazaro's uses of the motif demonstrate a sensitivity to the interplay between art and nature; the growth of the trees contrasts the steady rhythm of the natural world with the turbulent emotions of the human heart, providing a sense of temporal perspective from which to reflect on one's past. Ariosto's depiction of Angelica and Medoro carving their names into trees together, notes Lee (1977, 30), was a break from this tradition insofar as it shifted the act of carving on trees away from an "expression of sorrow, loneliness or nostalgia" to one that testified of "intense, unalloyed, present happiness."

Yet, such happiness also has negative ecological implications where this episode breaks with traditional usage of the motif. While in Boiardo's and Sannazaro's texts such inscriptions on trees are contrasted with a natural cycle of arboreal growth that magnifies, distorts, or effaces human writing, in Ariosto these very inscriptions transform a pastoral refuge of healing into a deceptive earthly paradise for Orlando. In Canto 23, the paladin arrives at a *locus amoenus* replete with a crystalline stream, a blooming meadow, and shady trees (100.iv-viii). When he stops to rest from the noonday heat, however, Orlando discovers to his horror that this space is inscribed with a truth he cannot sanely bear. These words are inscribed on the trees and in the cave where Medoro and Angelica would rest from the noonday heat (Ibid.: 23.108-9). What was previously a space of healing for Medoro, and provided restoration of agency for Angelica, has become – in the words of Tylus (1988, 167-8) – a "pastoral 'paradis fermé'" for Orlando, prompting his descent into madness.

Angelica and Medoro's appropriation of this grotto as their own is evident in the verses Medoro carves in Arabic on the grotto's entrance (Ariosto 1974, 23.108-9):

10 See Boiardo 1962, 76; Sannazaro 1990, 5.4.

Happy plants, verdant grass, limpid waters, dark, shadowy cave, pleasant and cool, where fair Angelica, born of Galafron and loved in vain by many often lay naked in my arms. I, poor Medor, cannot repay you for your indulgence otherwise than by ever praising you, and by entreating every lover, knight, or maiden, every person, native or alien, who happens upon this spot by accident or by design, to say to the grass, the shadows, the cave, stream and plants: 'May sun and moon be kind to you, and the chorus of the nymphs, and may they see that shepherds never lead their flocks to you.'

[Liete piante, verdi erbe, limpide acque,
spelunca opaca e di fredde ombre grata,
dove la bella Angelica che nacque
di Galafron, da molti invano amata,
spesso ne le mie braccia nuda giacque;
de la commodità che qui m'è data,
io povero Medor ricompensarvi
d'altro non posso, che d'ognior lodarvi:

e di pregare ogni signore amante,
e cavallieri e damigelle, e ognuna
persona, o paesana o vïandante,
che qui sua volontà meni o Fortuna;
ch'all'erbe, all'ombre, all'antro, al rio, alle piante
dica: benigno abbiate e sole e luna,
e de le ninfe il coro, che proveggia
che non conduca a voi pastor mai greggia.]

Orlando, who understands Arabic as well as he does Latin, reads and re-reads these words, searching in vain for some other interpretation as the short poem triggers his unbearable sorrow and subsequent descent into a destructive and violent madness. The generic implications of Orlando's madness as that of a classical epic hero out of place in a modern romance have been noted by various scholars.[11] Tylus's perceptive reading (1988, 156) notes how Orlando attempts to destroy both the site of Medoro's and Angelica's love, along with a text that someone else had written, demonstrating the paladin's "desire to appropriate what is not his own." While this is certainly the case with relation to Orlando's desire to possess Angelica, and his attempt to violently appropriate the multi-

11 See, for example, Carne-Ross 1966, 232; Tylus 1988, 168; Ceserani 1996, 129-30; and Zatti 1990.

plicity of other generic forms, few have noted how Medoro and Angelica effect their own act of spatial appropriation with their inscriptions, transforming the ecology of the *locus amoenus*. Medoro's poem at the entrance to the grotto implores passing travelers to respect the sanctity of the space, and to wish for its preservation from shepherds and their flocks. What was once a pastoral paradise, offering respite for travelers and common grazing land for sheep, has now become a personalized space, a built environment set apart from the traditional world of the shepherds who hosted the couple. Unlike other instances of the writing-on-trees motif, which emphasize the rhythm of the natural world as separate and autonomous from human writing, here, Medoro de-natures the space through his use of lyrics that bear a striking resemblance to Petrarch's lyric fragment 126, "Clear, fresh, and sweet waters" ["Chiare, fresche, et dolci acque."][12] These echoes are typical of Ariosto's wit, as Petrarch writes of unrequited love and impossible longing, while Medoro's poem describes the consummation of his love with Angelica.

Irony aside, if Orlando's use of epic violence is an attempt to appropriate the multiplicity of romance, Medoro's use of Petrarchan lyric serves as a means to appropriate the natural world, transforming it into a static vehicle for memorializing his amorous triumph. From this perspective, one can see in the environmental costs of Orlando's destruction a resistance to Medoro's narcissistic wish for natural preservation, and a direct response to the Petrarchan source upon which he draws. It is for this reason that Orlando first returns to the grotto and begins by destroying the stone that bears Medoro's verses, before uprooting trees and polluting the clear waters of the stream in lines that further highlight the Petrarchan undertones of this episode through their repeated emphasis of the adjective 'chiara' (Ariosto 1974, 23.130-1.i-iv):

> On impulse he drew his sword, and slashed at the words and the rock-face, sending tiny splinters shooting skywards. Alas for the cave, and for every trunk on which the names of Medor and Anglica were written! They were left, that day, in such a state that never more

---

12 Both poems include apostrophes to the natural elements that make up the *locus amoenus*. They also recall the presence of the beloved in the space and look forward to a future moment – in Petrarch's case, when Laura will weep at his tomb and in Medoro's case, when future travellers will stop to praise this space. Harrison (2009, 98-9) has also noted such similarities, reading Orlando's destruction of the space as indicative of Ariosto's anti-Petrarchism.

would they afford cool shade to shepherd or flock. The spring, too, which had been so clear and pure, was scarcely safer from wrath such as his; branches, stumps and boughs, stones and clods he kept hurling into the lovely waters until he so clouded them from surface to bottom that they were clear and pure never again.

[Tagliò lo scritto e 'l sasso, e sin al cielo
a volo alzar fe' le minute schegge.
Infelice quell'antro, et ogni stelo
in cui Medoro e Angelica si legge!
Così restâr quel dì, ch'ombra né gielo
a pastor mai non daran più, né a gregge:
e quella fonte, già sì chiara e pura,
da cotanta ira fu poco sicura;

che rami e ceppi e tronchi e sassi e zolle
non cessò di gittar ne le bell'onde,
fin che da sommo ad imo sì turbolle,
che non furo mai più chiare né monde.]

Ariosto's narrator is sensitive to such environmental devastation, commenting that Orlando's actions will destroy all coolness and shade for both the shepherds and their flocks. Elizabeth Chesney Zegura (2012, 752) has remarked upon the ecological implications of Orlando's madness in this scene. She notes that the wrath of the peasants who attack Orlando with a "peasant war" ["villanesco assalto"] at 24.8 is motivated by the ecological destruction he wreaks on their land; Orlando pollutes their stream with branches, trees, stumps, and earth until they "were clear and pure never again" ["non furo mai più chiare né monde"] (Ariosto 1974, 23.131). Orlando kills their livestock and uproots "age-old timber" ["piante antiche"] including oak trees that provide acorns and sustenance (Ibid.: 23.135, 24.4-14). His actions, Zegura observes (2012, 752), form part of a broader of an "allegory of seigneurial oppression" in this episode, which Ariosto uses to provide his readers with "a glimpse of the agricultural devastation visited on Italy by repeated invasions, marauding mercenaries and foreign troops" during the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. Though such sociological implications and the memory of recent warfare could not have been far from the minds of Ariosto and his readers, within the plot of the poem itself the destruction wrought in this episode is neither the direct consequence of warfare nor of a lordly arrogation of peasant labor. Rather, the deva-

station visited upon this space is a direct result of Medoro's misguided attempt at natural preservation that excludes not only the shepherds and their flocks, but Orlando as well from the pleasant respite that the site ought to portend.

From an ecological standpoint, Medoro's wish to forbid shepherds from grazing their flocks in this space represents the "Tragedy of the Commons" problem formulated by the ecologist Garrett Hardin in 1968 as an explicit counterpoint to Adam Smith's maxim that those who act out of self-interest are led by an 'invisible hand' to promote the public good (Hardin 1968, 1243-8). The problem states that rational actors will use a common resource for maximum personal gain, acting against the common interest of the group, leading to the depletion of that particular resource. Hardin gives the example of unregulated grazing on common land, where a certain piece of land may be shared by a community for a length of time. Eventually, however, due to the growth of both human and animal populations, each shepherd or cowherd will attempt to use as much of the resource as possible for themselves, leading to the depletion or destruction of the common resource for the community (Ibid.: 1244). Medoro is not grazing his flocks in this *locus amoenus*; nevertheless, he appropriates this common natural resource as a quasi-sacred space that bears witnesses to his love for Angelica. Through this action he excludes the shepherds and local community from using the resources offered by this common space. He also excludes Orlando from any respite that this paradise space might offer, shifting Hardin's emphasis in the "Tragedy of the Commons" problem from the usage of common natural resources to the common therapeutic effects such spaces offer their guests. Acting out of rational self-interest and – one might add – as a perfect shepherd out of Petrarchan pastoral, Medoro commemorates this space as a memorial park celebrating his love for Angelica. Prior to this inscription, the space's function was ambiguous: it could serve as a common land for shepherds grazing their flocks, a *locus amoenus* that offered respite from the heat of the day, and as a site of refuge from the poem's martial action. Medoro's inscription destroys this ambiguity, appropriating the psychological benefits of the space and depleting their possibilities for others. While the protected green space inhabited by the shepherds functioned as a pleasant edenic retreat for Angelica and Medoro, the inscription of their love upon the natural world appropriated this space and circumscribed its usage, prompting Orlando's violent reaction as he is psychologically locked out of this *locus amoenus*. The transformation of this space from a pleasant grove

into a memorial park makes this earthly paradise into a personal hell for Orlando. Paradoxically, it is as if Medoro's Petrarchan praise of this landscape and attempts at preservation lead directly to its destruction.

3.3 *From Memorial Park to Mausoleum in Tasso's* Gerusalemme liberata

The relationship present in Ariosto's poem between the motif of writing on trees and environmental destruction as a consequence of human appropriation is also represented in Tasso's *Gerusalemme liberata* (1581). By representing ecological transformation through the consequences of resource appropriation such poems challenge their own epic narratives of dynastic succession and imperial expansion.[13] In Tasso's poem, the forest of Saron on the outskirts of Jerusalem introduces the pastoral interlude of Erminia's time among the shepherds at the beginning of Canto 7, which also functions as a deceptive earthly paradise with Dantean echoes. Much like the *locus amoenus* that harbored Angelica and Medoro, this space functions as a heterotopia of crisis: a space through which Erminia passes as she traverses a crisis with relation to the social and generic values of chivalric epic: falling in love with her enemy and former captor, Tancredi. In the first octave of this Canto, Tasso's narrator tells us that Erminia continues her flight among the "ancient forest" ["l'antica selva"] (Tasso 2009/1993, 7.5). She continues to flee until she arrives at the banks of the Jordan, where she bathes before resting in a meadow. When she awakes, she seems to be in a paradisial space with chirping birds, a murmuring river, and a blooming meadow. Like Orlando, Erminia wakes in a *locus amoenus*, protected by a Dantean "selva antica" replete with the Petrarchan "chiare acque" of the Jordan and a gentle wind.

One might expect this space, like Dante's Eden or Angelica and Medoro's pastoral sojourn, to serve as a site of healing. Indeed, as Tylus (2012, 56) has noted, healing Tancredi was Erminia's original intention when she left the city. Yet, such expectations fail to materialize. Erminia chooses to live among the shepherds, dressing herself in pastoral garb and tending flocks, but cannot escape her impossible love for Tancredi. Much like Angelica and Medoro who

13 On the expansionist ideology underlying Tasso's poem, see Fuchs 2004, 25-34; and Tylus 1993a, 110-4.

appropriate the green space that provides them refuge, Erminia carves her woeful tale onto the trees, hoping that one day Tancredi himself will arrive at this site and mourn her dead body (Tasso 2009/1993, 7.21-22.i-iv):

'Perhaps (if gracious Heaven deign to hear
a mortal's fervent prayer) a time will be when he,
too, in this forest will appear
who now perhaps has never a thought of me,
and, when he sees my lowly grave, draw near
this weak and frail husk of mortality,
and to my pangs belatedly supply
the balm of a few teardrops and a sigh.

Thus, though my heart while living lived in pain,
at least in death my spirit may find grace,
and the cold embers of its flames may gain
the bliss I was forbidden to embrace.'

['Forse averrà, se 'l Ciel benigno ascolta
affettuoso alcun prego mortale,
che venga in queste selve anco tal volta
quegli a cui di me forse or nulla cale;
e rivolgendo gli occhi ove sepolta
giacerà questa spoglia inferma e frale,
tardo premio conceda a i miei martìri
di poche lagrimette e di sospiri;

onde se in vita il cor misero fue,
sia lo spirito in morte almen felice,
e 'l cener freddo de le fiamme sue
goda quel ch'or godere a me non lice.']

Erminia's lines are unmistakably Petrarchan, echoing the lyric poet's desire to have Laura mourn at his future tomb in lines 27-39 of 'Chiare, fresche, et dolci acque,' the same poem that Medoro imitated in Canto 23 of the *Furioso*.[14] She

14 Ferroni (2010, 65, n. 35) has also noted how Erminia's poem imitates Petrarch's wish to have Laura mourn at his tomb, but does not discuss its implications. The presence of Petrarchan allusions in the *Gerusalemme liberata* has been commented on by a number of

carves her story on beech and laurel trees ['ne la scorza de' faggi e de gli allori'] (Tasso 2009/1993, 7.19). The laurel further emphasizes the strong Petrarchan undertones of these lyrics, while the beech suggests Virgil's first Eclogue, where Tityrus lay under the spreading beech's shade. Erminia thus writes in both lyric and pastoral modes, finding refuge in neither genre. This *locus amoenus* functions as another kind of deceptive paradise; a space that initially portends healing, only for Erminia to realize the inescapability of her own selfhood with its attendant memories, anxieties, and unreciprocated desires. Unlike Medoro's poem, however, Erminia's lyrics contain a subtler prescription for how the space should be used. Rather than appropriating the space as did Medoro and Angelica, Erminia wishes for the space to appropriate her; she desires to be buried there in the hope that Tancredi will one day pass through and weep at her grave.

The forest of Saron is thus a common resource in the poem, used for various purposes by different communities. Yet, as Tasso makes clear at the beginning of Canto 13, the Christians' desire to cut it down offends the local inhabitants sense of the wood's sacred nature (Tasso 2009/1993, 13.5.i-iv):

[...] No native of the land
from that fierce wood dared cull the merest bough,
but the Franks despoiled it, since it stood at hand
for building their high engines.

[[...] abitante alcuno
dal fero bosco mai ramo non svelse;
ma i Franchi il violar, perch'ei sol uno
somministrava lor machine eccelse.][15]

Ismeno charges the demons to become environmental protectors and ecological stewards: "Possess this wood, take of these trees control / that one by one I here consign to you" ["prendete in guardia questa selva, e queste / piante che

scholars, who often note the poem's "lyricality." See, for example, Della Terza 1963, 175-91; and Gibbons 2000, 83-98. More recently, Ramachandran (2007, 188) has noted how Tasso sought to "explore the lyric's poetic potential and to rehabilitate its egocentric emphases within the national and historical concerns of the long poem."

15 Tylus (1999, 123-4) has commented on how Ismeno's enchantments represent local, cultic practices as opposed to the universalizing gods of epic.

numerate a voi consegno"] (Ibid.: 13.8.i-ii). Through the sorcerer's enchantment, the forest is protected but remains inaccessible, surrounded by a wall of fire. His enchantment personalizes the space to reflect the deepest fears of each knight, causing Tancredi to imagine that he has struck and wounded his beloved Clorinda once again, and Rinaldo to see a simulacrum of the recently-abandoned sorceress Armida. This enchantment is not dissimilar from Angelica and Medoro's appropriation of the *locus amoenus*; just as their writings transformed this paradisial space into a personal hell for Orlando, so too does Ismeno's enchantment of the wood transform a common resource into a site that excludes the Christian knights by individually reflecting their worst fears. Rinaldo is only able to disenchant the forest in Canto 18 once he has subordinated his personal desires to public duty.

Erminia's inscribed trees will ultimately not be destroyed by a mad knight, but rather by the crusader army. The only other use of 'antica selva' in the *Liberata* occurs in 18.41 when the crusaders begin cutting down the forest to build their siege machines.[16] Nevertheless, this destruction is markedly different than in Ariosto's poem. While Orlando destroys the natural resources of the peasants and shepherds – polluting their river, ripping up old trees, destroying their cattle – the crusaders employ good judgment ["buon giudicio"] to select the timber they need to build their siege engines (Tasso 2009/1993, 18.41). Despite the offense that such actions may cause to the inhabitants of the forest who consider it sacred, the crusaders maintain a small degree of respect for the common resources offered by the forest, not depleting the resource entirely. The ambiguous and multifaceted nature of this forest in Tasso's poem – which serves as a pastoral refuge, a sacred wood, an enchanted bespoke hell, and a natural resource crucial to the crusaders' victory – demonstrates how this site functions as a commons, both in terms of its physical and psychological affordances. While Erminia's writings nevertheless impose an anthropocentric interpretation on the landscape, they are shown to be but one of many possible uses of these resources.

16 Troy Tower (2013, 139-51) has convincingly argued that this episode demonstrates the artistic and personal costs of Tasso's narrative theory and the instrumental use of the natural world in this process.

4. *Conclusions*

What, finally, we might ask, are the ecological values that undergird such paradisial heterotopias of crisis? Initially, the protected pastoral spaces in these epics may seem to serve as an alternate model for the expansionist goals of empire. Yet, as discussed above, these spaces are much more than simple celebrations of pastoral life and natural husbandry, their landscapes are charged with significance insofar as they offer both natural and psychological resources to human inhabitants. Through acts of inscription these spaces are appropriated for personal and poetic ends: in the first instance, due to Angelica and Medoro's wish to memorialize their love and claim the site as their own; in the second, due to Erminia's Petrarchan desire to memorialize her pain, hoping for pity from future visitors or Tancredi's mourning of her dead body. While in Ariosto, we can see the appropriation of the natural world through Medoro's memorialization of love that triggers Orlando's descent into madness, in Tasso, Erminia's memorialization of her pain is destroyed by the broader resource needs of the Christian army. If these differences are mapped onto the level of genre, one could read these destructive encounters between lyric and epic modes as initially comedic – insofar as the insignificant Medoro's lyric *locus amoenus* mocks Orlando's status as an important paladin of chivalric epic; and then as tragic – insofar as the zero-sum agenda of domination, resource appropriation, and conquest of the Christian army (along with the analogous defense of Jerusalem by the Muslims) has no space for distracting lyric meditations or dalliances. The epic plot clear-cuts the forest that once contained lyric idylls and spaces of refuge, while Tasso's narrator and his characters can only stand idly by as they lament the costs of such losses and fragmentation.

Yet, as this article has attempted to show, the instrumental approach to nature taken by both Medoro and Erminia calls into question whether nature was ever neutral at all, and whether these lyric expressions are not equally forms of appropriation through inscription. In both cases, the natural world of the *locus amoenus* serves as a canvas for poetic self-expression. Such inscription, however, alters the landscape, framing it within the author's own subjective narrative, outlining who ought to be included or excluded from such spaces, and organizing the natural world in terms of prescriptive actions. The benefit of identifying such latent ecological values in these works demonstrates the nuanced power of imperial discourse as a form of dominion over

the natural world in early modern Italian epic. In other words, rather than serving as a counterpoint to the imperial ideology of epic, such spaces replicate the overarching expansionist goals of their respective poems through lyric appropriation.[17]

Moreover, through Foucault's concept of heterotopia, this article has also attempted to demonstrate how these pastoral interludes in Ariosto's and Tasso's poems may be considered as alternative earthly paradises in dialogue with those of Alcina and Armida, and within the broader development of the topos in Renaissance epic more broadly, as discussed by Giamatti. Both episodes gesture back to Dante's vision of Eden as a space of healing and refuge, but reveal themselves to be deceptive in ways different from the paradises of Alcina and Armida. While the latter heterotopias of deviation lead to a dissolution of self, these heterotopias of crisis initially promise the same escapism only to finally reveal that one is excluded from this refuge; such shelter becomes impossible due to one's own inescapable desires and memories. These episodes demonstrate the dangers inherent in an instrumental – one might even hazard to say Petrarchan – view of the natural world as a common resource to be appropriated either by its visitors' lyric expression or by the broader needs of the epic's resolution of plot. In sum, the "Tragedy of the Commons" problem appears to describe the finite potential that such spaces offer for psychological, generic, and physical appropriation, as one character's earthly paradise is another's hell on earth. Such an illustration in these texts, however, appears to be consonant with changes in thinking around earthly paradises in this period. Just as the location of earthly paradises on maps in this period shifted from a physically inaccessible location to one that was temporally inaccessible, so too do these episodes demonstrate a shift toward an earthly paradise that is subjectively inaccessible, yet bears traces of its potential healing function for others who came before.

17 Yet, as Richard Grove (1995) has demonstrated, imperialism and environmental consciousness were, historically, not as diametrically opposed as might be assumed, particularly in British, French, and Dutch colonies between 1600 and 1860. The idea of Eden animated early conservation efforts in island colonies and shaped early modern scientific thinking about the environment in several island colonies.

Bibliography

Alighieri, Dante. 1972. *La Divina commedia*. Edited by Charles Hall Grandgent. Revised by Charles S. Singleton. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Alighieri, Dante. 2003. *La Divina commedia*. Translated by Robert and Jean Hollander. New York: Anchor Books.

Appuhn, Karl. 2009. *A Forest on the Sea: Environmental Expertise in Renaissance Venice*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Ariosto, Ludovico. 1982 (1974). *Orlando furioso*. Edited by Edoardo Sanguineti. Milan: Garzanti.

Ariosto, Ludovico. 1974. *Orlando furioso*. Translated by Guido Waldman. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Armerio, Marco, and Hall, Marcus. 2010. *Nature and History in Modern Italy*. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press.

Barron, Patrick, and Re, Anna. 2003. *Italian Environmental Literature*. New York: Italica Press.

Bartlett Giamatti, Angelo. 1989 (1966). *The Earthly Paradise and the Renaissance Epic*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Benvegnù, Damiano, and Gilebbi, Matteo. 2022. *Italy and the Ecological Imagination: Ecocritical Theories and Practices*. Wilmington: Vernon Press.

Berger, Harry S. 1988. *Second World and Green World*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Boiardo, Matteo Maria. 1962. *Opere Volgari: Amorum Libri*. Edited by Pier Vincenzo Mengaldo. Bari: Laterza.

Borlik, Todd. 2010. *Ecocriticism and Early Modern English Literature*. New York: Routledge.

Brayton, Dan. 2012. *Shakespeare's Ocean: An Ecocritical Exploration*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.

Brucker, Lynne, and Brayton, Dan. 2011. *Ecocritical Shakespeare*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Buell, Laurence. 1996. *The Environmental Imagination*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Carne-Ross, D.S. 1966. "The One and the Many: A Reading of Orlando furioso, Cantos 1 and 8." *Arion* 5: 195-234.

Ceserani, Remo. 1996. "L'apparente armonia dell'Orlando furioso." *Cuadernos de Filología Italiana* 3: 125-43.

D'Arcy Wood, Gillen. 2008. "Introduction: Eco-Historicism." *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies* 8, no.2: 3.

Della Terza, Dante. 1963. "Tasso's Experience of Petrarch." *Studies in the Renaissance* 10: 175-91.

Estok, Simon. 2011. *Ecocriticism and Shakespeare: Reading Ecophobia*. New York: Palgrave.

Ferroni, Giulio. 2010. *Dopo la fine: una letteratura possibile*. Rome: Donzelli.

Foucault, Michel. 1986. "Of Other Spaces." Translated by Jay Miskowiec. *Diacritics* 16, no.1: 22-7.

Fuchs, Barbara. 2004. *Mimesis and Empire: The New World, Islam, and European Identities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Galli Stampino, Maria. 2005. *Staging the Pastoral: Tasso's Aminta and the Emergence of Modern Western Theatre*. Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies.

Gibbons, David. 2000. "Tasso 'Petroso:' Beyond Petrarchan and Dantean Metaphor in the *Gerusalemme liberata*." *Italian Studies* 55: 83-98.

Gough, Melinda J. 2001. "Tasso's Enchantress, Tasso's Captive Woman." *Renaissance Quarterly* 54, no.2: 523-52.

Grove, Richard. 1995. *Green Imperialism: Colonial Expansion, Tropical Island Edens and the Origins of Environmentalism,* 1600-1860. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hardin, Garrett. 1968. "The Tragedy of the Commons." *Science* 162, no.3859: 1243-8.

Harrison, Robert Pogue. 2009. *Forests: The Shadow of Civilization*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hiltner, Ken. 2006. *Renaissance Ecology: Imagining Eden in Milton's England*. Philadelphia: Duquesne University Press.

Hiltner, Ken. 2011. *What Else is Pastoral?: Renaissance Literature and the Environment*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Iovino, Serenella, Cesaretti, Enrico, and Past, Elena. 2018. *Italy and the Environmental Humanities: Landscapes, Natures, Ecologies*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.

Iovino, Serenella. 2016. *Ecocriticism and Italy: Ecology, Resistance, Liberation*. New York: Bloomsbury.

Knight, Leah. 2014. *Reading Green in Early Modern England*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Lee, Rensselaer W. 1977. *Names on Trees: Ariosto into Art*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Lollini, Massimo. 2022. "Anima mundi and metensomatosis in Giordano Bruno: Religion, Ethics, and Eco-Theology." In *Italy and the Ecological Imagination*, edited by Damiano Benvegnù and Matteo Gilebbi, 3-20. Wilmington: Vernon Press.

Marchesi, Andrea. 2011. "Oltre il mito letterario, una mirabolante fabbrica estense. Protagonisti e significati nel cantiere di Belvedere." In *L'uno e l'altro Ariosto. In corte e nelle delizie*, edited by Gianni Venturi, 175-214. Florence: Olschki.

Marshall, Ian, and Glotfelty, Cheryll. 1994. "Defining Ecocritical Theory and Practice: Sixteen Position Papers from the 1994 Western Literature Association Meeting: Salt Lake City, Utah; 6 October, 1994." *Association for the Study of Literature and Environment*. http://www.asle.org/wp-content/uploads/ASLE_Primer_DefiningEcocrit.pdf (accessed 16/04/2023).

McColley, Diane. 2007. *Poetry and Ecology in the Age of Milton and Marvell.* Aldershot: Ashgate.

Migiel, Marilyn. 1987. "Secrets of a Sorceress, Tasso's Armida." *Quaderni d'Italianistica* 8, no.2: 149-66.

Ostrom, Elinor. 1990. *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Raber, Karen. 2007. "Recent Ecocritical Studies of English Renaissance Literature." *English Literary Renaissance* 37, no.1: 151-71.

Ramachandran, Ayesha. 2007. "Tasso's Petrarch: The Lyric Means to Epic Ends." *MLN* 122, no.1: 186-208.

Sannazaro, Iacopo. 1990. *Arcadia*. Edited by Francesco Erspamer. Milan: Mursia.

Scafi, Alessandro. 2014. *Maps of Paradise*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Steuco da Gubbio, Agostino (Augustini Eugubini). 1535. *Cosmopoeia vel de mundane opificio*. Lyon: Sebastian Gryphius.

Tasso, Torquato. 1993 (1971). *Gerusalemme liberata*. Edited by Lanfranco Caretti. Turin: Einaudi.

Tasso, Torquato. 2009. *Gerusalemme liberata*. Translated by Max Wickert. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tower, Troy. 2013. "Naming Trees in the *Gerusalemme liberata*." *Romance Studies* 31, no.3/4: 139-51.

Tylus, Jane. 1988. "The Curse of Babel: The Orlando furioso and Epic (Mis) Appropriation." *MLN* 103, no.1: 167-8.

Tylus, Jane. 1993a. "Reasoning Away Colonialism: Tasso and the Production of the *Gerusalemme liberata*." *South Central Review* 10, no.2: 100-14.

Tylus, Jane. 1993b. *Writing and Vulnerability in the Late Renaissance. Stanford*. CA: Stanford University Press.

Tylus, Jane. 1999. "Tasso's Trees: Epic and Local Culture." In *Epic Traditions in the Contemporary World*, edited by Margaret Beissinger, Jane Tylus, and Susanne Wofford, 108-30. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Tylus, Jane. 2012. "Imagining Narrative in Tasso: Revisiting Erminia." *MLN* 127, no.1: 45-64.

Venturi, Gianni. 1979. *Le scene dell'Eden: teatro, arte, Giardini nella letteratura italiana*. Ferrara: Bovolenta.

Verdicchio, Pasquale. 2016. *Ecocritical Approaches to Italian Culture and Literature: The Denatured Wild.* Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Visentini, Margherita Azzi. 2005. "Islands of Delight: Shifting Perceptions of the Borromean Islands." In *Baroque Garden Cultures: Emulation, Sublimation, Subversion*, edited by Michel Conan, 245-90. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Watson, Robert N. 2006. *Back to Nature: The Green and the Real in the Late Renaissance*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Yoch, James J. 1982. "The Limits of Sensuality: Pastoral Wilderness, Tasso's *Aminta*, and the Gardens of Ferrara." *Forum Italicum* 16: 60-81.

Zatti, Sergio. 1990. *Il «Furioso» fra epos e romanzo*. Lucca: Maria Pacini Fazzi.

Zegura, Elizabeth Chesney. 2012. "Uprooted Trees and Slaughtered peasants: The Savaging of Rural Space in Ariosto's Orlando furioso (1532)." In *Rural Space in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Age: The Spatial Turn in Premodern Studies*, edited by Albrecht Classen, 729-54. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Bryan Brazeau is Associate Professor of Liberal Arts at the University of Warwick, where he directs the SCFS Venice programme and teaches on a wide range of transdisciplinary modules ranging from *Science, Society, and the Media* to modules focussing on Beauty, Paradises, Underworlds, Heroism, Exile, and Homecomings. He is the editor of *The Reception of Aristotle's Poetics in the Italian Renaissance and Beyond* (Bloomsbury Academic: London, 2020), an editor for the Brill *Sources in Early Poetics* series, and has published a number of articles and book chapters on Torquato Tasso, Lucrezia Marinella, sixteenth-century chivalric epic, Counter-Reformation poetry, Dante, and early modern poetics. He obtained his MA and PhD from New York University in 2015.