Rhetoric and Drama

Mayfield, DS (Ed.)

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version
Konferenzband / conference proceedings

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:
Mayfield, D. (Ed.). (2017). *Rhetoric and Drama*. Berlin: De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110484663

Rhetoric and Drama

Rhetoric and Drama

Edited by
D. S. Mayfield

DE GRUYTER

This book is published in cooperation with the DramaNet project, funded by the European Research Council

ISBN 978-3-11-048459-5
e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-048466-3
e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-048500-4

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at http://dnb.dnb.de.

Cover illustration: photodeedooo/iStock/Thinkstock
Printing and binding: CPI books GmbH, Leck
♾ Printed on acid-free paper
Printed in Germany

www.degruyter.com

dedicated to my mentor
Joachim Küpper
on the occasion of his 65th birthday

Acknowledgements

The editor wishes to thank Joachim Küpper for his tireless efforts to the benefit of DramaNet, the present volume, and the conference preceding it. A distinguished group of international scholars made the latter most memorable: DramaNet is grateful to Kathy Eden, Glenn W. Most, Martha Feldman, Maria Galli Stampino, Jan Bloemendal, and Jörg Wesche for accepting the invitation to speak at the conference. DramaNet thanks the invited discussants from HSE Moscow, Gasan Gusejnov and Natalia Sarana. It is grateful to Freie Universität Berlin for hosting the conference. The same as the DramaNet project overall, the conference and volume on 'Rhetoric and Drama' were funded by a grant from the European Research Council (ERC).

The preparations for the conference were largely performed during a research stay at The Humanities Center of Johns Hopkins University: for providing an advantageous environment, the present editor is most grateful to its director, Hent de Vries, and its administrator, Marva Philip. The editor wishes to thank the Friedrich Schlegel Graduate School at Freie Universität Berlin, particularly its scholarly coordinator, Rebecca Mak, as well as the Peter Szondi Institute of Comparative Literature, especially Regula von Schintling, for their support in terms of promoting and advertising the conference.

The present editor wishes to thank the conference team—Andrea Dueñas Paredes, Lena Maria Hein, and Anna Lena Schächinger—for their consummate industry and attentiveness in preparation and performance. Reliable technical assistance was provided by Paolo Brusa. The editor is especially grateful to DramaNet's administrator, Agnes Kloocke, for her nonpareil diligence.

The editor wishes to thank de Gruyter—particularly Ulrike Krauß and Daniel Gietz—for actively supporting the present volume from the very beginning; as well as the publisher's production editor for this volume, Antje-Kristin Mayr.

For her invaluable patience and precision in assisting the proofreading of the final version, the present editor is most grateful to Lena Maria Hein.

He wishes to thank Bernhard Asmuth for authorizing the translation of his entry "Drama" from the *Historical Dictionary of Rhetoric*. Most of all, the present editor is grateful to this volume's contributors. May it conduce to future research on rhetoric and drama.

Contents

Preface

DS Mayfield

Interplay with Variation: Approaching Rhetoric and Drama

> Interdisciplinarity [...] does not signify the mere exchange of results and methods, but the reciprocal illumination of the [respective] specialist approaches [...], so as to attain to novel aspects on a matter from various points of view, which [...] may lead to a statement of the problem that emerges only in the leeway ['Spielraum'] between the disciplines.
>
> Jauß (528; trans. dsm)

In this preface, a synopsis of the conference preceding this volume is followed by a concise description of the DramaNet project; after an outline of various ties between rhetoric and drama, including copious references for heuristic purposes and future research, each contributor's previous work in this field is briefly referred to, complemented by an abstract of the essay in the present volume.

The international conference laying the groundwork for this volume took place at Freie Universität Berlin from February 11 to 12, 2016—conceived, organized, and implemented by the present editor, a member of the DramaNet project, headed by Joachim Küpper. The project, the conference, and this volume were funded by a five-year European Research Council (ERC) Advanced Grant (2011 to 2016). The conference's speakers have contributed to the volume at hand: Kathy Eden (Columbia U, New York), Martha Feldman (Chicago), Maria Galli Stampino (Miami), Jan Bloemendal (The Hague/Amsterdam), Jörg Wesche (Duisburg–Essen), and Joachim Küpper (FU Berlin).[1] Gasan Gusejnov and Natalia Sarana (HSE Moscow) participated as invited guests. DramaNet members and alumni, faculty and students from Freie Universität, including from the Friedrich Schlegel Graduate School, and the general public constituted the audience.

The DramaNet project is concerned with conceptualizations of cultural dynamics: the disseminating, circulating, extracting, reassembling, alloying,

1 With the exception of Glenn W. Most (Pisa/Chicago), whose presentation had previously been promised for publication elsewhere; for a synopsis of his talk, as well as his comments during the discussions, see the minutes in the appendix.

DS Mayfield, Freie Universität Berlin

amalgamating of notional and material forms, artifacts, structures.[2] While extending to Antiquity and Modernity, a particular focus in this respect is on Early Modern drama—a highly virulent phenomenon of audiovisual mass culture, most attentive to its assorted audiences.[3] Throughout Europe, the Early Modern Eras are a heyday of rhetoric, an age of the stage. DramaNet's approach (decidedly pan-European, and extending beyond) suggests theorizing these dynamics by recourse to the metaphor of a (virtual, material) cultural network—qua human-made, non-hierarchical, poly-purposive, multi-directional structure, transcending the particularistic confines of individual 'national' frameworks and literatures.[4] The transcultural comparative case studies within the project trace

2 See Küpper's essay herein, as well as the synopsis of his talk in the appendix; for the concept of '*hypólepsis*' in this regard, see the present editor's respective article ("Variants of *hypólepsis*" passim; spec. part III). Cf. Valéry's rhetorico-technical approach to writing: "tout ce qu'il [sc. the poet] aura imaginé, senti, songé, échafaudé, passera au crible, sera pesé, épuré, mis à la *forme* et condensé le plus possible pour gagner en force ce qu'il sacrifie en longueur: un sonnet, par exemple, sera une véritable quintessence, un osmazôme, un suc concentré, et cohobé, réduit à quatorze vers, soigneusement *composé* en vue d'un effet final et foudroyant" (1786). If read without its biochemical or idealistic implications, Eliot's model for a poetics of accumulating and reassembling may seem compatible with a rhetorical view of *inventio*: "The poet's mind is in fact a receptacle for seizing and storing up numberless feelings, phrases, images, which remain there until all the particles which can unite to form a new compound are present together" ("Tradition" 19); one might call the ensuing a 'rhetorical poetics': "the larger part of the labour of an author in composing his work is critical labour; the labour of sifting, combining, constructing, expunging, correcting, testing" ("Function of Criticism" 30).

3 For Early Modern operas, plays as mass phenomena, see Feldman's, Stampino's contributions herein. Referring to (staged, dialogic, internal) practices of (self-)refutation, Eden's essay scrutinizes the inverse tendency (a quantitative reduction of intratextual audiences) in the dialogs featuring the Platonic Socrates, in Shakespeare's plays, and Montaigne's essays.

4 For a related perspective, see Bloemendal's contribution to this volume; cf. an earlier essay on his part ("Transfer" passim). Invoking classic works of "comparatist study ([...] Auerbach, [...] Curtius, [...] Spitzer)", Bender/Wellbery suggest seeing "the academic discipline of comparative literature" as "the successor [...] to the tradition of rhetorical doctrine and education that dominated literary study in Europe prior to the emergence of the national philologies" ("Preface" vii). As to fundamental elements of rhetoric persisting in certain areas and scholars, Most mentions the '*topica*' in Curtius, the "three *genera dicendi*" in Auerbach, 'tropology' in Genette, Jakobson, Lacan, de Man, Blumenberg ("Rhetorik" 62; trans. dsm). As the basis of Curtius' approach, Auerbach discerns "the continued existence of the tradition of rhetorical schooling" (92f.; trans. dsm). For "Dockhorn, Curtius, Lausberg" as "universalists", see Plett (*Systematische* 249; trans. dsm). As to Burke's influence, cf. Sloane/Jost (1177). For a review of "a variety of" twentieth century "perspectives on the rhetorical tradition", spec. by "Perelman, Booth, [...] Richards, [...] Foucault, Derrida and Barthes", as well as White, Genette, see Cohen (69; passim). In *Les mots et les choses*, ch. 4 (on speaking), Foucault refers to rhetoric mainly in terms of an 'analysis of rhetorical tropes' (121, 4.I.), spec. 'synecdoche, metonymy, catachresis (metaphor)'

the movements of human agents and authors, transtemporal metamorphoses of cultural artifacts, conceptions, contents—such as narratives transforming over time, according to their place of extraction from the net—as well as certain cultural forms and practices qua enabling or mediating structures.[5]

The *ars rhetorica* is precisely such a device of mediation and facilitation.[6] Conceptualized as a *téchne* from its onsets in Greek Antiquity, rhetoric is the expedient *kat' exochén*, a form for potentially any content: Blumenberg pointedly describes the "rhetorical medium" as being "nothing and capable of everything" (*Höhlenausgänge* 131; trans. dsm).[7] It claims to be—and effectually is—a *potentia* in the literal sense: a syn- and diachronically protean, polyfunctional, transgeneric technique, whose various potential functions may be (and often are) simultaneously (if latently) present.[8] A rhetorical dictum *par excellence*—'*celare*

(158, 4.VI; cf. 161), emphasizing *elocutio* qua 'spatially arranging linguistic signs', and as distinct from grammar, focusing on temporal sequence (125, 4.II; cf. 135; 162, 4.VI; 165, 4.VII; also: 267, 6.VIII, 406, 9.VII). As to this tendency, Niehues-Pröbsting notes: "In the course of its history[,] rhetoric was increasingly reduced to stylistics" ("Glauben" 25; trans. dsm).

5 An affine approach is tendered by Most's monograph on how "[t]he figure of Doubting Thomas [...] was received and transformed [...] [in] various narrative elaborations [...] and [...] visual representations" (*Doubting* ix): it "allows us to recognize with unusual clarity the degree to which cultural history is constituted by an incessant practice of recycling inherited models, retained by collective memory beyond the immediate situation for which they were first devised, into new contexts for which they must be adapted if they are to remain serviceable" (*Doubting* x–xi). As to the correlative needfulness of an interdisciplinary approach, Most accentuates: "Precisely because authors, artists, and their audiences have always tended to feel [...] free of disciplinary constraints, study of such processes of cultural transmission [...] must necessarily transgress the boundaries that academic disciplines have [...] seen fit to draw around themselves" (*Doubting* xi).

6 Rhetoric demands and accommodates interdisciplinary approaches. Cf. Plett: "despite regional and national differences, rhetoric [...] is a unifying cultural force" ("Rhetorik der Renaissance" 13; trans. dsm; cf. "Vorwort" V); he calls for "supranational and interdisciplinary perspectives" to "demonstrate rhetoric as the cultural substrate of the European Renaissance" ("Rhetorik der Renaissance" 14; trans. dsm). This applies to all rhetorical traditions since Ancient times, spec. also to Late Antiquity; cf. Ueding ("Vorwort" VI); Most states: "the entire literary culture of post-Classical Antiquity was shaped by rhetoric" ("Rhetorik" 64; trans. dsm).

7 Concerning the applicable concept of '*téchne*', see Lausberg (*Elemente* 20, §28; *Handbuch* 25–34, §1–14; 45–48, §37–45); Curtius (155–157); Heinimann (passim); Niehues-Pröbsting ("Rhetorik" 44f.; 51); Halliwell (236). For "[t]he idea of literature as a craft" versus the Romanticist "idea of literature as self-expression", see France (1); cf. Sloane/Jost (1179). As to rhetoric and Romanticism, see Dockhorn (9–45; 125–128; passim); de Man (passim).

8 Cf. Blumenberg: "Power is [...] *potentia* [...] possibility is its actuality [or: effectual reality, 'Wirklichkeit']" ("Staatstheorie" 137; trans. dsm). For rhetorical polyfunctionality, see Lausberg (*Elemente* 9; 12, §2; 27, §46). Describing "the 'rhetorical situation'", Plett calls it "a multi-factorial

artem'—applies also to rhetoric's own history, its periods of manifest predominance and artful latency.[9] The assorted systems of rhetoric transcend

construct" (*Systematische* 34f.; trans. dsm). Vickers stresses the "functionality of rhetoric" (88), spec. its polyfunctionality as staged in a meta-rhetorical play: "The plot [...] allows Shaw to achieve several goals at once. [...] he has each of the figures and tropes appear as individual speaking characters" (93), some are 'performative' qua 'enacting their functioning' (94). For a semiotic (linguistic) view, cf. Jakobson on "the multiple functions performed simultaneously by verbal communication" (53). Plett sees in "Greek rhetoric [...] a complex arch-text, which constantly continued to be enlarged ['fortgeschrieben'] in the course of the centuries" ("Rhetorik der Renaissance" 2; trans. dsm). For a diachronic overview of the complexities of the various rhetorical traditions, see Ueding ("Vorwort" V–VI; *Rhetorik* passim). As to rhetoric's protean quality, Curtius stresses: "Ancient rhetoric has a long, manifold ['gestaltenreiche', sc. 'taking (on) many forms, shapes'] history" (77; trans. dsm); see Bloemendal's essay herein; cf. Plett ("*Theatrum Rhetoricum*" 328; 334; 334n.; 335; 335n.), spec. "As such an artist of [many] roles ['Rollenkünstler'], the orator [or: speaker] puts the rhetorical principle of *varietas* into effect; he embodies Proteus" ("*Theatrum Rhetoricum*" 334; trans. dsm). Küpper describes 'rhetoric' as "a trans-generic system of speech [or: diction]" (*Diskurs-Renovatio* 300; trans. dsm).

9 This rhetorico-technical view describes rhetoric's (potential) latency by recourse to a rhetorical device and desideratum *par excellence*: 'concealing the art'; the corresponding act or process is a "rediscovery of rhetoric" (Most "Rhetorik" 74; trans. dsm). As to '*celare artem*' generally, cf. Pfister (214); Oesterreich (864); Marschall (522); France (24), spec. his noting a "preference for a concealed rhetoric" (34), and stating (with reference to d'Aubignac): "Hidden rhetoric is the rule" (33). Strätling refers to Genette's term '*rhétorique restreinte*' (cf. 28n.; Cohen 75), and mentions that Beaujour speaks of a "'rhétorique occulte'" as regards the Surrealists (qtd. in: Strätling 28n.). As to latency and patency, cf. Jakobson (87)—including the "effective device" of changing "the *modus obliquus* [...] into a *modus rectus*" (91). For spec. instances, see Heraclitus, suggesting that 'invisible accord is stronger than a visible one', '*harmoníe aphanès phaneres kreítton*' (in: Kranz *Vorsokratiker I*. 162, 22B54); cf. Aristotle (*Rhetoric* 350–355, III.ii.3–7, 1404b); Quintilian (*Oratoria 3–5*. 280f., 4.2.127; *Oratoria 9–10*. 294f., 10.1.82); 'Longinus' (230f., 17.1–2; 240f., 22.1; 247, 23.4). For the paradigmatic Early Modern case, see Castiglione: "practice in all things a certain *sprezzatura* [nonchalance], so as to conceal all art and make whatever is done or said appear to be without effort [...] we may call art true art which does not seem to be art; nor must one be more careful of anything than of concealing it [...] certain most excellent orators in ancient times [...] tried to make everyone believe that they had no knowledge whatever of letters; and, dissembling their knowledge, they made their orations appear to be composed in the simplest manner" (32, I.26); thereto, cf. Plett ("Rhetorik der Renaissance" 9; "*Theatrum Rhetoricum*" 335; 349; 349n.); Berger (295f.; 306); Hempfer (115f.; 115n.); Oesterreich (866). The fact that the *rhetoriké téchne* tends to be reduced to only one of its *partes* (*elocutio*)—or but one of its ends (*persuasio*)—points to rhetoric's efficacy in concealing its own artfulness; *de re*, it is never reducible to the elocutional aspect only, nor to a specific, 'ideological' mode of expression. In such cases, 'rhetoric' is conceived of as that which is manifestly on display—from a given audience's point of view; this would always only cover a certain aspect or tendency. As to "the nexus of drama and rhetoric" in terms of *elocutio*, see Asmuth (*Dramenanalyse* 76–78; here: 76; trans. dsm); ostentatiously rhetoricized diction, spec. if deemed excessive in the respective

temporal, spatial (local, later 'national'), linguistic, cultural, specialist, departmental, ideological, denominational, and generic confines—both regarding their theoretical (envisioned, latent, asserted, overall) functionality, and in terms of the respective application: be it juridical, theological, economic,

predecessors, leads to various forms of dismissal or denunciation of 'rhetoric' as a whole (cf. *Dramenanalyse* 77). In 1919, Eliot notes that one is "thinking of rhetoric as something recently out of fashion" and "that the word is merely a vague term of abuse for any style that is bad" ("'Rhetoric' and Poetic Drama" 37). He defends the term: "It is one of those words which it is the business of criticism to dissect and reassemble. Let us avoid the assumption that rhetoric is a vice of manner" ("'Rhetoric' and Poetic Drama" 38). His redefinition has recourse to drama: "The really fine rhetoric of Shakespeare occurs in situations where a character in the play *sees himself* in a dramatic light" ("'Rhetoric' and Poetic Drama" 39). The present thesis of rhetoric's latency in (discourse) historical terms either specifies processually—as (re)discoveries—the views speaking of an apparent 'return' or even 'rebirth' of rhetoric; or disaffirms them, if taken as essentialist. "RHETORIC never dies"—thus France opens *Racine's Rhetoric* (1); Dockhorn speaks of "the rhetorical tradition" as having been "presumed dead" (96); cf. Plett: "Even in 1970[,] Roland Barthes was able to proclaim the 'death of rhetoric'" (*Systematische* 248; trans. dsm); he himself speaks of "a 'renaissance of rhetoric'", a "'rhetoric boom'" ("Vorwort" 5; trans. dsm; cf. "Rhetorik der Renaissance" passim; *Systematische* 252). Worthington states: "there has been something of a renaissance of Greek rhetoric and oratory" ("Preface" viii). Ueding stresses a "theoretical, scholarly renaissance of rhetoric" ("Vorwort" VI; trans. dsm). Cf. the title of Bender's/Wellbery's essay ("Rhetoricality" passim), as well as their thesis: "*Modernism is an age not of rhetoric, but of rhetoricality*" ("Rhetoricality" 25); *de re*, the latter might seem to be exemplified in Wells (cf. passim); see Vetter's/Heinrich's ed. volume (passim), Vetter's introduction (passim). Haverkamp speaks of "rhetoric having become obsolete", respectively its "*termini technici*"—of which Blumenberg is then said to make "paleonymic use" ("Skandalon" 36). In a Heideggerian context, Haverkamp refers to "rhetoric" as having been "repressed" by philosophy, and so speaks of the "return of something repressed, which contains the mechanisms of repression within itself" (*Figura cryptica* 11; trans. dsm). While he speaks of "the latency of rhetoric" with reference to Blumenberg on myth and Freud (cf. "Wirkungspotential" 24f.), the present thesis is not in line with Haverkamp's invocation of a "mythical quality" of "latency", "*latere*" (*Figura cryptica* 7; trans. dsm; cf. 7–9), with his recourses to Ovid, Freud, Heidegger, in that context (*Figura cryptica* 7f.; 10f.), nor his "supposing latency as a basic concept of cultural studies" (*Figura cryptica* 10; trans. dsm). Closer to the notions of latency and discovery herein, Kahn chronicles a "revival of interest in rhetoric" ("Resistance" 388). Longman links this to drama: "such theorists as [...] Burke, [...] Bowman, [...] Olson, [...] de Man have rekindled our interest in the rhetorical dimension of drama and in the dramatic nature of rhetoric" (5). Hunter has: "The interest in rhetoric in recent times [...] is clearly associated with a general revulsion against essentialism (so called)" (108). Cf. Mack: "there has been a tremendous resurgence of interest in the history and theory of rhetoric" ("Intro" vii). See Plett's ch. "From the Decline of Rhetoric to its Revival" (*Literary Rhetoric* 3–31).

scholarly, political, proto-scientific, etc.[10] Fairly stable in its flexibility, this multipurpose *téchne* is a paradigmatic mediating device; in structural analogy to what the *lingua franca* Latin is in the conceptual realm, one might describe the *ars rhetorica* as a '*forma franca*'.[11] With regard to its respective agent, Lausberg remarks: "The orator must be capable of comprehending all matters"; his "being universally disposed is one reason for the entrance of rhetoric also into literature" (*Elemente* 20, §29; trans. dsm).[12]

10 See Küpper, Bloemendal, herein. As Heudecker/Wesche confirm, rhetoric's (social) polyfunctionality (its "manifold functions for the community") was deemed one of its express fortes during the Baroque (101; trans. dsm). For the trans-spatial aspect during the Early Modern age, see Plett: "The geographical space [...] reaches from Italy to England, from Spain and far into Eastern Europe" ("Vorwort" V; trans. dsm; cf. "Rhetorik der Renaissance" 13); rhetoric is "transcultural in character" (*Literary Rhetoric* xii); the universality, cosmopolitanism of 'rhetorical' agents is empirically verifiable (cf. "Rhetorik der Renaissance" 7; 13). As to the trans-denominational quality of (Baroque) rhetoric, see Heudecker/Wesche: "Independent of the confessional orientation, rhetoric represents the foundation of learned communication" (105; trans. dsm); cf. Knox (63; 66f.; 76n.; passim); see Barner's comparisons of Protestant (258–321; 346; 367–369) and Jesuit rhetoric (321–369); as to the latter, cf. Fothergill-Payne (passim; spec. 376). Plett affirms: "as many differences as there may have been [...], a fundamental consensus obtained *in rebus rhetoricis*" ("Rhetorik der Renaissance" 13; trans. dsm).

11 Blumenberg cites Nietzsche's assertion that, "with rhetoric", "the Greeks [...] invented 'form itself'" ("Annäherung" 408; trans. dsm). Barner refers to "rhetoric" as "an agglomerate [...] handed down and modified over the course of millennia" (VIII; trans. dsm). Plett stresses that the "complex edifice" of rhetoric, while undergoing "ever new variations", remains stable in its "primary function": "to produce texts according to the rules of the [sc. this] art" (*Systematische* 13; trans. dsm). "Across millennia[,] rhetoric not only proved durable, but also flexible enough for being applied to ever new texts" (*Systematische* 13f.; trans. dsm). "Latin" being "the language of the supranational *respublica literaria* and its literary systems" ("Transfer" 275), Bloemendal glosses: "this polysystem [...] also consisted of several [...] subsystems functioning like networks" ("Transfer" 275); cf. remarks on other *linguae francae* ("Transfer" 286), and his essay herein.

12 Aristotle tenders universality as rhetoric's distinctive characteristic: it "may be defined as the faculty of discovering the possible means of persuasion in reference to any subject whatever. This is the function of no other of the arts, each of which is able to instruct and persuade in its own special subject [...] Rhetoric [...] appears to be able to discover the means of persuasion in reference to any given subject" (*Rhetoric* 14f., I.ii.1, 1355b); thereto, see Halliwell (237); Sansone (149); Sloane/Jost (1178). Cf. Garver: "Rhetoric is a method for dealing with a domain apparently beyond method" (41). Curtius notes the universal, anthropo-technical character of Aristotle's overall approach (cf. 156). Concerning rhetoric, Lausberg refers to a "universality of the *materia*" (*Handbuch* 49, §49; cf. §50; trans. dsm). Most sees a "potential claim to universality"—an "imperialism"—of both rhetoric and hermeneutics ("Rhetorik" 68; trans. dsm). Cf. Curtius' emphasis on "the Ancient ideal: rhetoric as the integrating component of education overall. This premise was shared by Cicero, Quintilian, Augustine" (86; trans. dsm). For similar claims re Early

The protean, partially latent traditions of rhetoric—as theory and practice—evince an interplay with, and applicability to, various related arts.[13] As a flexible

Modern times, see Plett: "rhetoric [...] extends to [...] all of the *studia humanitatis*" ("Rhetorik der Renaissance" 3; trans. dsm), functioning as their "foundation" ("Evidentia" 255; trans. dsm).

13 See Feldman's essay herein. As to uses of rhetoric in "treatises on painting", see Blumenberg (*Schriften zur Technik* 241; trans. dsm; cf. *Geistesgeschichte* 67); for "Raphael's position in the history of visual eloquence", see Rubin (passim; here: 165), spec. "Vasari adopted a rhetoric of appreciation that placed Raphael in the 'discourse of letters'" (165; cf. 178); "Raphael's paintings provided a rhetoric of images, a figurative vocabulary and narrative structures that were the basis for pictorial communication for over three hundred years. The writings that promoted his reputation borrowed their terms, concepts and subdivisions from the rhetorical tradition. [...] Rhetorical language gave writing about art credibility as well as coherence. It also conditioned a sensitivity to style, order, ornament, decorum and invention" (166). See Plett for applications to music and the visual arts (*Systematische* 252). Sloane/Jost state: "rhet[oric] has periodically expanded to become not only a prominent but the overarching art of discourse, e.g., in the Roman Republic and throughout the Ren[aissance] in Europe. When this occurred, poetry itself was usually written and read by people for whom rhet[oric] was not only the major craft of composition but the general intellectual context for interpreting *all* matters of thinking, feeling, and acting" (1176). Generally, see Lausberg: "the relation of poetics to rhetoric [is] very intimate" (*Handbuch* 44, §35; trans. dsm); cf. Curtius (157f.). For the "kinship" of these "sister arts" (Plett "Evidentia" 258; trans. dsm; cf. "*Theatrum Rhetoricum*" 339; 341) spec. during Early Modern times, see Bloemendal's analysis of the poetics of Scaliger, Pontanus, Vossius, logging "close ties between literature ['Poesie'] and rhetoric" ("Poetiken" 206; trans. dsm); cf. Buck ("Einleitung" VIII; XV); Sloan[e] (passim); Heudecker/Wesche on the (German) Baroque (100; 103; 107f.). Eden emphasizes a "substantial overlapping between Chapter 25 of the *Poetics* [...] and portions of his [sc. Aristotle's] *Rhetoric*" ("Ancient Rhetorical Tradition" 60); cf. Plett, as to ch. 19 of the *Poetics* (*Systematische* 257). The nexus of dramatic poetics and rhetoric, the term 'rhetoric(al)' qua value judgment (spec. re drama), are both found in Aristotle: "Plot ['mythos'] [...] is the first principle and [...] soul of tragedy, while character ['éthe'] is secondary. [...] Tragedy is mimesis of action, and it is chiefly for the sake of the action that it represents the agents. Third in importance is thought ['diánoia']: that is, the capacity to say what is pertinent and apt ['tà enónta kaì tà harmóttonta'], which in formal speeches is the task of politics and rhetoric ['tes politikes kaì rhetorikes érgon']. The earliest poets made people speak politically ['politikos'], present day poets make them speak rhetorically ['rhetorikos']" ("Poetics" 52f., VI, 1450a–b); thereto, cf. Bers (178). Dockhorn demonstrates "how a rhetorical schema of dispositio is sustained in the aesthetics of the dramatic throughout the centuries" (83f.; trans. dsm), here spec. the Aristotelian "basic schema [...] 'πρᾶγμα, πάθος, ἦθος" as it "recurs from Scaliger to Schiller" (81; trans. dsm)—via, among others, Racine, Dryden, Hume, Lessing, Herder, Wordsworth (cf. 81–84; as to the latter three: 18–24). Marschall accentuates Aristotle's role in addressing "the interrelation of t[heater] and rhetoric" (514; trans. dsm). Cf. Booth: "Unlike many modern aestheticians, Aristotle never completely repudiates the rhetorical dimension of poetry. He [...] recognizes that [...] the poet [...] produce[s] effects on audiences. In exciting feelings [...], and in suggesting 'importance or its opposite', poetry is [...] closely related to rhetoric" (92). For the reception of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* after the fifteenth century, see Green (passim); he focuses on

set of highly mobile, universal (teachable, learnable, transferable) techniques floating in virtual networks, rhetoric enables and propels the production, circulation, reception, reproduction, and transformation of literary artifacts.[14] Expediting—and proving fruitful in—myriad applications throughout its more than two millennia of prevalence, the rhetorical *téchne* entertains a particularly symbiotic interrelation with drama.[15] Privileging the latter, Nietzsche asserts:

"the emergence of a renaissance interest in the role of the audience in persuasion" (19); as to the nineteenth, twentieth centuries, cf. Niehues-Pröbsting ("Anmerkungen" passim). For that of the *Poetics*, see Buck ("Einleitung" VII, VIIn.). Aristotle's *Poetics* is saturated with rhetorical terminology and a respective approach. Sansone highlights this for "[t]he distribution of the word εἰκός": "although the *Poetics* comprises only one percent of the Aristotelian corpus [...], it contains nearly 10 percent of the occurrences (25 out of 254) [...] of εἰκός"; in "the *Rhetoric*" (being longer) there are "51 occurrences": "The significance of these figures is that [...] the contriver of tragic plots must be [...] as concerned with probability as the orator in the law court, perhaps even more so" (168). In Aristotle, "εἰκός" (*Rhetoric* 26, I.ii.15, 1357a–b; cf. Freese 475) ties in with "εἰκὸς" in a poetic context via '*tò kathólou*'—including reference to the "πιθανόν" ("Poetics" 58–63, IX, 1451a–b). Cf. also "εἰκὸς" ("probably") in Gorgias (756f., 49.5); see Burckhardt (304); for the terms employed: "Neque enim refert an [...] pro veri simili probabilem credibilemve dicamus" (Quintilian *Oratoria 3–5*. 234, 4.2.31; cf. 244–249, 4.2.52–60); as to "*probabile, credibile, verisimile*", '*pithanón*', see Lausberg (*Elemente* 23f., §34–38); Most ("Rhetorik" 71). Cf. "εἰκός" in connection with '*phaínetai*' (given as "seems sensible") in a context pertaining to assumptions without the possibility of definitive knowledge (Plato "Phaedo" 216f., §7, 62C). Generally, see Hunter: "Plays operate, like rhetoric, in a world of [...] probability, in a world of verisimilitude (the mimetic equivalent of probability in logic) not verity" (115).

14 Cf. "cognoscere rhetoricam" (*Rhetorica* 2f., I.i.1). As to rhetoric's "universalistic" aspect, the learnability, teachability of this *téchne*, see Most ("Rhetorik" 68; trans. dsm); Niehues-Pröbsting ("Rhetorik" 45; 51); for Early Modern times, cf. Heudecker/Wesche (104). As to the cultural and theoretico-conceptual foundations of universalism, see Küpper's contribution to this volume.

15 For a diachronic perspective, see Eden's essay herein. Asmuth traces dramatico-rhetorical reciprocities (cf. *Dramenanalyse* passim; spec. 9f., 12, 25, 27, 42f., 51f., 70–78, 86f., 138, 160–166, 174, 187–189). As to Ancient times, cf. Sansone (passim). Dubischar traces the nexus of rhetoric and drama in Aeschylus (15–18), Sophocles (18–20), and stresses Euripides' "affinity for contemporary rhetoric" (21–27; here: 21; trans. dsm). As to the "ἀγὼν λόγων", he notes "that conflicts are frequently waged [and staged] in dramatic works" (14; trans. dsm; cf. 29), seeing Euripidean agonal scenes as "early paradigms for the mode of communication of debate" (15; trans. dsm). As to Euripides vis-à-vis the Sophistic movement (Gorgias), cf. Croally (221–227), spec. "tragedy, as it developed through the fifth century, became increasingly suffused by elements of sophistic thought" (226); he sees "tragedy as a rhetorical discourse related to, and informed by, the [...] concept of *peithō*. [...] truth [...] was constructed in terms of *peithō*, and [...] discourses were judged [...] on the basis of their power, their persuasiveness. Athenians were in Cleon's words 'spectators of speeches' (Thuc[ydides] 3.38.4: 'θεαταὶ τῶν λόγων')" (33f.; cf. Bers 181). Harding studies "the influence [...] of comic drama [...] on Greek rhetoric in style, vocabulary, technique and theme [...] examin[ing] the texts of the orators for echoes or

"Actor and orator: the former presupposed" (*KSA 7*. 758, 32[14]; trans. dsm).[16]

---

applications of Old Comedy in practice" (196). "Lysias [...] used many of the techniques of the comic dramatist – exaggeration, incongruity, parody, absurdity, the impossible [...] he [...] take[s] the comic hero off the stage and put[s] him in court" (206). As to Aeschines, Blume notes that the 'careers' of rhetor and actor evinced a certain professional permeability (81; cf. 80). For Aristophanes and rhetoric, see Dubischar (27f.); Kindermann (*Theaterpublikum der Antike* 99). While also treating Ancient drama (Aeschylus, Aristophanes), Crick uses both 'rhetoric' and 'drama' in an extensive sense (passim; spec. 9f.; 61; cf. 223–226). Sheppard shows an interplay in Plato: "[t]he *Symposium* [...] is a prose dialogue in which Plato uses the techniques of rhetoric in a highly dramatic way. Plato is implicitly criticizing comic drama, tragic drama and epideictic rhetoric and trying to show how the techniques of rhetoric can be used and combined with Socratic dialectic in both the grand style of tragedy and the simpler style of comedy to convey what he believes to be the truth" (39). Cf. Eden: "As both practiced and preached in the *Symposium*, philosophical discourse prevails because it is as dramatic as tragedy, as persuasive as sophistic oratory and as therapeutic as medicine" (*Friends* 54). For Early Modern times, see Hunter (passim); Skinner (*Forensic Shakespeare*; "Hobbes on Representation" 168); cf. Trüstedt (547; 551; 553). Reading "the rhetorical component in Shakespeare's work", Müllenbrock states: "the art of rhetoric, with its dialectical and actively dynamic element ['evinces'] an immediate affinity to [...] drama [...]. It is no coincidence that the theater was also labeled ['orator's academy'] during the Renaissance. Rhetoric and speech qua central dramatic instrument of expression are indeed closely related" (49; trans. dsm; cf. Marschall 518f.). Johnson's article on Rochester addresses the nexus of "Rhetoric and Drama" (passim), the links being to the epideictic ("simultaneously to mock and entertain"); to satire: "He unites the rhetorical and the dramatic in a persona who elicits our support but figures forth Rochester's satiric aims" (366); and to the agonal structure within: "The 'Satyr against Reason and Mankind' appears first of all to be a debate. [...] Rochester has created a declamation carefully organized on the principles of classical rhetoric" (367). As to the rhetorico-dramatic Jesuit *praxis*, cf. Fothergill-Payne (passim). For the French case: "the rhetorical elements in the language of literature in the seventeenth century are very strong. This is [...] the case with the oratorical works of Bossuet or Patru, where the precepts of rhetoric are directly applied, but it is also true of most of the *grands genres*, and particularly of tragedy. The theorists of the time often made the comparison between the actor and the orator; in practice there are many similarities between the speeches of formal rhetoric and the long tirades which form so large a part of these tragedies, where, in D'Aubignac's words, 'parler, c'est agir' [in the 1657 *La Pratique du théâtre*]. [...] the *récit* of classical tragedy often recalls the funeral oration" (France 2; cf. the ch. "Rhetoric and the Theatre", 30–36; see Barner 89; 103). Despite his anti-rhetorical bias (cf. 212f., §51; 220f., 221n.–222n., §53), Kant notes that 'eloquence' ("Beredsamkeit") may be linked to a 'pictorial (painterly, scenic) representation'—both in terms of the 'subject matter', and the 'objects' represented—within a (staged) 'play' (218, §52). In the same context, Kant—while separating eloquence from 'lyric poetry' ("Poesie")—seems to equate "malerischer" (qua scenic, pictorial) with "theatralischer" representation (218, §52). As regards the nexus of rhetoric and drama, de Man describes Kleist's *Über das Marionettentheater* (265–290; here spec. 269) as "a staged scene [...] of persuasion" (268).

16 For Nietzsche on rhetoric and drama (cf. *KSA 7*. 735, 30[10]; 756, 32[8], 32[10]; *KSA 2*. 437f., §144; 180f., §221); thereto, see Barner (3; 20). From a genealogico-diachronic viewpoint, Sansone

With theoretical and applied contributions from a Classicist, musicologico-operatic, (socio-)historical, linguistic, cultural and literary studies perspective, the present volume tenders interdisciplinary assessments of specific reciprocities between the systems of rhetoric and dramatic works of art. Tracing the *longue durée* of this nexus—highlighting its Ancient foundations and transformations, its Early Modern variants, as well as certain (conceptual) configurations enduring to this day—enables describing shifting degrees of rhetoricity.[17] Approaching it from decidedly interdisciplinary perspectives facilitates focusing on the rhetorical phenomena located beyond the textual plane (specifically *memoria*

---

wants "to entertain the possibility that rhetoric owes more to the drama than vice versa" (xi); he maintains "the pioneering role [...] tragedians [...] played in the development of formal speech" (6f.): "it was the revolutionary innovation represented by the development of the drama that inspired the creation of rhetorical theory" (20; cf. x); "Gorgias and Prodicus had more to learn from the poets of Attic tragedy than they could teach the dramatists" (184; cf. 126, 223). Harding has: "Demosthenes employed the techniques, themes and vocabulary of Old Comedy in his rhetoric to a greater extent than any of his predecessors" (210); he "was the unsurpassed master of the use of theatre in rhetoric, especially comic theatre" (214; cf. 212f.; 215f.). Referring to Aristotle (*Rhetoric* 344–349, III.i.3–7, 1403b), Sansone states: "From the frequent references to poetry in this passage, it is clear that Aristotle sees no fundamental difference between delivery as it relates to dramatic acting and as it relates to oratory" (13; cf. 12); cf. Garver (201; 208; 247). See Quintilian: "the delivery ['pronuntiatione'] must be designed ['accommodata'] to ensure that the judge takes in what is said as easily as possible" (*Oratoria 3–5*. 238f., 4.2.36). For the nexus of the orator and actor with respect to voice and persuasiveness, see Blume (105). On "[*t*]*he actor as orator*", cf. Plett ("*Theatrum Rhetoricum*" 338; trans. dsm), spec. that it is "with reference to the art of rhetoric" that Hamlet instructs the actors ("*Theatrum Rhetoricum*" 342; trans. dsm): his "*lectio ad actores* [...] presents the professional director, who develops a rhetorical theory of acting" ("*Theatrum Rhetoricum*" 362; trans. dsm; cf. Shakespeare *Hamlet* 287–292, III.ii.1–87).

17 For an influential Ancient transformation, see Branham, who (in a Lucianic context) speaks of "a histrionic sophistic literature" (2), "[t]he centrality of dramatic impersonation to sophistic performance" (3), "the preference of sophistic orators for themes with dramatic possibilities" (4): a "theatrical form of oratory [...] achieved [...] remarkable popularity in Lucian's time [...]. Its practitioners, appropriately characterized as 'concert orators', toured the great cities on the rim of the eastern Mediterranean from Athens to Alexandria, giving a variety of [...] elaborate [...] rhetorical performances. [...] A sophist's act [...] would typically involve reminiscence, by impersonation or evocative description, of legendary figures, places, or events and was acutely conscious of itself as theater, complete with dramatic entrances, flamboyant dress, interpretative gesturing, careful modulation of the voice, and [...] a shrewd sense for the audience's expectation" (3); cf. his ch. "The Rhetoric of Laughter" (9–63). For Early Modern times, Plett asserts: "Not only is rhetoric theatralized during the Renaissance, but theater [is] also rhetoricized" ("*Theatrum Rhetoricum*" 338; trans. dsm). As to "the rhetoricity of literature [...] in terms of a hermeneutics of production or reception", see Plett (*Systematische* 252; trans. dsm; cf. 250–254). Generally, cf. Jost/Sloane (1178).

and *actio*), including the description of a variety of acoustic and visual effects.[18] Tackling this synergetic interplay from various viewpoints and with diverse emphases, long-lasting and highly prolific processes of cross-fertilization between drama and rhetoric are rendered visible—at a theoretical and conceptual level, as well as in terms of the respectively effectual application.[19] This

18 See spec. Feldman's and Wesche's essays herein. Cf. Lausberg (*Handbuch* 42, §34); as well as these entries in the *Historical Dictionary of Rhetoric*: Asmuth on 'drama' ("Drama" passim; spec. 910; in trans. herein; cf. *Dramenanalyse* 187); Steinbrink on '*actio*' (passim); Rebmann on '*pronuntiatio*' (passim); Marschall on 'theater' (passim). For "actional evidence", see Plett ("*Theatrum Rhetoricum*" 330; trans. dsm; cf. 340). Cf. "Theory without practice in speaking is of little avail; from this you may understand that the precepts of theory here offered ought to be applied in practice" (*Rhetorica* 4f., I.i.1); the book's last sentence: "All these faculties we shall attain if we supplement the precepts of theory with diligent practice" (*Rhetorica* 411, IV.lvi.69). For the import of gesture in Medieval drama, the nexus of rhetorical *actio* and "German school theater", cf. Borcherdt (97; trans. dsm). As to the sidelining of these *partes* in the tradition, Vickers states: "Erasmus's rhetorical works [...] give very little space to *actio* (or *pronuntiatio*, gesture), and virtually dismiss *memoria*" (84). For the latter, see Sloane/Jost: "Rhyme was early considered not only a figure but a mnemonic device; so was the pithy form of eloquence known as *sententia*" (1180); "[t]he art of memory also became involved with the creation of [...] elaborate 'memory theaters' for the rapid recall of complex, even encyclopedic knowledge" (1180). As to rhetorical *memoria* in general, see Dockhorn (96–104). For a semiotic perspective on rhetorical *actio* and drama, cf. Fischer-Lichte, who—in a ch. on 'paralinguistic signs' (*Semiotik des Theaters 2*. 41–43)—notes that these had been "developed in Ancient rhetoric", and were "adopted by Baroque dramatic art for the most part. [...] like rhetoric[,] [the latter] aimed at arousing affects in the audience/spectators [...]. Seeing that rhetoric carefully describes both the various affects and the paralinguistic signs indicating them[, while] distinguish[ing] them in a significant manner, it [immediately] suggested itself [...] to [use rhetoric] as a basis and to transfer its rules to the theater" (*Semiotik des Theaters 2*. 43; trans. dsm). For the 'recourse to Ancient rhetoric' in "the constituting of gestural signs", see Fischer-Lichte (*Semiotik des Theaters 2*. 53; trans. dsm). For the "pantomimus games" as linked to (funereal) oratory, cf. Kindermann (*Theaterpublikum der Antike* 181; trans. dsm); as to Ancient mime, see Blume (128–131); Aust/Haida/Hein (37–41). For a philosophical assessment of pantomime in terms of acting, see Plessner ("Anthropologie des Schauspielers" 208–211), including a reference to Kleist ("Anthropologie des Schauspielers" 217); also for facial expression generally ("Deutung des mimischen Ausdrucks" passim).

19 See Asmuth's article ("Drama" passim; in trans. herein; *Dramenanalyse* passim). Booth—"pursuing the author's means of controlling his reader"—stresses the "rhetorical resources available to the writer [...] to impose his fictional world upon the reader", spec. in terms of "the disguised rhetoric of modern fiction" ("Preface", n.pag., equivalent to v). He uses both "rhetoric" and 'drama' in a flexible sense (cf. "Preface", n.pag., equivalent to v; 100f.; 104; 106; 161; spec. 162), e.g. when speaking of 'dramatized and undramatized narrators' (cf. 151f.; 211f.; for the latter re rhetoric, see Sloane 464); "In many completely dramatic works with no choral commentary [...], there are scenes which are obviously rhetorical in intent. [...] the function [...] is [...] to make the play more easily intelligible [...] [with a view to] the problem of convincing the spectators"

interaction of rhetorical techniques and theatrical performance is particularly visible in a distributed *mise-en-scène* of argument "in utramque partem vel in

(Booth 101); in application: "The subplot seems to have been invented as a way of heightening Lear's tragedy, [...] hence it is [...] rhetorical" (104). Generally, Booth seems to equate "the rhetorical dimension in literature" with what is effectual: "*any* successful scene" (105). Similarly Burke, when speaking of "dramatic 'efficiency'" ("Shakespearean Persuasion" 110), or "effective rhetorical images" ("Rhetoric and Poetics" 305); Plett has: "rhetorically, i.e. with a view to effect" ("Rhetorik der Renaissance" 10; trans. dsm). Worthen focuses on "modern British and American drama", on "the sense of theatricality it demands, [...] the audience it both reflects and creates"—the latter qua "cast[ing] the spectators [...] as part of the spectacle" (1): "The scene of modern drama is a rhetorical arena in which texts are staged as theater, and in which individuals are cast as spectators" (11). With regard to Chekhov, O'Neill, Pinter, Shepard, Yeats, Eliot, Beckett, Soyinka, Worthen describes techniques of "the mise-en-scène, [...] the arrangement and disposition of the audience" (1; cf. passim), analyzing "how the theater produces and qualifies the position(s) the audience comes to occupy. Drama in production defines and legitimates a certain range of interpretive behavior and experience as the role the audience performs—this is [...] the rhetoric of theater" (5). Pfister reads drama with "recourse to [...] Jakobson's model of linguistic communication" (152; trans. dsm; cf. 30, 50, 151–168, 213), stressing the 'polyfunctionality of dramatic language' (cf. 151; 156; 168; Jakobson 53). The "CONATIVE function", an "[o]rientation toward the addressee" (spec. in the "vocative and imperative", Jakobson 67), pertains to rhetoric qua 'aiming to persuade': "forms of dramatic speech, in which the appellative [sc. conative] function predominates, render particularly evident [...] the generally applicable character of dramatic speech qua action: persuasion and command represent speech acts [...] [that] actively alter the situation" (Pfister 158; trans. dsm; cf. 160, 213); hence 'the conative function has a tendency to dominate in dramatic speech': "dialogs of convincing and persuading represent all but obligatory structural elements over long periods of the history of drama" (158; trans. dsm; cf. 160, 168). By recourse to *Emilia Galotti*'s climax, Pfister shows that Lessing's 'aversion' to rhetoric qua (Baroque) *elocutio* does not translate into a 'de-rhetoricized' drama (158–161; cf. Lessing 76f., V.vii.‹148–150›). Similarly, Asmuth suggests that Lessing, for all his "refusal of 'rhetorical language'" (*Dramenanalyse* 77; trans. dsm), is indeed an exemplar of "the possibility of a dialogics, of a rhetoric of dialog" (*Dramenanalyse* 78; trans. dsm). In the ch. "Drama and Rhetoric", Pfister proposes to "copiously tap [...] the heuristic potential of rhetoric" (213; trans. dsm), hence suggests utilizing "the descriptive repertoire of rhetoric" for analyzing "dramatic dialog"; and "not only, if the respective text" (in terms of its poetics) "had already been conditioned by a rhetorical system of norms and forms. For there is an affinity of intention between the rhetorical diction and the Classical form of dialogical speaking in drama: both wish to 'influence [and] change the situation by means of words' [(Berghahn)]" (212; trans. dsm). Plett propounds a 'rhetorico-historical hermeneutics' (cf. *Systematische* 13), spec. for drama, reading parts of Shakespeare's *A Midsummer-Night's Dream* (cf. *Systematische* 95–98), *Julius Caesar* (see *Systematische* 166–171); as to Brutus' oration (cf. Mayfield "Variants of *hypólepsis*" part III.iii), Plett notes that "[t]he overall impression is that of a forensic speech" (*Systematische* 167f.; trans. dsm), and states that "rhetorical questions and appeals [...] already reckon with the reaction of the audience" (*Systematische* 169; trans. dsm). This may be generalized for drama (*de re*).

plures" (Quintilian *Oratoria 3–5*. 156, 3.11.2).[20] Moreover, drama effectually enacts

20 As to the (forensico-)rhetorical technique of (hypothetically) arguing on the other, or several sides of a question, cf. Curtius (78); Eden (*Rhetorical Tradition* 8); Oesterreich (863f.); on the basic tenet of "*audiatur et altera pars*", see Burckhardt (310; there negated re Lysias). The rhetorico-theatrical *locus classicus* is found in Cicero: "when he [sc. the client] has departed, in my own person and with perfect impartiality I play three characters, myself, my opponent and the arbitrator", "tres personas unus sustineo summa animi aequitate, meam, adversarii, iudicis" (*Orator I–II*. 274f., II.xxiv.102); thereto, see Hobbes (*Leviathan* 112, I.xvi.80); Skinner ("Hobbes on Representation" 162); Trüstedt (551; 553f.). Concerning "the cornerstone of sophistic thought, that either side of any question can be argued with equal success", Branham remarks that "[o]n this model, 'truth' is nothing more than a rhetorical effect" (70). Cf. D. Laertius on Protagoras: "He was the first to [...] emphasize the importance of seizing the right moment ['kairou'], to institute contests in debating ['lógon agonas'], and to teach rival pleaders the tricks of their trade. [...] he was the father of the whole tribe of eristical ['eristikon'] disputants now so much in evidence" (464f., IX.52); "Protagoras was the first to maintain that there are two sides to every question ['dýo lógous einai'], opposed to each other, and he even argued in this fashion, being the first to do so" (462f., IX.51); he is said to have written a '*Téchne eristikon*', followed in the list by one on "Wrestling ['Perì páles']" (466f., IX.55). Generally thereto, cf. Bers (179). Isocrates states: "oratory is of such a nature that it is possible to discourse on the same subject matter in many different ways" (123, 42.7–8). The Platonic Socrates emphatically employs the technique of hypothetically taking other perspectives for purposes of persuasion: "And if you are not convinced ['peíthei'] in that way [...] see ['sképsai'] if you don't agree when you look at it this way ['skopouméno syndóxe']" ("Phaedo" 253–255, §18, 73B); later: "Look ['skópei'] at the matter in this way" ("Phaedo" 258f., §19, 74B). As to Socrates, Cicero discerns a "multiplex ratio disputandi rerumque varietas", while the poly-perspectivally agonal mode is also accentuated in terms of content: "de vita et moribus rebusque bonis et malis quaerere" (*Tusculan* 434f., V.iv.10–11). Cf. Seneca, in an ethical context: "Multa enim sunt, quae in utramque partem trahere possunt" (*Ep. 66–92*. 62, LXX.11; for the technique being negated, cf. *Ep. 1–65*. 188–191, XXVI.5–7; here: 188f., XXVI.6). Cicero states: "mihi semper Peripateticorum Academiaeque consuetudo de omnibus rebus in contrarias partes disserendi [...] quod esset ea maxima dicendi exercitatio; qua princeps usus est Aristoteles, deinde eum qui secuti sunt" (*Tusculan* 154, II.iii.9). Lucian 'dramatizes' this in the case of "Intemperance *v*. the Academy" (109, §13), where "Hermes" has the latter act as advocate for its very opponent before making its own case, seeing that "'[t]he Academy [...] is always ready to argue on both sides and trains herself to be able to speak eloquently both pro and con" (115, §15). Aristotle states: "the orator should be able to prove ['peíthein'] opposites"—as a defensive, anticipatory technique ("to counteract false arguments", *Rhetoric* 10–13, I.i.12, 1355a); thereto, cf. Halliwell (237). As regards the application to drama, Kindermann notes the accentuation (via representation) of "the relative validity of both sides [sc. parties]" in Euripides, stressing the potentially "uncomfortable effect of the Euripidean adoption of the standpoint of both sides", in which "dialogic structure the influence of contemporary ['Sophistic'] rhetoric with its tactics of persuasion was most conspicuous" (*Theaterpublikum der Antike* 80; trans. dsm; cf. 81). For the "δισσοὶ λόγοι, the 'double speeches' [...] *in utramque partem*" in Euripides, see Dubischar (25; with different accentuation, cf. Bers 179f.; generally, see Kranz "Δισσοὶ λόγοι" passim; Gomperz 126–200). For the Early Modern period, cf. Mack: "It was one of the aims of

the rhetorical desideratum of '*evidentia*'.[21]

---

rhetorical education to develop the ability to speak forcefully on both sides of the question [...]. The divided soliloquy, one of the characteristic features of Elizabethan prose romance, is an opportunity for the display of this skill" ("Rhetoric in Use" 126f.). Hunter states: "The relation between rhetoric and drama and in the dialogue form raises the issue of the *argumentum in utramque partem* as a rhetorical technique particularly apposite to both" (112); he specifies "that persuasion is what plays aim at", while "the audience" is "not [...] simply persuaded serially by one person", since "the ethos of the individual character in drama is never an isolated phenomenon"—terming this "the effect of ethical polyphony" (113). "The polyphony of truths and standards that a drama sets before us is certainly a proper part of the persuasive means the dramatist uses" (113). Cf. "Ciceronian tactics drawn from judicial rhet[oric] seemed to fire the poets' imaginations [...]: arguing *in utramque partem* [...] became a kind of lawyerly embracing of contraries [...] reappearing in the argumentative [...] fabric of Tudor poetry and drama" (Sloane/Jost 1179). Norbrook stresses the political implications of the technique (146). As per Kahn, "the early humanists' resistance to theory" aligns with "their insistence on intersubjective dialogue or rhetoric *in utramque partem* as the model of human cognition and action" ("Resistance" 388). For a Baroque formulation, see Gracián: "Hanse de discurrir las materias por entrambas partes, y rebolverse por el uno y otro lado" (*Oráculo manual* 201, §180; cf. 226f., §227; 257, §294). Repeatedly accentuating a rhetorico-poetic "area of overlap" ("Rhetoric and Poetics" 295; cf. 302, 305), Burke nuances: "where a rhetorician might conceivably argue the cause of Love rather than Duty, or the other way round, in Poetics a profound dramatizing of the conflict itself would be enough" ("Rhetoric and Poetics" 296). Generally, the technique of arguing 'also on the other side(s)' is conducive to a dramatization of verbal *agón*, and so also links to rhetorico-dramatic *refutatio*, to metrico-theatrical techniques such as *stichomythia*; thereto, see Eden's, Bloemendal's, Wesche's contributions herein.

21 For '*evidentia*' in a rhetorico-theatrical application, see Shaw (passim); generally, cf. Asmuth (*Dramenanalyse* 12); Gil ("Rhetorische Figuren" 28; 35); Webb/Weller (409); Cornilliat: "*enargeia* [...] *evidentia* [...] 'showing' vividly with words [...] the art of verbal 'painting'" ("Ornament" 985). Spang stresses the persuasiveness of rhetorico-dramatic *evidentia* (cf. 213f.). Boriaud/Schouler refer to rhetorical "*enárgeia*" as a 'means' for "transforming the audience into spectators" (794; trans. dsm). With regard to Ophelia's death as described by Gertrude (Shakespeare *Hamlet* 373–375, IV.vii.162–183), Plett notes that this is "the paradigm of a rhetorical description", whose "elocutional means form the verbal setting for a drama that the queen [...] re-experiences" ("*Theatrum Rhetoricum*" 353; trans. dsm). On "vivid description", see Sansone (35f.; as related to 'urbanity' in Aristotle, cf. Heeney 23; for an application in Leiris, see Strätling 75f.). Plett (cf. "Evidentia" passim; "*Theatrum Rhetoricum*" 347–351) develops the rhetorical concept of '*evidentia*' ('*enárgeia*')—the "rhetoric of presence" ("Evidentia" 255; trans. dsm; cf. passim), "rhetorical evidence" ("Evidentia" 263; trans. dsm)—as a decisive link between rhetoric and poetics, to other (visual) arts such as emblematics, painting (see "Evidentia" 264; 267f.; 270; cf. Stolt 78–129), and aural ones, such as music (cf. Plett "Evidentia" 270f.; "Vorwort" VI); he précises: "in the Early Modern age[,] *evidentia*[,] respectively *enargeia*[,] marks not only one elocutional concept of rhetoric among others, but the foundational constituent of all verbal arts" ("Evidentia" 272; trans. dsm)—concluding that "*evidentia* contributes to [the fact] that rhetoric is poetized" ("Evidentia" 273; trans. dsm). Eden stresses the Ancient origins of *evidentia* in the

The contributors to this volume have worked on rhetoric and drama in various ways. The following will briefly highlight selected aspects from their previous research, and then précis their essay herein; the respective abstracts aim at remaining as proximate to the texts they describe as possible.

Eden's monograph *Poetic and Legal Fiction in the Aristotelian Tradition* is expressly concerned with the present nexus:

> the methods of dramatic poetry and forensic oratory, as conceived by Aristotle, overlap in many essential details—ranging from the most logical way to organize the presentation of events, to the psychological methods of arousing the appropriate feelings in the audience, to the even more practical details of acting or, as Aristotle calls it, *hypokrisis*. [...] In tragedy as in legal oratory, the object represented is human action, usually past action and often a *hamartia*, an error in judgment. The tragic poet and the forensic orator, equally bound by the demands of probability, both face the task of transforming [...] past action [...] from a random and inexplicable series of isolated events into a logical sequence of cause and effect. [...] the spectators at a theatrical performance or the jury at a legal trial witness, as if with their own eyes, an action that has been skillfully represented. (*Poetic and Legal Fiction* 4f.).[22]

---

genus iudiciale: "The poet [...] makes his audience feel as if they were *eyewitnesses* to the scene so imaginatively recreated" (*Poetic and Legal Fiction* 4); "Quintilian [...] advises the forensic orator to persuade his judge by transforming his own vivid impressions of the events in question into rhetorical images with the same vividness. In this way, the orator will seem to show (*ostendere*) rather than simply to narrate (*dicere*) the events as they occurred; and the judge, in turn, will seem to see these events as if he were an eyewitness, rather than merely hear them told. By virtue of this *enargic* or *evidential* quality of the forensic image, the orator influences the judgments and consequent action of his judge. This technique [...] is not exclusive to the law courts. It also belongs to the dramatic stage" (*Poetic and Legal Fiction* 179f.). As to the employment of the realm "[o]utside language", Eden links dramatic *praxis* to 'inartificial' rhetorical proofs (cf. Aristotle *Rhetoric* 14f., I.ii.2, 1355b): "[a]s palpable proof—the bloody knife, the torn cloak, the scar—the *sēmeion* is especially useful in arousing the emotions of the audience, bringing the physical reality of the deed right before their eyes (*Rhetoric*, 2.8.6)" (Eden "Ancient Rhetorical Tradition" 72). For the "rhetorical term meaning distinctness and clarity" in connection with the "peculiarly English sense of the word 'evidence'", see Hutson (*Invention of Suspicion* 25). As regards the nexus of *evidentia* and *mímesis*, cf. the notion of the '*speculum vitae*': "the drama of the 16th century [...] [often] defines itself as [a] 'mirror'/*speculum*" (Titzmann 387; trans. dsm). Cf. Fuhrmann on a respective Ciceronian passage (86f.). For "*imitatio vitae*" qua "'acted to the life'", "'lively action'" in the Renaissance, see Plett ("*Theatrum Rhetoricum*" 340). As to "what [...] might make one kind of dramatic fiction seem more 'lifelike' than another", cf. Hutson (*Invention of Suspicion* 6; spec. 104–145).

22 Eden glosses: "It is no coincidence that the Renaissance *hypocrite* originates in the Greek theater, the Renaissance *actor* in the Roman law court" (*Poetic and Legal Fiction* 5). Skinner investigates "the place of the *ars rhetorica* in the history of Renaissance culture", spec. the extent

Another focus of Eden's work stresses: "rhetoric itself is first and foremost the art of accommodation" (*Rhetorical Tradition* 14; cf. 2), since "the fundamentally rhetorical task" is that of "accommodating the speech to the demands of the particular occasion: its time, place, audience, speaker" (*Rhetorical Tradition* 66).[23] These factors conduce to a consideration of the rhetoric of drama in terms of its production and reception; from the playwright's perspective: "Adept in the art of persuasive speaking, the dramatist can endow his tragic characters with varying capacities both to say what they mean and to convince their audiences that they mean what they say" ("Ancient Rhetorical Tradition" 72).[24] Hermeneutic

---

to which "the dramaturgy ['in several of Shakespeare's plays'] is extensively drawn from classical and Renaissance treatises on judicial rhetoric"—leading him to characterize them as downright "forensic plays" (*Forensic Shakespeare* 1); cf. his reference to Eden (*Forensic Shakespeare* 237n.). As to the nexus of forensic oratory and drama, see the volume ed. by Kahn/Hutson (passim): therein Wilson (passim), Hutson ("Reading the 'Body Politic'" passim); cf. the latter's monograph, spec. that "the forensic rhetoric of Roman New Comedy", which "drives the action of the Latin comedies of Plautus and Terence", proved crucial to these rhetorico-judicial poetics of drama (*Invention of Suspicion* 3; cf. 7f., 146–172). For Ancient forensic oratory, see also Harris (passim); Trüstedt (547).

23 As to the *aptum* ("*accommodatum*", "*decorum*", '*prépon*'), see Lausberg (*Handbuch* 144, §258; cf. *Elemente* 44, §102). See Eden: "In matters of style, this accommodative function is served by the principle called *to prepon* by Aristotle [...] and *decorum* by the Latin tradition [...] Cicero defines eloquence as the ability to practice *decorum*, defined [...] as the ability to accommodate the occasion, taking account of times, places, and persons: [...] *Is erit ergo eloquens, qui ad id quodcumque decebit poterit accommodare orationem*" (*Rhetorical Tradition* 26); "He [...] will be eloquent who can adapt his speech to fit all conceivable circumstances" (Cicero "Orator" 399, xxxvi.123). Cf. Quintilian's formula: "ut quid quoque loco prosit", "what is best in any given situation" (*Oratoria 3–5*. 236f., 4.2.33). For the "omnipotent criterion of French Classicism, that of *décence*, of decorum", including Diderot's reaction to it, see Szondi (102; trans. dsm).

24 Eden stresses the pertinence of "*accommodatio*" (qua "*oikonomia*") to "*dispositio*" in the sense of a "more devious type of arrangement" ("Erasmus' Later Works" 93; cf. 93n.; *Rhetorical Tradition* 42n.). Green puts the process of accommodation in parrhesiastic terms: "Once your auditor thinks you love him, you can tell him anything" (7); he gives this as a restatement of "Augustine, *In Joannem*, 7.8": "Ama, & dic quod vis" (22n.). As to rhetoric qua persuasion, see the Aristotelian *locus classicus*: "the whole business of Rhetoric is to influence opinion [dóxan]" (*Rhetoric* 346f., III.i.5, 1404a; cf. 347n.); for an Early Modern uptake thereof, see Green (9). The overall tendency applies also to spec. parts: "A Narrative is an exposition, designed to be persuasive ['utilis ad persuadendum'], of an action done or deemed to be done" (Quintilian *Oratoria 3–5*. 234f., 4.2.31). For the nexus of rhetoric qua persuasion and theater, see Scaliger: "An verò omnibus his, Philoſophicæ, Ciuili, Theatrali, vnus demum finis propoſitus fit? Ita ſané eſt. vnus enim idémque omnium finis, perſuaſio"; "Bene dicit autem, vt perſuadeat" (2, I.i); "eſt enim finis omnium ſuaſio, quid enim aliud oratio, quàm fidem facit? Hoc autem eſt ſuadere" (3, I.i). Hobbes asserts: "*eloquence*, whose end, as all the masters of rhetoric teach us, is not truth ['non veritas'] (except by chance ['nisi per accidens']), but victory ['sed victoria']; and whose

and poetic applications are traced in Paul—incisively christened "master-rhetorician and advocate of accommodation" (*Rhetorical Tradition* 77); in Plutarch, who "outspokenly considers fiction itself an accommodation" (*Rhetorical Tradition* 34); and in Erasmus.[25] Accordingly, Eden accentuates "the accommodative function of all interpretation" (*Rhetorical Tradition* 66).

---

property is not to inform ['non docere'], but to allure ['sed suadere']" (*Man and Citizen* 231, X.11; *Elementa philosophica de cive* 175, X.xi; spelling accommodated; cf. Blumenberg "Annäherung" 428); for a similar emphasis, see Plato's invective against rhetoric, branded as striving "to win the victory ['nikan dynaménen'], whether the pleas concerned be just or unjust" (*Laws VII–XII*. 470f., 937E, XI; cf. 937E–938A). While disinclined to agree, Hunter refers to "Stanley Fish" as having had "the courage (or impudence) to bring criticism into line with traditional rhetoric and argue that the aim of literary criticism is not truth but victory" (103). Generally, Most stresses "the central aim of rhetoric, that of persuasion" ("Rhetorik" 69; cf. 71); cf. Plett (*Systematische* 36f.). Toohey sees "persuasion as the *sine qua non* of the rhetorical occasion" (163). Nietzsche cautions: "Yet does the 'attainment' pertain to the definition? No. Even if the aim is not attained, there still is rhetoric" (*KSA 7*. 735, 30[10]; trans. dsm). The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* clarifies that the deliberative genus is concerned with both "persuasion and dissuasion" (*Rhetorica* 5, I.ii.2). Burke mentions "the persuasive and dissuasive resources of rhetoric" ("Rhetoric and Poetics" 296; cf. "Shakespearean Persuasion" 111). Generally, see France's pointed formulation: "rhetoric [...] means the giving of form to one's material, form which is intended [...] to persuade" (1). As to etymological ramifications, see Niehues-Pröbsting: "True to its semantic origin, the term 'pistis' indicates [...] a work of the 'peitho'" ("Glauben" 13); cf. Carey (26); Bers on "the 'making sweet' suggested by the Latin word *persuadeo*, the origin of the English word" (188).

25 For Paul, see spec. *1Cor* 9:19–22; cf. Gracián's (Jesuit) variant: "hásele de hablar a cada uno en su lenguaje" (*Oráculo manual* 233, §240; cf. 145, §77; see Küpper "Jesuitismus" 428f.; 429n.; Mayfield *Artful Immorality* 218; 256n.). In an accommodative accentuation, Erasmus deems Paul and Jesus "master-rhetoricians" (Eden "Erasmus' Later Works" 91; cf. 95). "Plutarch understands reading as a process of rendering the text familiar. Literary interpretation is [...] a process of accommodation, of making oneself at home" (*Rhetorical Tradition* 41). In Erasmus, Eden discerns a Renaissance (re)emphasis of accommodation: "Decorum [...], adapted from rhetorical composition to the demands of interpretation, constitutes the first rule of Erasmian hermeneutics"—facilitated by the humanist's recourse to the 'rhetorico-forensic principle of equity' ("Erasmus' Later Works" 96); the latter's "mitigating power" is "to correct the rigor of the law by accommodating its universal statement to the particularities of the individual case—a form of accommodation that relies on the legal fiction of intentionality" ("Erasmus' Later Works" 96). Another focal point of Eden's research ties in here, the "*scriptum/voluntas* controversy" ("Erasmus' Later Works" 99; cf. "Ancient Rhetorical Tradition" 76; 77; *Rhetorical Tradition* 11f.; 57; 87): "*Scriptum/voluntas* belongs to the orator's arsenal of proof exploited during the first stage of rhetorical activity, that of invention" ("Erasmus' Later Works" 100). In a diachronic conceptual overview, she shows the influence of Ancient rhetoric on Paul, Augustine, Erasmus, scrutinizing accommodative alterations in the terms applied: "Under cover of a new terminology [...] Paul [...], and not Augustine, is responsible for changing the terms. In his efforts to engage his Jewish constituency, Paul renames the first controversy—which in Greek is *rhēton/dianoia*—

With reference to Antiquity and Early Modern times, Eden's contribution to the present volume traces the diachronic and trans-generic application of the rhetorico-dramatic technique of *refutatio*—thus complementing her aforesaid emphasis on rhetoric qua accommodation with a focus on its agonal potentials.[26] In Attic tragedy, the Platonic dialogs, and Shakespeare's plays, she discerns structural reciprocities between the theater and courts of law—between rhetorical composition, forensic procedure, and dramatic *praxis*.[27] Focusing particularly on the refutative, adversarial, verbally agonistic aspects of both oratory and drama, Eden describes the theoretical, dramatico-dynamic potentials of refutation itself, as well as its trans-generically expedient employment in drama, dialog, and *essai*.[28] Specifically, she stresses the possibilities inherent in various devices of adversarial and duration-related alternation, such as *stichomythia*.[29] With regard

gramma/pneuma, terms familiar to Jewish law. Augustine's Latin translates these terms—*gramma* and *pneuma*—as *littera* and *spiritus*. The spiritual reading, as Augustine defines it, contrasts with the literal in grasping the intention, the *voluntas* of the *scriptor*, not just his words; and that intention throughout is *caritas* or love. [...] *caritas* Christianizes the values of *aequitas* or equity" ("Erasmus' Later Works" 101; cf. "Augustinian Hermeneutics" 51; 51n.; 59n.; *Rhetorical Tradition* 57; 87).

26 Blumenberg describes "the rhetorical function" as "evoking effects ranging between provocation and familiarity" (*Legitimität* 115; trans. dsm). See Burke's formulation of the complementarity between *agón* and accommodation: "rhetoric was developed by the use of language for purposes of cooperation and competition. It served to form appropriate attitudes that were designed to induce corresponding acts (the *flectere* or *movere* of Cicero's third office)" ("Rhetoric and Poetics" 296).

27 Cf. Sheppard: "Whereas both epideictic rhetoric and drama were directed to a mass audience, the speeches in the *Symposium* are delivered to a small, select group" (28; cf. 31, 32, 34f., 39); even so, "the *Symposium* is also concerned with rhetoric, especially epideictic rhetoric" (29). "Drama is [...] part of the *Symposium* in a [...] fundamental way: the dialogue itself, like many Platonic dialogues, is dramatic" (31). Similarly, Eden notes its "rhetorical contest [...] the narrative and dramatic settings" (*Friends* 37; cf. 39, 52, 54).

28 For an example from Ancient comedy, see Aristophanes' "Clouds", spec. the altercation between the 'Better (Decent)' and 'Worse (Sophistic) Argument' personified (128–159, v.889–1111; cf. Dubischar 28; Lowe 41f.; Gomperz 136f.). As to the (agonal) dynamics of staged rhetoric in general, cf. "Persuasion [...] must encounter resistance" (Bers 184).

29 The latter links Eden's essay to Bloemendal's contribution, to Wesche's analyses of stichomythic techniques in Gryphius (both herein). Cf. Sansone: "such rapid forms of exchange as stichomythia and antiphonal lament [were] techniques that can be seen already fully developed in the earliest surviving tragedy, Aeschylus' *Persians*" (15). For this technique ("skirmishes [consisting] of sententiae") in Baroque drama, see Asmuth (*Dramenanalyse* 163; trans. dsm). Generally, Gorgias speaks of "the compelling contests of words" (759, 49.13), accentuating the agonal aspect: "λόγων ἀγῶνας [...] λόγων ἀμίλλας" (758, 49.13). As regards the German '*Wortkampf*', see Stolt's respective volume (passim).

to the intratextual addressees, her diachronic synopsis retraces a continuous reduction of the audience, culminating in Montaigne's Socratico-essayistic practice of *auto-refutatio*—internalizing the (forensic) *agón*, dramatically setting the self against itself.

In previous research, Feldman scrutinizes the exemplarily rhetorical phenomenon of Early Modern operatic castrati. In the eighteenth century reception, castrati—in addition to representing extravagantly artificial *personae* themselves (cf. 178f.)—were often considered to 'excessively' "ornament" (187; cf. 188) also their musical renderings, thereby flouting the *aptum*, and (indirectly) the rhetorical virtue of *perspicuitas*.[30] The respective critique utilizes formulations

30 For the notion and "conceptual history of [the term] '*persona*'", see Blumenberg ("Wirkungspotential" 31, 31n.; trans. dsm; cf. "Epochenschwelle" 102), spec. his reference to "expressions such as *personam agere, induere, mutuare, ferre*" ("Epochenschwelle" 102); Fuhrmann adds: "appetere [...] capere [...] sumere [...] suscipere [...] imponere [...] induere [...] gerere [...] ferre [...] mutare [...] abicere [...] ponere [...] deponere [...] detrahere" (88n.); he states: "The figurative usage, that is[,] the meaning persona = role, character in life [...] evinces several typical areas. These are mainly 'systems', which are similar to theater in that a certain 'ensemble' with respectively specific roles acts in them, as well: [...] the judicial system [...] the state [...] the society [...] the family [...]. The [figurative] transition from the theater to the court was particularly effortless: for[,] here as there[,] there were actions in the emphatic sense (agere, actio, actor) [...] fixed roles, and [...] the entirety – from the first to the fifth act in drama, from the complaint or summons to the sentence in the lawsuit – [...] could only emerge from a conjoint, reciprocal [...], interdependent action" (88; trans. dsm). Cf. Cicero (*Duties* 98f., I.xxviii.97; 108f., I.xxx.107; 116–119, I.xxxii.114–115; *Orator I–II*. 274f., II.xxiv.102); Horace (466f., v.192); Hobbes (*Leviathan* 112, I.xvi.80–81); thereto, see Skinner ("Hobbes on Representation" passim; spec. 161f., 168, 180n.), Trüstedt (passim; spec. 547, 551, 553). Generally, cf. Nietzsche (*KSA 11*. 438, 34[57]); Hirzel (passim; spec. 41); Fuhrmann (passim); Barner (131); Asmuth (*Dramenanalyse* 90f.); Boriaud/Schouler (passim; spec. 790, 797f.); Oesterreich (passim; spec. 862f.); Hartmann (811); Wesche (2109). Cicero links the playing of a *persona* (performing a function) on stage and in life to the rhetorical *aptum*: having stated that one should follow the actors in choosing "not the best plays, but the ones best suited ['accommodatissimas'] to their talents", he refers to it again in the same paragraph ("aptissimi") to stress that if one be unable to "perform" one's *persona* (role) "with propriety ['decore']", one should "at least [do so] with as little impropriety ['minime indecore facere'] as possible" (*Duties* 116f., I.xxxi.114). A particularly striking literary *persona* publicly alloying rhetoric and drama is 'Diogenes the Cynic': "He was going into a theatre ['θέατρον'], meeting face to face those who were coming out, and being asked why, 'This', he said, 'is what I practise doing all my life'" (D. Laertius 66f., VI.64; cf. Mayfield *Artful Immorality* 39; 39n.; 308n.; 412); in this respect, see Branham, describing '*ho kýon*' as "a self-dramatizing iconoclast" (52), displaying "the polish of a self-consciously rhetorical practice" (54). D. Laertius emphasizes the Diogenical capacity for (unorthodox forms of) persuasion (cf. 60f., VI.59; 76f., VI.74–75). As to "rhetorical[,] [...] credible mise-en-scène of self", a "plausible modeling of one's own persona" in general, see Oesterreich (863; trans. dsm).

and criteria suggesting a rhetorical assessment of music, or a transferal of rhetorical categories (in terms of *elocutio*, specifically the *ornatus*) to this realm.[31] As Feldman demonstrates, critical views were ill at ease with the suavely persuasive, aurally 'seductive' music of castrati—finding fault with an alleged lack of content.[32] They were seen to be "[a]ngling to seduce spectators' ears at the expense of their hearts" (187)—a valuative tendency mirroring a groundswell of the antagonism between philosophy and the Sophists *de re*.[33] In addition, the very *personae* of the castrati were now seen as 'walking incongruities': "The disparity between their persons and those they represented had [...] started to become

31 As to this rhetorical value, Eden stresses "Aristotle's theory of style [...] in its commitment to clarity and perspicuity (*Rhetoric*, 3.2.1)" ("Ancient Rhetorical Tradition" 73). Rationalistic discourses tend to emphasize this specific virtue, while devaluing the *rhetoriké téchne*: "['if we would speak of things as they are, we must allow, that all the art of rhetoric, besides order and clearness, all the artificial and figurative application of words eloquence hath invented, are for nothing else but to insinuate wrong ideas, move the passions [...] and therefore [...] they are certainly, in all discourses that pretend to inform or instruct, wholly to be avoided' (*Essai Concerning Human Understanding* III, 10, 34)" (Locke qtd. in: Küpper *Diskurs-Renovatio* 457n.–458n.); generally, cf. Plett ("Rhetorik der Renaissance" 9). As to "Kant's [...] locus classicus of a contempt for rhetoric", see Niehues-Pröbsting ("Rhetorik" 49; trans. dsm; cf. 50); the reference is to Kant (219–222, §53; spec. 221n.–222n.); cf. Bender/Wellbery ("Rhetoricality" 18f.).

32 See Blumenberg, *de re*: "Aesthetically[,] this holds good for times of 'Realism', for all sorts of naturalism: to be able to afford [the] waiving [of] rhetoric. If one considers oneself to be on the side of nature or for nature, not even art is to be artificial. Even an actor is then berated by accusing him of rhetoric" (*Begriffe* 164; trans. dsm); to elucidate the latter, he quotes an anecdote from Fontane, describing a verbal *agón* between two actors: "'Dear Kahle, you're not an actor, you're a rhetorician'. – 'But, Mr. Döring, didn't I . . .' – 'Sure, you do have your successes. Admittedly. There was frenetic applause once again. Yet you did not get to the heart, only to the ear. You're a rhetorician'. – 'But, Mr. Döring . . .' – 'Try it for yourself. You don't have a persuasive natural tone. You're a rhetorician. When we're done here, go to [the restaurant] ['Lutter and Wegener['] and order half a bottle of red wine. I assure you, you'll be waiting forever, – the waiter [literally: the 'wine cooper'] won't bring you a single [bottle] . . . ' – 'But Mr. Döring . . . if I order red wine . . . why wouldn't he bring it?' – '*Because he won't believe you*'" (Fontane qtd. in: Blumenberg *Begriffe* 164f.; trans. dsm). As to 'natural rhetoric', cf. Lausberg (*Handbuch* 46, §41). Generally, see Blumenberg: "the denial of rhetoric is [...] rhetorical" ("Annäherung" 420; trans. dsm); "Even the veto on rhetoric is a rhetorical process [...] in modern times [...] anti-rhetoric became one of the most important rhetorical devices for claiming the severity of realism for oneself" ("Annäherung" 429; trans. dsm). As to "the rhetorical topos of distancing [oneself] from rhetoric", cf. Niehues-Pröbsting: "The best, because most convincing rhetoric is the waiving of rhetoric. Anti-rhetoric as rhetoric" ("Glauben" 25; trans. dsm).

33 Cf. the affirmative assessment on the part of 'Longinus': "men find in melody not only a natural instrument of persuasion and pleasure ['peithous kaì hedones'], but also a marvelous instrument of grandeur and emotion" (284f., 39.1); "composition [...] is a kind of melody in words—words which are part of man's nature" (287, 39.3).

unbearable" (192)—in terms of the gender conceptions and anthropological considerations pertaining to that period (cf. 193).[34] Feldman's panorama thus suggests that the Enlightenment's critical measures—here applied to castrati—tend to have recourse to rhetorical terms, *virtutes* and *vitia*, as far as their language and (the structure of) their estimates is concerned.[35]

In the present volume, Feldman approaches the *dramma per musica* (*opera seria*) from a rhetorico-musicological point of view. Unfolding a scenario accentuating the dramatic dynamics of delivery (*actio*), Feldman describes opera as highly rhetorical, its vigorously vivid arias as virtuoso declamations, its performers as operatic orators.[36] With *puritas* in enunciation, *variatio* in ornamentation, and being in accord with what is deemed appropriate (the *aptum*), decisive rhetorical precepts conduce to a suavely or forcefully convincing *mise-en-scène* of voice itself—*vox* being immediacy of effect *par excellence*, a dramaturgically strategic *actio*, delivered with a view to a suasive meld of delighting and moving.

---

34 For the Ancient nexus of music, theater, rhetoric, see Sansone: "Poetic performance in ancient Greece, whether sung or recited, was accompanied by music, and part of its effect was accomplished by such musical means as melody, rhythm, and tempo" (22; generally, cf. Thomas 117). Blume states: "The Greek drama of the Classical age is a complex construct: [the] spoken word, music and dance formed a whole, of whose [specific] character we are no longer able to form a clear conception" (2; trans. dsm). For drama as a constitutively plurimedial phenomenon, see Pfister, speaking of the "staged[,] plurimedial text" (29; cf. 28) as regards its *mise-en-scène*: the "multimediality" of "dramatic texts" entails "the collectivity of production" (29; trans. dsm). Comparably, Wesche refers to "the plurimedial art form of the theater" (2103; trans. dsm). The dominant senses would typically be the auditory and visual (cf. Pfister 26), e.g. in the acts of recital or reading; naturally, other senses will always also be involved. As to potential variations within the scope of one sense, such as the aural, the dramatic form tends to conduce to the employment of speech (also as *oratio ligata*), of (inarticulate) noise or basic sounds (of pain, pleasure), of music (melody, rhythm, voiced or instrumental), etc. This scope of all but simultaneous applications will differ in (epic, lyric) recitals, oratory. Heeney stresses the "interplay of the senses": "'Tragedy's frequent use of synaesthetic imagery [...] and its explicit orchestration of visual and acoustic experience [...] call attention to this interconnection of the different senses'" (Segal qtd. in: Heeney 19). Stampino highlights the multisensory nature of performances (here spec. of "*intermezzi*") during the Italian Renaissance: "The stage becomes a magic box which dazzles and changes all the time, involving all five senses (even flavors and smells are included)" (Pieri qtd. in: Stampino "Epideictic Pastoral" 45); unlike Pieri, Stampino emphasizes the effectuality of such techniques.

35 Generally, see Plett: "there is hardly any sector in scholarship and art, which is not suffused with the categories and techniques of rhetoric" ("Rhetorik der Renaissance" 10; trans. dsm).

36 As to "the drama of opera" and the "rhetoric of musical production", Worthen lists "features we usually think of as dramatic—the voicing, pace, intensity, and dynamic range of the performance" (9).

Moreover, Feldman addresses the *personae* of the musical rhetoricians themselves, specifically the alluring and awe-inspiring display of technical nuance and novelty on the part of castrati—stars of the Early Modern stage, vocally catering to mass audiences, musical eloquence embodied, purposively cultivating public *personae* forever oscillating between hubristic ostentation and courtly *decorum*. These prodigies of extravagant individualistic proficiency Feldman locates in a remarkably collaborative, poly-authorial environment, where compositional craft always already blends with resourceful improvisation and consummate performance.[37]

In earlier work pertaining to rhetoric and drama, Stampino studies the use of "rhetorical strategies" (in terms of *elocutio*) by female narrators, including "[t]he recourse to ekphrasis" ("Woman Narrator's Voice" 86), the indirect mode of "rhetorical questions", the distinctive utilization (or conspicuous omission) of otherwise "traditional rhetorical and narrative topoi" ("Woman Narrator's Voice" 75; cf. 77)—productively (often subversively) refunctionalized by Early Modern female writers (here by the Venetian author Marinella).[38] Stampino accentuates a reapplication of the Ancient dramatic device of the polyvocal chorus, noting (as to the narrator in the heroic epic *Enrico*) that "[h]er voice emerges as choral, expressing the position of a community" ("Woman Narrator's Voice" 77). Apart from strategies of indirection and 'postponement' (cf. "Woman Narrator's Voice" 87), Stampino highlights a rhetoric of conscious silence and omission: flouting the expectations of her readership, Marinella displaces the otherwise required "crucial rhetorical topos of invoking a muse" ("Woman Narrator's Voice" 80), thereby accentuating her independence and self-reliance as an author—glossed as "a quietly revolutionary move" ("Woman Narrator's Voice" 85).[39] Hence the

37 For the Ancient context, Blume accentuates the range of skills required of the persons involved: "The same as 5th century poets were at once composers and directors[,] and not infrequently also actors, the actors had to be both declaimers and singers, and[,] beyond that[,] dance performances were also demanded from them" (103; trans. dsm).

38 For indirection and rhetoric, cf. Blumenberg ("Annäherung" 420); Hunter stresses "its power of indirection", and links it "to drama – the art of persuasion by indirection *par excellence*" (111).

39 Cf. "'The speaking arts include the tacit [or: silent, wordless] [one]'. Jean Paul" (qtd. in: Nietzsche *KSA 7*. 693, 29[142]; trans. dsm; cf. 707, 29[186]). See Blumenberg: "The technique of speaking [or: eloquence] appears [...] as the specific case of regular [or: structured] modes of conduct that signify something, set [forth] signs, effect consensus or provoke contradiction. A silence, a visible omission in a context of conduct can become as rhetorical as an exclamation read from a sheet [of paper] [...]. Rhetoric is, also below the threshold of the spoken or written word, form as [a] means, regularity as institution" ("Annäherung" 407; trans. dsm). Cf. "More difficult [...] than understanding what is present in a text is to perceive and ascertain what has been left out and pretermitted" (*Genesis der kopernikanischen Welt I*. 230; trans. dsm); see the

intra-textual speaker "giv[es] a nod to the tradition", while "set[ting] her opinion apart from the rest": "she builds on, but in an oppositional way, what came before. [...] Marinella's narratorial voice emerges as original and independent but in continuity with the past, the canon, and the prevailing rhetorical *topoi* of this genre [sc. the epic]" ("Woman Narrator's Voice" 93).

In her essay herein, Stampino analyzes Gozzi's *Le gare teatrali* with respect to its historical—cultural, socio-economic, political—environment of emergence. Venice's self-conception as a mercantilistic republic sets the scene for a drama of community, which addresses the implications of contemporary artistic and political changes. Early Modern culture being saturated with rhetoric, Stampino shows Gozzi's instrumentalization of demonstrative rhetoric for ideological

---

reference to a "rhetorically omitted premise" (*Sorge* 216; trans. dsm), and Blumenberg's noting that "what does *not* occur" textually is particularly "revealing [or: instructive]" (*Schiffbruch* 15n.; trans. dsm); similarly, as to what "could have also been stated" (*Genesis der kopernikanischen Welt II*. 457; trans. dsm): "Not only the additions [are] [...] revealing, but also the omissions" (*Genesis der kopernikanischen Welt III*. 677; trans. dsm; instances infinitized). For Augustine's rhetoric of at once "answering and foreclosing the question", cf. Blumenberg (*Verführbarkeit* 114f.); also on "Nicholas of Cusa", advocating "a Christian form of rhetoric" (*Genesis der kopernikanischen Welt II*. 320; trans. dsm). For Wittgenstein's 'frugal rhetoric' ("Rhetorik der Kargheit"), cf. Blumenberg (*Sorge* 181). As to a "rhetoric of silence", see Hart Nibbrig (passim; spec. 40–45; here: 40; for a "literary rhetoric of silence", cf. 49; trans. dsm): "The situation, in which silence is kept, while one expects speech, begins to speak itself [or: as such]" (41; trans. dsm); he refers to Iser's theory of "Leerstellen" ('gaps') in terms of a 'rhetoric of silence' (43). As to drama, Hart Nibbrig suggests a 'dramaturgy of silence' for Schiller's case, here qua "dramatic mise-en-scène of silence" (60; trans. dsm; cf. 61–70). For the "gaps of indeterminacy", providing "scope for a wide variety of reactions on the part of the reader", see Iser (3–30, spec. 9, here: 7); he highlights the fact that these are "techniques" (11); that one is dealing with a "repertoire of structures that lead to indeterminacy in a text" (12); that this amounts to "reader manipulation" (14). For links to Booth, cf. Iser (42; 56–66). In a section on "The Dramatization of Double Meaning in Shakespeare's *As You Like It*", Iser (re Bakhtin) speaks of a "'carnivalization' of rhetoric" (a "rhetoric of double meaning") in "[t]he fools rhetoric", which "renounces emphatic persuasion", and so 'deconstructs' "conventional emphatic rhetoric" (115). This "disintegration of semantics" as "practiced by the fool" ("the semiotic game of double meaning"), Iser calls "dramatic" (116). Skinner refers to "Shakespeare's rhetorical silences" (*Forensic Shakespeare* 2). Kegl uses the term 'rhetoric of concealment' to denote "an author's recurrent rhetorical gesture—riddling disclosure in Puttenham's *The Arte of English Poesie*, the logic of architecturally unsound bodies and buildings in Sidney's *Arcadia*, the network of insults in Shakespeare's *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, and the collection of proverbial wisdom in Deloney's *Jack of Newbury*" (2; cf. 3). With Jameson, she sees these gestures "as the style [...] or 'verbal thrusts' of a text. This rubric encompasses a range of formal properties, including genre, recurring gaps in a narrative, characteristic sentence structure, and figures that convey sensory perceptions [...] [and] the text's more general organizing logic" (2).

purposes—exalting the city of Venice, while issuing a vivid caveat as to its future.[40] In terms of form, Gozzi's play is a hybrid, tendering scripted sections and parts leaving ample room for the dynamics of improvisation (as in the *commedia dell'arte*). Conceived for, and intratextually mirroring, a mass audience of the eighteenth century, this highly agonistic play ultimately aims at a morally conservative message: Gozzi employs the rhetorical functions of *delectare* and *movere*—via epideictic praise, reproach, a passionate, violent *actio*—for purposes of *docere*, for prevailing upon the audience to maintain Venice's communal order, to uphold the values of justice, decency, and civic duty.[41]

---

40 Cf. also Stampino ("Epideictic Pastoral" passim). As to engaging an audience in Ancient drama, see Croally: "Tragedies were produced to be performed for audiences, who, through response and interpretation, were therefore actively involved in constructions of meaning" (35).

41 Drama and oratory are public phenomena, conducing to association, participation, (social) integration, interactivity. Cf. Most: "the space of the rhetorical scene is [...] normally a public space, designated for this purpose: [...] *forum*, *senatus*, *tribunal*" ("Rhetorik" 70; trans. dsm). Blumenberg notes that rhetoric "established itself as a more or less open technique of persuasion and inveiglement, as a technique of forensic speech, [of speaking] at public assemblies, to the congregation" (*Unbegrifflichkeit* 85; trans. dsm); cf. Möller (11). Plett: "the open forum, the origin of rhetoric" (*Systematische* 260; trans. dsm); Sheppard: "Drama, like epideictic rhetoric, was normally a production for a mass audience" (31; cf. 28, 32, 34). Cf. Burckhardt (302); Curtius: "Every citizen is drawn into public life" (73; trans. dsm); Dubischar (25; 29). As to rhetoric's pervasiveness, Quintilian speaks of "the vast army of orators [...] at Athens" (*Oratoria 9–10*. 291–293, 10.1.76); cf. Worthington ("The Canon" passim; spec. 252–254). On the communal character of rhetoric: "The task of the public speaker ['Oratoris officium': *érgon*, function] is to discuss capably those matters which law and custom have fixed for the uses ['ad usum'] of citizenship, and to secure as far as possible the agreement ['adsensione'] of his hearers" (*Rhetorica* 4f., I.ii.2; 4n.). Halliwell notes that Aristotle saw "a role for a well-informed rhetoric as an agency of the common currency of beliefs and values that circulate within a society's public discourse" (240). As to Oesterreich on rhetoric in politics, economics ('*corporate identities*': "'rhetorical inventions'"), Niehues-Pröbsting refers to how "communities are constructed by rhetoric" ("Rhetorical Turn?" 952; trans. dsm). Longman sees an "aesthetic and social connection between drama and rhetoric. [...] Both [...] concern themselves with the process of affecting audiences" (5). Staub stresses "the very publicness" (7) of "[r]itual and religious ceremony [...] eating [...] Athletics [...] Warfare in the Greek practice" (7n.), "the implications of [...] publicness in ancient theatre" (7); "Greek plays are not 'kitchen dramas' but events of the civic assembly" (9). He discerns this nexus: "rhetoric is concerned with public thinking, *phronesis*, or the practical thought processes common to a given order. [...] rhetoric is characterized by the *enthymeme*, [...] used by the group [...] employed by a 'civic intelligence'" (8; cf. Garver 34; 45–51, on the "civic" aspect; 150–154, 162–169, on the enthymeme). Branham notes: "All true humor has an enthymematic character: it requires the audience to perform an act of mental collaboration" (54). Staub defines the "*enthymeme* [...] as suasion in action [...] at play [...] [at] the *dramenon* of the city-wide festivals" (8); stressing its "dynamics", he suggests "that the *mythos* of drama may be called the dramatic *enthymeme*" (9), so joining Aristotle's *Poetics* and *Rhetoric*. Staub sees "the

Stampino demonstrates the play's meta-dramatic character—(re-)presenting,

dramatic *stasis*" as "a collection of agonistic energies (*dynamos*), a dynamic event that holds in tension the actions" (10). Cf. Sloane/Jost: "The enthymeme [...] draws its major premise from the audience's beliefs [...]; its facts also draw from the audience's perceived situation [...]. Rhet[oric] allows the audience silently to supply a condition, premise, [...] conclusion itself" (1178). Staub calls drama "a very public spectacle of great potency" (10); cf. Thomas (117f.); Cartledge ("a revolutionary genre", 70). For "the mass commodity 'theatre'" in Aristotle, see Sansone (on Revermann, 12f.; cf. 5), asserting: "Plays are created for performance, not for reading, or for 'reading'" (14; cf. 19f.); he disputes an exclusive emphasis on speech qua action, tracing this back to Aristotle, who "claims that the visual aspect – [...] *opsis*, or *mise-en-scène* – of tragedy is [its] most dispensable element [...] that the potency of tragic poetry exists independently of actors and performance" (8; cf. 9, spec. 12, 22); "literacy and the existence of written texts of Attic drama [...] made it possible for Aristotle to make his claim [...] about the dispensability of *opsis*" (14; cf. Blume 3). See Aristotle: "spectacle is emotionally potent ['psychagogikòn'] but falls [...] outside the art ['atechnótaton'] and is not integral to poetry: tragedy's capacity is independent of performance and actors [...] the costumier's art has more scope than the poet's for rendering effects of spectacle" ("Poetics" 53–55, VI, 1450b). Cf. Booth: "Aristotle [...] repudiates the last of the three most obviously rhetorical temptations of drama [sc. 'intrusive commentary', a non-integrated chorus], the use of spectacular staging. The plot [...] should take care of the emotional effect"—glossing "'spectacular means'" as "the producer's rhetoric" (92). Worthen's usage—"the rhetoric of stage production" (4)—may seem to be affine (cf. e.g. 1; 3; 5). On the public quality of drama, the "special affinity between the theater and the [respective] society" (as per Gurvitch), cf. Pfister (49; trans. dsm). Kindermann opens his volume on the Ancient theatergoing public thus: "For at least two and a half thousand years, we [have been] aware of the fact that theater without [a] public cannot take place in a meaningful and expedient way" (*Theaterpublikum der Antike* 7; trans. dsm); "Comedy was distinctively a social phenomenon[;] as such[,] it renders [...] patent the social character of Greek theater [...]. Performances of tragedies and comedies were a vital necessity to the Athenians to such an extent that the dramatists – and [...] actors – called on them to [...] participate actively or critically ['Mitagieren', 'Miturteilen'] by means of turning toward the [spectators]. Offending the audience was also already [a device utilized]" (*Theaterpublikum der Antike* 18; trans. dsm); for a comic realization of the latter, see the prolog to Machiavelli's *Mandragola* (6f.). Cf. Kindermann: "[i]n both cases" (the Ancient, Medieval) one is "predominantly deal[ing] with mass theater", but under "fundamentally different" conditions (*Theaterpublikum des Mittelalters* 7; trans. dsm). Marschall stresses "the relation to the public": "Medieval t[heater] aims to show and to demonstrate, above all[;] an 'optical rhetoric' holds sway [...], a play of gesticulation and movements with signs and ritual gestures" (517; trans. dsm; cf. Kindermann *Theaterpublikum des Mittelalters* 39–57; spec. 40–42). On the Italian Renaissance's "public arena", cf. Stampino ("Epideictic Pastoral" 40). Bloemendal calls "the rhetoricians' 'movement' [...] a typically urban phenomenon" ("Transfer" 279). As to the public character of Jesuit school theater, see Fothergill-Payne (375). Cf. Barner: "Baroque rhetoric [...] is geared toward playing along ['Mitspielen'], toward communication, an eminently social phenomenon" (89; trans. dsm; cf. 100). For the French context: "in school and in the *salon*, at church or in the theatre, in his study or in the law courts, the contemporary of Racine was all the time surrounded by rhetoric, learning it, using it, admiring it, being affected by it" (France 8f.).

performing the effects of a community's theatrical practices on all social strata.[42] Its intense—increasingly antagonistic—audiovisual spectacle stages the attempts at swaying and persuading a community on the part of playwrights and actors, hence the influence of dramatic rhetoric on cultural life.[43]

Bloemendal's research focuses on (Early Modern) rhetoric and Neo-Latin drama, specifically from the Low Countries and the Anglophone world. His approach has affinities with the agenda of the DramaNet project, in that it emphasizes a "*common* [...] *use of* [...] *subjects, motifs and structures*", the "'mobility' of texts", the fact that "[t]exts 'moved', but so did authors and languages": "Texts are continually moving through time and space, within and across borders" ("Transfer" 274).[44] As to the withdrawal and reshaping of material from the cultural network, Bloemendal stresses:

> There are no 'neutral' transfers. [...] transfer is an integration, seen from the point of view of the receiving literary system. The process of transfer involve[s] [...] varying degrees of refraction, remaking, rewriting with the purpose of integrating and domesticating the text in the receiving culture. ("Transfer" 285)[45]

Tying in therewith in the present volume, Bloemendal initially provides a historical, socio-cultural, and literary panorama outlining the manifold functions of the *téchne rhetoriké*, accentuating its ubiquity, elasticity. Early Modern

42 Cf. Sansone: "Appropriately, we still refer to dramatists in English as 'playwrights', speaking of them in terms of their crafting of theatrical experiences rather than as writers of scripts" (20).
43 See Nienkamp: "The study of rhetoric has, from the beginning, been about how language influences people [...] how people manipulate others using language" (69)—and about how to manipulate language. For the Ancient context, Sansone notes: "the radical innovation of the drama [...] affected the perceptions of the spectators in the theater; a new set of cognitive skills [...] was now required of audiences [...]. The playwright himself [...] was a member of the audience before he became a dramatist" (150). Bers refers to the interchange between genres: "the comic poets [...] were sitting in the Theatre of Dionysus, ears perked up for material" (183); they "watched tragedy with their own compositional requirements in mind, and there is no reason why speechwriters could not have done so too" (189). For an English case, cf. Norbrook: "If men like Northampton were trying to turn Parliament into a theatre, there were others who were trying to turn the theatre into something not a little like a Parliament – or even a senate" (159).
44 In addition to Bloemendal ("Transfer" passim), see Titzmann as to the manifold variants of the "*Elckerlyc*/*Everyman*" theme (353–356; here: 354; cf. 361, 375, 385); generally, see Kindermann (*Theaterpublikum des Mittelalters* 187–192).
45 Referring to Erasmus' defense of laying claim to (or appropriating) Jerome's works, Eden describes a similar process of extracting 'floating material' qua "abandoned literary property": "For centuries they ['the works of Jerome'] had been treated as abandoned goods; I entered upon them as something ownerless, and by incalculable efforts reclaimed them" (Erasmus qtd. in: Eden *Friends* 172f.); generally, cf. Eden ("Intellectual Property" passim).

literature—in its manifold phenotypes—is described as thoroughly rhetorical, specifically due to the pervasive presence of rhetoric in both theoretical and practical education.[46] As being of particular import for drama, he notes the *declamatio* and the device of *prosopopoiía*.[47] Bloemendal calls attention to the cultural dynamics effected by human(ist) agents and their letters—both traveling throughout Europe, crafting a factual and virtual, transnational *res publica litteraria*.[48] The cultural function of the rhetorical *téchne* is described as enabling formal and linguistic flexibility and mobility.

---

46 Cf. Hunter: "for a renaissance audience, trained in the potentials of rhetoric and waiting for the social situation that might actualise it, [...] the playhouse could act as a kind of rhetorical gymnasium in which oratorical muscles could be flexed and imagined as if at full power" (116). As to Jesuit education, see Fothergill-Payne: "Following the example of other institutions, such as the German Scola Latina, the early English Grammar Schools and the Dutch Rederijkers Kamer (rhetorical society), the Jesuits realized that producing plays might well be an excellent method for practising the rules of the rhetorical arts" (376). Cf. Mareel: "The activities of the chambers [...] were characterized by a strong competitive element. The *rederijkers* held contests within the chamber, generally for poetry, as well as among chambers, mostly for drama [...]. They owed a considerable part of their prestige [...] to their activities during urban public festivals, such as religious processions and joyous entries, where they performed literary texts and *tableaux vivants*" (1151); cf. Borcherdt (132f.; 138–148); Kindermann (*Theaterpublikum des Mittelalters* 172–198), spec. "'Rederijker' [...]: masters in the art of rhetoric" (*Theaterpublikum des Mittelalters* 172; trans. dsm). For the 'stylistics' of the French "*Grands Rhétoriqueurs*", spec. Parmentier, see Lindner (106–114), also on Fabri's rhetoric (106–109; passim), Ronsard's *elocutio* (114–123; cf. Cornilliat "Rhétoriqueurs, Grands" 1181f.). For the French case generally: "in seventeenth-century France [...] rhetoric was a flourishing discipline. All those who had a formal education learned the same sort of rhetoric—and they spent a good deal of time on it. Later, with individual variations, they put the same precepts into practice in their speaking and writing" (France 2).

47 For Quintilian on the orator's, poet's, historian's "'induere personam'" via *prosopopoiía*, see Plett ("*Theatrum Rhetoricum*" 354n.; cf. Quintilian *Oratoria 3–5*. 138–143, 3.8.49–54; "personam induit", 138, 3.8.50); as to the rhetorico-dramatic device of *prosopopoiía*, cf. Plett ("*Theatrum Rhetoricum*" 354–356; 359); Barner (103f.); Vickers on Shaw (94); Brogan/Halsall/Sychterz (1121); Menke (passim); Oesterreich (863); Boriaud/Schouler (794; 798; 802; 805); Hartmann (passim; spec. 811f.); de Man rewords it thus: "Voice assumes mouth, eye, and finally face, a chain that is manifest in the etymology of the trope's name [...] to confer a mask or a face (*prósopon*)" (76); its "rhetorical function [...] [i]s positing voice or face by means of language" (81).

48 For the rhetoric of (official, legal) epistolary writing ('*ars dictaminis*' and '*ars dictandi*') in the Spanish *Siglo de Oro*, see Große (passim); generally, cf. Curtius (158–161); Barner: "it was the *ars dictandi* (or *dictaminis*), which most faithfully preserved and handed down the legacy of Classical rhetoric throughout the Medieval centuries. [...] as discipline of the chancery, it [...] remained in most immediate contact with the respective political, juridical reality" (129; trans. dsm; cf. 155–159). As to "forms of *drawing-room rhetoric*", spec. "the *familiar letter*", see Bakhtin (143). For a case study with a synoptic assessment of Humanist epistolography, see Buck

Against this backdrop, Bloemendal proceeds to a close reading of two Neo-Latin tragedies by Simon Simonides—strongly influenced by Greek drama and Senecan traditions.[49] Displaying considerable erudition, particularly with regard to his Ancient intertexts, this Early Modern author takes up and varies both his material and its usual generic framework: typically staged as a comedy, Simonides shapes and arranges (*dispositio*) the *Scriptural* narrative of Joseph as a tragedy.[50] Bloemendal describes the extraction and refunctionalization of standardized set pieces, memorable maxims, conventional characters, and familiar settings from the cultural *copia* of convenient intertexts (during the phase of rhetorical *inventio*)—precisely for fashioning audience consensus via crafting a rhetorico-theatrical common ground.[51] In terms of *elocutio*, he points to

("Humanistische Bildung" spec. 404; passim). Vickers notes that "the renaissance witness[ed] an extraordinary boom in epistolary rhetoric treatises" (84; for an application, cf. 91f.).

49 See also Bloemendal ("Senecan Drama" passim; spec. 39; 41). As to Seneca's rhetoricized drama (including its reverberations) generally, cf. Curtius (75); Most ("Rhetorik" 65); Fitch (1); Asmuth (*Dramenanalyse* 51); Marschall (515). For the "dominant role of the rhetorical in the dialogic structure of Roman tragedy"—qua having a "markedly appellative character" vis-à-vis the public—see Kindermann (*Theaterpublikum der Antike* 202; trans. dsm; cf. 203).

50 For *copia* qua 'display' (showing the author's "skill", for the "reuse" of the reader) in an Elizabethan context, here in Greene, cf. Mack ("Rhetoric in Use" 121; cf. 122′, 124, 127). As to the use of *copia* (vis-à-vis *eruditio*, *ornatus*: "Bilderschatz", a 'figural treasure') in Baroque writing ("especially in rhetorical writings, wedding poems and funeral orations", theoretical, epideictic forms), and including drama (spec. Lohenstein, Gryphius), Benjamin (referring to Schmidt) notes "that collectanea were generally part of the instrumentarium of those poets. Not only did they contain realia, but[,] in line with the Medieval 'Gradus ad Parnassum'[,] also poetical commonplaces" (71; trans. dsm; cf. 72, 217n.). See Titzmann for the (rhetorico-)poetic emblematics of Masen, Harsdörffer (passim; spec. 356–358; 363–370; 379–385), as applied to sixteenth, seventeenth century drama—including a bibliography of such plays (387–391).

51 For these rhetorical terms, see Quintilian "rerum verborumque copia", "a rich stock of ideas and words" (*Oratoria 9–10*. 282f., 10.1.61); Curtius: "*copia rerum ac verborum*" (436); Lausberg: "*copia rerum* [...] *verborum* [...] *figurarum*" (*Elemente* 27, §46; cf. 43, §99; 156, §470). For a problematic view on *copia*, cf. Jardine (29), with Vickers' objection (82). As to the Ancient Greek context, see Bers: "Euripides is rich in what we might suspect are portable arguments detachable from their dramatic contexts" (182). "The speakers quite often quote tragedy for the same reason they quote or refer to Homer, Tyrtaeus or Solon: poetry represents a sort of unassailable wisdom. [...] Tragedy had [...] become a source for exploitation by rhetoric in the real world of the detachable arguments" (190). With (forensico-)rhetorical declaimers in mind, Quintilian recommends using comedy as *copia*: "other comic poets too, if you do not read them too critically, contain passages you can excerpt ['decerpere']" (*Oratoria 9–10*. 288f., 10.1.72); "if we except Homer [...] there is probably no ‹poetry› closer to oratory or better adapted for training orators" than "Old [Attic] Comedy" (*Oratoria 9–10*. 284f., 10.1.65); he praises Menander (*Oratoria 9–10*. 286–289, 10.1.69–71), Euripides (cf. Russell 247), rather than Sophocles: "Euripides will be

the efficient use of dynamic, stichomythic altercations; to the device of variation for purposes of enhancing audience receptivity, specifically the expedient embedment of *sententiae* as textual highlights; and to the emphatically didactic employment of *páthos* (*movere* with a view to *docere*)—all of which stage the respective dramatic works as effective oratory.[52]

In an article coauthored with Heudecker, Wesche focuses on rhetoric during the Baroque, and specifically in the German-speaking realms. The authors term 'rhetoric' a "*metaregulation*" integrating and transcending "*all disciplines and* [...] *social structures*" (97). For this epoch, they distinguish a "dichotomy of *erudite rhetoric* [...] and *courtly oratory*", where the former—specifically "Jesuit rhetoric"—utilizes Latin, the latter the respective vernacular (98; trans. dsm); at court, the rhetorical virtue of the *aptum* prevails, while the function of persuasion is seen to recede (cf. 100).[53] As another "typical" feature pertaining to the "rhetoric of the Baroque", Heudecker/Wesche perceive a "tight interconnection of written and oral education" (98; trans. dsm; cf. 103). The link of rhetoric to drama is established in both Jesuit and Protestant schools, where "practical

much the more useful to persons preparing themselves to plead in court. His language [...] is closer to the norm of oratory; he is full of striking thoughts ['sententiis densus']" (*Oratoria 9–10*. 286f., 10.1.67–68). Generally, Blumenberg speaks of "the arsenal of Ancient authors [being] exploited" (*Genesis der kopernikanischen Welt I*. 59; trans. dsm), spec. by "skeletonizing into sententiae" such "passages" as were "[pre]disposed for [serving as] practicable citations [...] on account of their rhetorical formulation" (*Legitimität* 377; trans. dsm). As to the use of *sententiae* in drama from Antiquity to Lessing, see Asmuth (*Dramenanalyse* 161–168; "Drama" 914; in trans. herein); for the German Baroque, cf. Benjamin (174f.; 229n.). On the distinctive characteristic of *sententiae*, see Kallendorf: "B[revity] became especially relevant for dramatic language: here it improved the pregnancy of the dialogs and was thus called for" (58; trans. dsm). As to modern times, Bers believes that "Brecht is perhaps the only sententious playwright of the twentieth century who enjoys enduring popularity in the United States" (192n.).

52 For the rhetorical technique of 'repetition with variation', see the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*: "Refining ['Expolitio'] consists in dwelling on the same topic and yet seeming to say something ever new. [...] We shall not repeat the same thing precisely [...] but with changes. Our changes will be of three kinds: in the words, in the delivery, and in the treatment. Our changes will be verbal when, having expressed the idea once, we repeat it once again or oftener in other, equivalent terms [...]. Our changes will reside in delivery ['Pronuntiando'] if now in the tone of conversation, now in an energetic tone, and now in variation after variation of voice and gesture, repeating the same ideas in different words, we also change the delivery quite strikingly. [...] The third kind of change, accomplished in the treatment, will take place if we transfer the thought into the form of Dialogue ['ad sermocinationem'] or into the form of Arousal" (*Rhetorica* 364–367, IV.xlii.54–55).

53 For the "Ständeklausel" with regard to rhetoric, see Asmuth (*Dramenanalyse* 24–27, spec. 25); on this dramatic 'criterion of the estates' generally, see Szondi (passim; spec. 32–39).

rhetorical abilities" are promoted "in the form of speeches, disputations, the recital of poems, staged trials or theatrical performances" (99; trans. dsm).[54] Referring to a preferred meta-trope of the Baroque, Wesche/Heudecker emphasize the "*theatrum mundi* metaphor", in which context the "rhetoric of affect"—respectively the "affective control" taught by the system of rhetoric with a view to expediency—is refunctionalized in terms of what the authors call an "Early Modern social disciplining" (104; trans. dsm).[55] In another article in

54 Generally thereto, see Knox (passim), spec. "As exercises for oratory [...] [school] boys should perform plays to practice their delivery of voice and gesture. [...] rhetorical techniques [...] [were] displayed [...] to public scrutiny" (66f.); cf. Vickers (92–98; passim), spec. on Shaw's seventeenth century meta-rhetorical play with the performatively vivid title *Words Made Visible* (passim). For Luther's (sermonical) view of drama (spec. tragedy), see Asmuth (*Dramenanalyse* 165); Barner (259f.); Stolt (31–77; 100–119). As to Protestant rhetoric generally, spec. Melanchthon's, see Meerhoff (passim): "Ultimately rhetorical analysis reveals the principles of God's own rhetoric, especially in the Scriptures" (60n.). For Jesuit drama, see Barner's detailed account (321–369; spec. 344–352, 365); cf. Fothergill-Payne (passim); Eybl (passim; spec. 725f.); Knox (77n.); Marschall (520f.), spec. "Since Jesuit school theater has greater [financial] means at its disposal, including for instance a respective stagecraft, it represents a considerable competition for Protestant grammar schools" (521; trans. dsm).

55 As Eden stresses (with recourse to Sidney), another preferential image is "the internal 'forum' of the mind, so familiar to the Renaissance" (*Poetic and Legal Fiction* 6); cf. Hutson (*Invention of Suspicion* 4f.; 20–22; 30–43); see Kant's version of the "internal forum", which Oesterreich calls "a model of the conscience with affinities to rhetoric" (868f.; trans. dsm). On the '*theatrum mundi*', see Curtius (148–154; spec. 149; cf. Petronius 188f., §80; 189n.); Barner (86–131; spec. 93, 95); Marquard on Schopenhauer and Nietzsche (110); Blumenberg on Simmel ("Annäherung" 417f.; cf. Simmel 80); Oesterreich (862); Marschall (520); Plett: "'Totus mundus agit histrionem' [...] a possible key to the epoch of the Renaissance" ("*Theatrum Rhetoricum*" 328; trans. dsm). Cf. a *dictum* attributed to Democritus: "ὁ κόσμος σκηνή, ὁ βίος πάροδος· ἦλθες, εἶδες, ἀπῆλθες", 'The world (is) a stage, life a (theatrical) entrance. You come, see, leave' (in: Kranz *Vorsokratiker II*. 165, 68B115*84); thereto, see Barner (94n.). Cf. Epictetus: "Remember that you are an actor ['hypokritès'] in a play ['drámatos'], the character of which is determined by the Playwright: if He wishes the play to be short, it is short; if long, it is long; if He wishes you to play the part of a beggar, remember to act even this rôle adroitly; and so if your rôle be that of a cripple, an official, or a layman. For this is your business, to play admirably the rôle ['πρόσωπον'] assigned you; but the selection of that rôle is Another's" (496f., §17; thereto, cf. Niehues-Pröbsting *Der Kynismus* 232f.; Mayfield *Artful Immorality* 64n.). For spec. literary realizations, see Erasmus: "Now what else is the life of mortal men but a kind of fable in which the actors appear on stage under the disguise of different masks? Each plays his assigned part till the stage manager comes forth and takes them off stage. Indeed, he often assigns one actor several roles, so the performer who just now acted a king in purple majesty presently comes back a humble servant in rags. They are all but shadows of real persons, yet there's no other way to put on the show" (28; cf. 29, 49; see Barner 96). In Shakespeare: "All the world's a stage, / And all the men and women merely players. / They have their exits and their entrances, / And one man in his time plays many parts"

Rhetoric and Stylistics, Wesche seems to call precisely for the volume at hand: "*the relation between drama and rhetoric*" has not been "*sufficiently looked into*", and a "*general rhetoric of drama is still missing*" (2100).

Herein, Wesche takes a linguistico-literary approach, with recourse to interaction studies. In his analyses of selected Gryphian plays, he describes the specifically dramaturgical function of certain rhetorical techniques, particularly the oratorical power of rhythm—its immediacy of effect conducing to *memoria*—and the supple, persuasive employment of metrical verse. Throughout, Wesche accentuates various interactive reciprocities between metrico-poetic forms and the dynamics of drama: when arranged with a view to the intense acoustic force

(*As You Like It* 227, II.vii.140–143); "Life's but a walking shadow, a poor player, / That struts and frets his hour upon the stage" (*Macbeth* 288, V.v.23–24); as regards a plurality of roles (sans Erasmian "manager"), Shakespeare's textual tendency here seems rhetorico-sophistic, underwritten by a worldview characterized by (consummate) contingency (generally thereto, cf. Blumenberg *Legitimität* 181; Mayfield *Artful Immorality* passim; spec. 12, 54, 54n., 66, 68, 98–108)—rather than determinist (contrast Epictetus, Calderón). With reference to Shakespeare, see Waddington (110–117). Barner notes "the internationality of the theatrical metaphor" (88; trans. dsm): "What is the world? The authors of the 17th century pose this question with [...] frequency and urgency [...] in one [...] answer all [...] partial answers are likely to find their common denominator: the world is a theater. This thesis has [a] European validity" (86f.; trans. dsm; cf. 126); among others, he mentions representative passages in Shakespeare, Calderón, Rotrou, Vondel, Gryphius, Lohenstein, Avancini (cf. 86–88)—stressing the trope's 'memorability', 'persuasiveness', 'interpretive polyfunctionality', 'perspectival polysemy', 'pluralism' (cf. 91; 99; 105; 117; 123). As per Barner, an integration of the partial aspects is consummated in Gracián (cf. 124–131; spec. 126; for the German reception thereof: 93, 142–149). Cf. "Vase empeñando nuestra vida como en Comedia, al fin viene a desenredarse. Atención, pues, al acabar bien" (Gracián *Oráculo manual* 218, §211; cf. 218n.)—with decidedly rhetorical color (here qua 'with a view to effectuality') in this (enthymematic) *conclusio*; see also: "*El gran teatro del Universo*" (*Criticón* 74–83, I.ii; here: 74); thereto, cf. Barner (124–131); Forcione (22–44). See Calderón's *El gran teatro del mundo* (passim), spec. "que represente el que viva" (52, v.376); "*que toda la vida humana / representaciones es*" (53, v.427–428); "es representación la humana vida, / una comedia sea / [...] los hombres [...] en el *teatro* / *del mundo*, que contiene partes cuatro [sc. 'Europa, Asia, África, y América'] / con estilo oportuno / han de representar" (41, 41n., v.46–47, v.52–56)—with the rhetorical *aptum* ("estilo oportuno") adapted to Calderón's Counter-Reformation message (generally thereto, cf. Küpper *Diskurs-Renovatio* passim; 126–229, spec. 128–130, 198; 250f.; 305–455, spec. 392n., 413n.). See Fischer-Lichte for Pirandello's 'inversion' of the "Baroque topos of the *Theatrum vitae humanae*" (*Geschichte des Dramas 2*. 212; trans. dsm), and for the "topos of the theatrum vitae humanae or of the theatrum mundi" from a semiotic perspective (*Semiotik des Theaters 2*. 87–90; here 89f.; trans. dsm). Cf. Eliot, with another nuance: "A very small part of acting is that which takes place on the stage!" ("'Rhetoric' and Poetic Drama" 41).

of verse (qua *oratio ligata*), language itself is vividly staged and meter effectively performed (*actio*).[56]

Wesche's essay demonstrates the functionality of rhetorical techniques for representing spoken, situational language in dramatic dialogs, effected by various interactional techniques such as markers of oral discourse, elliptic expressions, as well as aural, metrico-poetic effects of mimesis. In intra-dramatic verbal contests, the agonal quality of intense stichomythia is further enhanced by their particularly context-conscious, metrical distribution (*dispositio*); likewise, theatrical conventions (such as the chorus) are arranged to reassert, and integrate with, the action. In what is a partly meta-dramatic manner, correlations

56 Plett discerns a "*Theatrum Elocutionis*", a "*mise-en-scène of language*" itself, during the Renaissance ("*Theatrum Rhetoricum*" 346; trans. dsm; cf. 359; 361n.); as to "Elizabethan England", Marschall accentuates "the ['suggestive'] principle of *verbalized decoration* or *verbal mise-en-scène* ['*Wortkulisse*']" (519; trans. dsm). As to the "Redekriterium" ("Dialog", "Figurenrede"), the 'criterion of *rhesis*, of speech', with regard to rhetoric, see Asmuth (*Dramenanalyse* 9; cf. Pfister 19–21). Asmuth notes that "before the 18th c[entury] [...] school education and literature [...] were primarily guided by the ideal of the orator. [...] From the 18th c[entury] on the reputation of rhetoric increasingly suffered" (*Dramenanalyse* 9; trans. dsm). As to the 'criterion of speech' in drama generally, see France: "language is always basic. When [...] we study Racine's characters, we are [...] studying the words they use" (4). Contrast Sansone's stance, referring to the Ancient context (14; cf. 19f.). Privileging verbalization, Fitch tenders an inclusive view: "Senecan drama is a drama of the word. Its speeches are eloquent, forceful, delighting in the language [...]. Their fluency reflects the rhetorical training which Seneca received, and which had become established as the standard form of higher education at Rome in the second half of the first century B.C.—so much so that all Roman writers from Ovid on reflect its influence in varied ways. Seneca's interest in powerful utterance does not [...] exclude an interest in [...] action and character, but they are mediated through the rhetoric. He is a master of pace and diction [...] at contrasting long, flowing sentences with brief pithy ones [...]. Such verbal energy is highly theatrical [...] it invites comparison [...] with the verve of blank verse in the hands of Marlowe or Shakespeare. [...] Above all, the script of Seneca's dramas demands performance, as much as a musical score does" (1). Szondi states: "In the *tragédie classique*[,] actuality [or: 'reality'] exists only to the extent that it has turned into language. By contrast[,] Diderot notices the medium of gesture, the form of pantomime: *Nous parlons trop dans nos drames*" (107; trans. dsm). For twentieth century tendencies trying to "free theater from the bonds of literature", see Fischer-Lichte (*Geschichte des Dramas 2*. 163; cf. "deliterarization of theater", 165; trans. dsm). For the contrapuntal tendency, see Dürrenmatt's poetics: "The human being of drama is a speaking human being, [...] and the action serves to coerce the human being into [uttering] a special [or: 'specific'] speech. The action is the crucible, in which the human being turns into word, must turn into word. [...] in a drama I am to bring the human being into situations, which coerce it into speaking" (48; trans. dsm); "a playwright writing for the stage must always aim at this: that his theater feature moments, in which the characters [or: 'figures'], whom he is writing, turn into language and nothing else" (51; trans. dsm); for his defense of "the rhetorical", see Dürrenmatt (49; trans. dsm); cf. Asmuth thereto ("Drama" 917; in trans. herein).

between structural and intra-character tensions again accentuate the accord or convergence of the form employed with the content conveyed.

From Küpper's seminal study on Spanish Golden Age drama, two aspects pertain specifically to the titular nexus herein: first, the legacy of rhetorico-discursive strategies present in Baroque plays (in terms of an expedient *electio*, *dispositio* of the *materia*); these are traceable to Late Antiquity, when, "by recourse to selected rhetorical practices of pagan Antiquity, a comprehensive 'Christian' discourse on the [...] world accessible to this epoch is developed" (*Diskurs-Renovatio* 18f.; trans. dsm).[57] Secondly, Küpper tenders a description of significant aspects of Baroque style,

> characterized by a high degree of rhetoricization with a manifest proclivity for several specific figures, the most patent being the paradox and the metaphor—especially the expanded ('metaphora continuata') and the 'daring' (or 'bold') metaphor—in addition to those rhetorical techniques that traditionally signal 'elevated style', such as the hyperbaton, the periphrasis, the correlation, etc. (*Diskurs-Renovatio* 10; trans. dsm).

In this context pertaining to *elocutio*, Küpper elucidates the exceptionally rhetoricized mode of Mannerism (cf. *Diskurs-Renovatio* 290–304), accentuating the aspects of '*agudeza*' and '*stupore*'—also central to (Baroque) drama—as theorized by Tesauro's and Gracián's rhetorical poetics (cf. *Diskurs-Renovatio* 10; 301–304; 304n.).[58] Küpper stresses that what had been '*ornatus*' turns into "the dominant aspect in Mannerist texts" (*Diskurs-Renovatio* 11; trans. dsm).[59] In this

57 Cf. Press' assessment: "Greco-Roman culture [...] was itself essentially rhetorical. The Christian culture of which Augustine is rightly considered the founder is [...] at its heart a rhetorical culture no less than the pagan culture that it replaced—and perhaps more so. For [...] ideas and habits that were formed in the rhetoric of early Christianity [...] became deep structures of Christian philosophy and theology and remain so to this day" (Press qtd. in: Eden "Augustinian Hermeneutics" 47n.); see also Niehues-Pröbsting ("Glauben" 24).

58 For the latter, see Küpper ("Jesuitismus" passim; spec. 441f.; with remarks on Tesauro: 441n.–442n.); as to *agudeza* and Gracián, cf. Curtius (297–305; also: 88); Schulz-Buschhaus (92–97); Mayfield (*Artful Immorality* 14f.; 52n.; 199–270); on the "argutia movement" generally, see Gil ("Rhetorische Figuren" 29; trans. dsm). As to "*argutia* [...] *stupore*" generally, cf. Plett ("Rhetorik der Renaissance" 12). For Gracián and rhetoric—also with regard to Baroque theater, 'theatricality'—see the volume ed. by Spadaccini/Talens (*Rhetoric and Politics* passim); therein, cf. spec. their introduction ("Practice of Worldly Wisdom" xxii); Forcione (22–44); Castillo (195–200); Sánchez (209–224); as well as Friedman's synoptic afterword (passim; 364).

59 For the Ancient origins, cf. Küpper's note: "As regards the formal features, see Friedrich's sketch concerning Mannerism as a specific variant of a special form of Ancient speech, constituted during the first century; it subsequently influenced Christian Late Antiquity, and was handed down via the rhetorical manuals into Medieval times (albeit in a 'normal stage', initially

vein, Calderón is described as the "poet of rhetorical splendor and discursive rigor" (*Diskurs-Renovatio* 147; trans dsm): "For Calderón, and in contrast to Lope, conceptist diction is not an *ornatus* utilized for the rhetorical adornment of 'crucial' passages; it is a stylistic dominant of the entire text" (*Diskurs-Renovatio* 349; trans. dsm).[60]

In the present volume, Küpper's essay takes a synoptic, theoretico-diachronic approach. It charts the conditions of possibility for cultural production by describing various forms of virtual and material mobility, the poly-directional floatation of structures and contents in a universal cultural network. From a (script) culture's preexisting material (contents, structures, practices) stored by certain techniques (*copia*, via *memoria*, for *inventio*), artifacts and patterns are assembled, disassembled, reassembled to serve in diverse and shifting contexts (*dispositio*).[61] In this panorama of permanent transferal and refunctionalization, rhetorical theory itself represents a flexible and widely circulated set of precepts for formulating texts—its considerable mobility also enabled by a *lingua franca*.[62]

---

only slightly or hardly influenced by Mannerist style); over the course of the centuries, it once more developed into a manner of pervasive rhetoricization, thereby blazing the way for a renewed reception of Ancient Asianism (*Epochen der italienischen Lyrik* 593–616)" (*Diskurs-Renovatio* 25n.; trans. dsm).

60 See Jakobson's stance: "poeticalness is not a supplementation of discourse with rhetorical adornment but a total reevaluation of the discourse and of all its components whatsoever" (93). Cf. "Successful ornament [...] is absorbed in the energy it creates" (Cornilliat "Ornament" 985).

61 Lausberg remarks that 'the doctrine of memory, which was conceived of in spatial terms, in turn influenced the disposition of literary works' (*Elemente* 26, §45); he ties "*copia rerum*" to the spatialized '*téchne* of *memoria*', walking through a mind map of '*tópoi*', "*loci*" (*Elemente* 24, §40); the questions to be asked in this respect are: "*quis, quid, ubi, quibus auxiliis, cur, quomodo, quando*" (*Elemente* 25, §41). Cf. "Nonnulla pars inventionis est nosse quid quaeras" (Augustine qtd. in: Auerbach 83). Cicero terms '*inventio*' "prima ac maxima parte rhetoricae" ("De Inventione" 344, II.lix.178); he joins *copia* and *memoria*: "Quid est enim memoria rerum et verborum? quid porro inventio?" (*Tusculan* 74, I.xxvi.65; cf. 75n.); prior: "eloquentiam", "sententiis", "inventum"—in effect equating the implicit *copia* with "memoria" via "rerum et verborum" (*Tusculan* 74, I.xxvi.64); the respective concepts are again paired "invenire, meminisse" (*Tusculan* 76, I.xxvi.65)—a nexus functionalized in his essay on old age: "Fructus [...] senectutis est [...] memoria et copia" ("Senectute" 82, XIX.71). In rhetorical terms, Lotman's *Structure of the Artistic Text* is dedicated to *dispositio*: "Material [that is] without a system [and] structurally unorganized cannot be a means for storing and transmitting information. Hence the first step toward crafting a text is the crafting of a *system*" (421; trans. dsm).

62 See Bender/Wellbery: "[t]he rhetorical paradigm was international in character, tied to the Latin language" ("Rhetoricality" 21).

In tracing deliberate and inadvertent or incidental patterns of transcultural dynamics, the human agencies described are the Church, the aristocracy, scholars, academies, the Jewry, and merchants. The Catholic approach is always already universal(ist) rather than national: this is exemplified, above all, in religious (didactic) plays.[63] Such and similar, continuous or intermittent endeavors on the part of transcultural intermediaries (individual or collective) constitute the preconditions for the factual omnipresence of a shared set of rules for formulation; at once, rhetorical techniques serve as expedient instruments of dissemination with a view to (spiritual, humanist, moral) education and edification, as well as for other purposive (power political) ends.[64]

Throughout, Küpper accentuates the human agents themselves, their active upkeep and expansion of various networks: they are carriers of cultural memory, which includes rhetorical schooling, social norms (referring to the *aptum*), customary forms of *actio* (gesture, voice).[65] Like highly mobile humanist scholars, the Early Modern aristocracy—always already transnational by diverse marriage alliances and scattered properties (typically resulting in frequent travels)—is also a crucial factor for both rhetoric and drama: as authorities, and on account of their prestige, they convey and promote a courtly rhetoric (specifically in terms of the *ornatus*, the *aptum*), and employ a highly rhetorical drama for purposes of (self-)representation and the maintenance of power relations.[66] Early Modern

63 As to a paradigmatic case in this respect—the Baroque Portuguese preacher, rhetorician, politician, missionary, and Jesuit António Vieira—see the volume ed. by Gil/Thielemann (*Die Rhetorik António Vieiras* passim; "Vorwort" passim; spec. VII–XI); for his rhetorico-political sermons and missionary activity in Brazil, see Thielemann (passim; spec. 33–35), stressing the utilization of the rhetorico-dramatic technique of *evidentia* for swaying the audience (37, 46, 54, 62, 64, 68f.); as to Vieira's writings, Gil's essay accentuates the functional synergy of hermeneutics and rhetoric with a view to effects on, and in, the audience ("Rhetorik des *Discurso Engenhoso*" passim; spec. 108f., 114f., 119f.).

64 For the affinity between politics, 'theatrics', rhetoric in Machiavelli, see Kahn (*Machiavellian Rhetoric* 26; 57; "Example" 201); Mayfield (*Artful Immorality* 84n.; 87n.; 104n.; 122; 135; 141).

65 Bender/Wellbery stress the continuity of "[t]he discipline of rhetoric" as "dominat[ing] European education and discourse, whether public or private, for more than two thousand years", including a "rhetorical conduct of thought and speech" ("Rhetoricality" 4).

66 As to the court qua theater—a "*Theatrum Aulicum*" ("*Theatrum Rhetoricum*" 360)—Plett focuses on "[*s*]*imulatio* and *dissimulatio*", which fashion "a rhetorical appearance, manifesting itself in mise-en-scènes of the body and of language. The result is a [form of] art, which [...] disavows the claim to [its] being art. The entirety of its manifestations constitutes a Theatrum Rhetoricum, which conceives of [a] human being as [an] actor" ("*Theatrum Rhetoricum*" 360; trans. dsm). He stresses that the "*homo rhetoricus* [is] not only [a] committed actor, but simultaneously a spectator at a distance", referring to "Baldassare Castiglione's *Libro del Cortegiano*"—refunctionalizing "Cicero's philosophy of the ideal orator in culture[-specific]

academies provide an institutionalized infrastructure for systematically enabling and propelling various processes of cultural absorption, re-synthetization, and re-floatation, specifically via the considerably rhetoricized genres of the *disputatio* and the dialog. The Jewry act as a most influential instrument of transnational cultural exchange, the same as various economic endeavors leading to incidental transfer; as to the latter, Küpper describes the trade network of the *Deutsche Hanse* in more detail, seeing in its merchants prototypically flexible agents of cultural transfer.

In tendering a balanced panorama of theoretical reflections, detailed case studies, and descriptive synopses, this volume also points toward terrain yet to be charted in the scholarship to come. For this purpose, the appendix features Asmuth's entry "Drama" from the *Historical Dictionary of Rhetoric*, in an English translation by the present editor.[67] Representing academic *actio*, the conference minutes—including a concise description of the discussions and issues raised—are tendered as potential points of reference for further research; the same holds true for the *copia* of notes and the detailed bibliography offered in this preface. Longstanding reciprocities and dynamic synergies between rhetoric and drama have primed this field for future case studies, for rhetorically heuristic theoretical approaches. In all its parts, the present volume aims at conducing thereto.

---

aesthetic reflections"—as the "[c]onsummate expression" of "this concept", which "interprets the courtier as an actor" ("*Theatrum Rhetoricum*" 360; trans. dsm). See Barner: "the court [...] is theater to the highest degree" (117; trans. dsm; cf. 119). As regards courtly (aristocratic) self-representation and epideictic rhetoric ("life at court [...] *is* epideictic"), see Stampino ("Epideictic Pastoral" 39; cf. 43, passim). For the Imperial Roman nexus of rhetoric and representation as regards the respective elite, Fuhrmann accentuates the aristocracy's education as ensuring "that the show ['Spiel'] rehearsed over many centuries [be] continually enacted", and that "a sufficient number of conventionalized representatives ['Rollenträger'] for the set of actors ['Rollenplan'] of the aristocratic theatrical stage ['Schaubühne'] [be] at disposal" (102; trans. dsm). Thereto, cf. Marschall (514), and her comparative remark on Baroque theater, noting a "scope of functions: courtly absolutistic representation and diversion, Counter-Reformation propaganda and school education" (520; trans. dsm).

67 See Asmuth ("Drama"); he also traces the reciprocities between drama and rhetoric throughout his monograph (cf. *Dramenanalyse* passim; spec. 9f., 12, 25, 27, 42f., 51f., 70–78, 86f., 138, 160–166, 174, 187–189).

Bibliography

Primary Literature

Aristophanes. "Clouds". Ed. and trans. by Jeffrey Henderson. *Clouds. Wasps. Peace*. Vol. II. *Loeb Classical Library*. 488. Ed. G. P. Goold. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1998. 1–211. Print.

Aristotle. *The 'Art' of Rhetoric*. 1926. Trans. John Henry Freese. *Loeb Classical Library*. 193. Ed. Jeffrey Henderson. Vol. XXII. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2006. Print.

—. "Poetics". Ed. and trans. by Stephen Halliwell. *Aristotle. Poetics. Longinus. On the Sublime. Demetrius. On Style*. Vol. XXIII. *Loeb Classical Library*. 199. Ed. G. P. Goold. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1995. 27–141. Print.

Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhaĭlovich. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. 1981. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. *Slavic series*. I. Ed. Michael Holquist. Austin, TX: U of Texas P, 2002. Print.

Benjamin, Walter. *Ursprung des deutschen Trauerspiels*. 1955. Ed. Rolf Tiedemann. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1978. Print.

Blumenberg, Hans. "Anthropologische Annäherung an die Aktualität der Rhetorik". *Ästhetische und metaphorologische Schriften*. Ed. Anselm Haverkamp. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 2001. 406–431. Print.

—. *Begriffe in Geschichten*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1998. Print.

—. *Die Genesis der kopernikanischen Welt. Die Zweideutigkeit des Himmels. Eröffnung der Möglichkeit eines Kopernikus*. 1981. 3rd ed. Vol. I. 3 Vols. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1996. Print.

—. *Die Genesis der kopernikanischen Welt. Typologie der frühen Wirkungen. Der Stillstand des Himmels und der Fortgang der Zeit*. 1981. 3rd ed. Vol. II. 3 Vols. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1996. Print.

—. *Die Genesis der kopernikanischen Welt. Der kopernikanische Komparativ. Die kopernikanische Optik*. 1981. 3rd ed. Vol. III. 3 Vols. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1996. Print.

—. *Die Sorge geht über den Fluß*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1987. Print.

—. *Die Verführbarkeit des Philosophen*. 2000. Ed. Manfred Sommer. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 2005. Print.

—. "Epochenschwelle und Rezeption". *Philosophische Rundschau* 6 (1958): 94–120. Print.

—. *Geistesgeschichte der Technik*. Eds. Alexander Schmitz and Bernd Stiegler. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 2009. Print.

—. *Höhlenausgänge*. 1989. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1996. Print.

—. *Legitimität der Neuzeit*. 1966. 2nd ed. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1999. Print.

—. *Schiffbruch mit Zuschauer. Paradigmen einer Daseinsmetapher*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1979. Print.

—. *Schriften zur Technik*. Eds. Alexander Schmitz and Bernd Stiegler. Berlin: Suhrkamp, 2015. Print.

—. *Theorie der Unbegrifflichkeit*. Ed. Anselm Haverkamp. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 2007. Print.

—. "Wirklichkeitsbegriff und Staatstheorie". *Schweizer Monatshefte: Zeitschrift für Politik, Wirtschaft, Kultur* 48.2 (1969): 121–146. Print.

—. "Wirklichkeitsbegriff und Wirkungspotential des Mythos". *Terror und Spiel. Probleme der Mythenrezeption*. 1971. Ed. Manfred Fuhrmann. *Poetik und Hermeneutik*. IV. München: Fink, 1983. 11–66. Print.

Burckhardt, Jacob. *Griechische Kulturgeschichte*. 1957. *Gesammelte Werk*. VII. Vol. III. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1962. Print.

Calderón de la Barca, Pedro. *El gran teatro del mundo. El gran mercado del mundo*. 1974. Ed. Eugenio Frutos Cotés. *Letras Hispánicas*. 20th ed. Madrid: Cátedra, 2009. Print.

Castiglione, Baldesar. *The Book of the Courtier. An Authoritative Text. Criticism*. 1959. Trans. Charles S. Singleton. Ed. Daniel Javitch. *Norton Critical Edition*. New York, NY: Norton, 2002. Print.

Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *On Duties (De Officiis)*. 1913. Trans. Walter Miller. *Loeb Classical Library*. 30. Ed. Jeffrey Henderson. Vol. XXI. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1913. Print.

—. "On Invention (De Inventione)". Ed. and trans. by H. M. Hubbell. *On Invention (De Inventione). Best Kind of Orator (De Optimo Genere Oratorum). Topics (Topica)*. Vol. II. *Loeb Classical Library*. 386. Ed. Jeffrey Henderson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1949. 1–346. Print.

—. "On Old Age (Cato Maior De Senectute)". Trans. William Armistead Falconer. *On Old Age. On Friendship. On Divination (De Senectute. De Amicitia. De Divinatione)*. Vol. XX. *Loeb Classical Library*. 154. Ed. Jeffrey Henderson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1923. 1–99. Print.

—. *On the Orator (De Oratore). Books I–II*. 1942. Trans. E. W. Sutton and H. Rackham. Ed. H. Rackham. *Loeb Classical Library*. 348. Ed. Jeffrey Henderson. Vol. III. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1948. Print.

—. "Orator". Trans. H. M. Hubbell. *Brutus. Orator*. 1939. Eds. G. L. Hendrickson and H. M. Hubbell. Vol. V. *Loeb Classical Library*. 342. Ed. Jeffrey Henderson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1962. 295–509. Print.

—. *Tusculan Disputations (Tusculanae disputationes)*. 1927. Ed. and trans. by J. E. King. *Loeb Classical Library*. 141. Ed. Jeffrey Henderson. Vol. XVIII. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1945. Print.

D. Laertius. *Lives of Eminent Philosophers II*. 1925. Trans. R. D. Hicks. *Loeb Classical Library*. 185. Vol. II. 2 Vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2006. Print.

Dürrenmatt, Friedrich. *Essays, Gedichte*. 1985. *Gesammelte Werke*. 7. Zürich: Diogenes, 1996. Print.

Eliot, T. S. "The Function of Criticism (1923)". *Selected Essays*. 1932. 3rd ed. London, UK: Faber and Faber, 1961. 23–34. Print.

—. "'Rhetoric' and Poetic Drama (1919)". *Selected Essays*. 1932. 3rd ed. London, UK: Faber and Faber, 1961. 37–42. Print.

—. "Tradition and the Individual Talent (1917)". *Selected Essays*. 1932. 3rd ed. London, UK: Faber and Faber, 1961. 13–22. Print.

Epictetus. "The Encheiridion". Trans. W. A. Oldfather. *The Discourses. Books III–IV*. Ed. Jeffrey Henderson. Vol. 2. *Loeb Classical Library*. 218. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1928. 479–537. Print.

Erasmus, Desiderius. *The Praise of Folly and Other Writings. A New Translation With Critical Commentary*. Ed. and trans. by Robert M. Adams. *Norton Critical Edition*. New York, NY: Norton, 1989. Print.

Foucault, Michel. "Die Ordnung der Dinge. Eine Archäologie der Humanwissenschaften". Trans. Ulrich Köppen. *Die Hauptwerke*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 2008. 7–469. Print.

Gorgias. "Encomium of Helen (49[F10])". Ed. and trans. by Daniel W. Graham. *The Texts of Early Greek Philosophy. The Complete Fragments and Selected Testimonies of the Major Presocratics*. Vol. II. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP, 2010. 754–763. Print.

Gracián, Baltasar. *El Criticón*. 1980. Ed. Santos Alonso. 11th ed. Madrid: Cátedra, 2009. Print.

—. *Oráculo manual y arte de prudencia*. 1995. Ed. Emilio Blanco. *Letras Hispánicas*. 9th ed. Madrid: Cátedra, 2011. Print.

Hobbes, Thomas. *Elementa philosophica de cive*. Amsterodami: L. Elzevirium, 1647. *The Making Of The Modern World*. July 7, 2016. <http://find.galegroup.com/mome/infomark.do?&source=gale&prodId=MOME&userGroupName=fub&tabID=T001&docId=U3604059325&type=multipage&contentSet=MOMEArticles&version=1.0&docLevel=FASCIMILE>.

—. *Leviathan*. 1991. Ed. Richard Tuck. *Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought*. Eds. Raymond Geuss and Quentin Skinner. 11th ed. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP, 2008. Print.

—. *Man and Citizen (*De Homine *and* De Cive*)*. 1972. Trans. Charles T. Wood, T. S. K. Scott-Craig, and Bernard Gert. Ed. Bernard Gert. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 1991. Print.

Horace. "Ars Poetica". Trans. H. R. Fairclough. *Satires. Epistles. Ars Poetica*. 1926. *Loeb Classical Library*. 194. Ed. Jeffrey Henderson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2005. 442–489. Print.

Isocrates. *Volume I*. Ed. and trans. by George Norlin. *Loeb Classical Library*. 209. Ed. Jeffrey Henderson. Vol. I. 3 Vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1928. Print.

Kant, Immanuel. *Kritik der Urteilskraft*. Ed. Heiner F. Klemme. *Philosophische Bibliothek*. 507. 2nd ed. Hamburg: Meiner, 2009. Print.

Kranz, Walther, ed. *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*. 1903. Trans. Hermann Diels. 6th ed. Vol. II (59–90). 3 Vols. Zürich/Hildesheim: Weidmann, 1985. Print.

—, ed. *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*. 1903. Trans. Hermann Diels. 6th ed. Vol. I (1–58). 3 Vols. Zürich/Hildesheim: Weidmann, 1985. Print.

Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim. *Emilia Galotti. Ein Trauerspiel in fünf Aufzügen. Historisch-kritische Ausgabe*. Ed. Elke Monika Bauer. *Gotthold Ephraim Lessing. Werke in Einzelausgaben*. Ed. Winfried Woesler. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2004. Print.

'Longinus'. "On the Sublime". Ed. and trans. by W. H. Fyfe and Donald Russell. *Aristotle. Poetics. Longinus. On the Sublime. Demetrius. On Style*. Vol. XXIII. *Loeb Classical Library*. 199. Ed. G. P. Goold. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1995. 143–307. Print.

Lucian. "The Double Indictment, Or Trials By Jury". Ed. and trans. by A. M. Harmon. *Lucian III*. Vol. III. *Loeb Classical Library*. Eds. E. Capps, T.E. Page, and W. H. D. Rouse. London: Heinemann, 1921. 83–151. Print.

Machiavelli, Niccolò. *Mandragola*. Ed. Guido Davico Bonino. *Collezione di Teatro*. 33. Torino: Einaudi, 1980. Print.

Man, Paul de. *The Rhetoric of Romanticism*. New York, NY: Columbia UP, 1984. Print.

Marquard, Odo. *Aesthetica und Anaesthetica. Philosophische Überlegungen*. 1989. München: Fink, 2003. Print.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Menschliches, Allzumenschliches*. 1967. *Kritische Studienausgabe (KSA 2)*. Eds. Giorgio Colli and Mazzino Montinari. 2nd ed. Vol. 2. 15 Vols. München/Berlin/New York: dtv/de Gruyter, 1999. Print.

—. *Nachgelassene Fragmente 1869–1874*. 1967. *Kritische Studienausgabe (KSA 7)*. Eds. Giorgio Colli and Mazzino Montinari. 2nd ed. Vol. 7. 15 Vols. München/Berlin/New York: dtv/de Gruyter, 1999. Print.

—. *Nachgelassene Fragmente 1884–1885*. 1967. *Kritische Studienausgabe (KSA 11)*. Eds. Giorgio Colli and Mazzino Montinari. 2nd ed. Vol. 11. 15 Vols. München/Berlin/New York: dtv/de Gruyter, 1999. Print.

Petronius. "Satyricon, Fragments, Poems". Trans. Michael Heseltine and E. H. Warmington. *Petronius. Seneca, Apocolocyntosis*. 1913. Ed. E. H. Warmington. *Loeb Classical Library*. 15. Ed. G. P. Goold. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1975. vii–430. Print.

Plato. *Laws (Nomoi). Books VII–XII*. 1926. Trans. R. G. Bury. *Loeb Classical Library*. 192. Ed. Jeffrey Henderson. Vol. XI. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1984. Print.

—. "Phaedo". Trans. H. N. Fowler. *Euthyphro. Apology. Crito. Phaedo. Phaedrus*. Ed. W. R. M. Lamb. Vol. I. *Loeb Classical Library*. 36. Ed. Jeffrey Henderson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1914. 193–403. Print.

Plessner, Helmuth. "Die Deutung des mimischen Ausdrucks. Ein Beitrag zur Lehre vom Bewußtsein des anderen Ichs". *Zwischen Philosophie und Gesellschaft. Ausgewählte Abhandlungen und Vorträge*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1979. 150–204. Print.

—. "Zur Anthropologie des Schauspielers". *Zwischen Philosophie und Gesellschaft. Ausgewählte Abhandlungen und Vorträge*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1979. 205–219. Print.

Quintilian. *Institutio Oratoria / The Orator's Education. Books 3–5*. Ed. and trans. by Donald A. Russell. *Loeb Classical Library*. 125. Ed. Jeffrey Henderson. Vol. II. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2001. Print.

—. *Institutio Oratoria / The Orator's Education. Books 9–10*. Ed. and trans. by Donald A. Russell. *Loeb Classical Library*. 127. Eds. Jeffrey Henderson and G. P. Goold. Vol. IV. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2001. Print.

Rhetorica ad Herennium. 1954. Ed. and trans. by Harry Caplan. *Loeb Classical Library*. 403. Ed. Jeffrey Henderson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2004. Print.

Russell, Donald A. "Introduction [to Book 10]". *Institutio Oratoria / The Orator's Education. Books 9–10*. Ed. Donald A. Russell. Vol. IV. *Loeb Classical Library*. 127. Eds. Jeffrey Henderson and G. P. Goold. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2001. 246–251. Print.

Scaliger, Julius Caesar. *Poetices Libri Septem. Faksimile-Neudruck der Ausgabe Leipzig von Lyon 1561*. 1561. Ed. August Buck. 2nd ed. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: frommann-holzboog, 1987. Print.

Seneca, L. Annaeus. *Epistles 1–65*. Trans. Richard M. Gummere. *Loeb Classical Library*. 75. Ed. Jeffrey Henderson. Vol. IV. Cambridge MA: Harvard UP, 1917. Print.

—. *Epistles 66–92*. Trans. Richard M. Gummere. *Loeb Classical Library*. 76. Ed. Jeffrey Henderson. Vol. V. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1920. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *As You Like It*. 2006. Ed. Juliet Dusinberre. *The Arden Shakespeare*. Eds. Richard Proudfoot, et al. 3rd ed. London, UK: Bloomsbury, 2015. Print.

—. *Hamlet*. 1982. *The Arden Shakespeare*. Ed. Harold Jenkins. 2nd ed. London, UK: Thomson, 2003. Print.

—. *Macbeth*. Eds. Sandra Clark and Pamela Mason. *The Arden Shakespeare*. Ed. Richard Proudfoot, et al. 3rd ed. London, UK: Bloomsbury, 2015. Print.

Shaw, Samuel. *Words Made Visible: Or Grammar and Rhetorick Accommodated to the Lives and Manners of Men. Represented in a Country School for the Entertainment and Edification of the Spectators*. London (at the Flying-Horse near St. Dunstans Church in Fleetstreet): Daniel Major, 1679. Print.

Simmel, Georg. "Zur Philosophie des Schauspielers". *Das individuelle Gesetz. Philosophische Exkurse*. Ed. Michael Landmann. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1987. 75–95. Print.

Valéry, Paul. "Sur la technique littéraire". *Œuvres I*. Ed. Jean Hytier. *Bibliothèque de la Pléiade*. 127. Paris: Gallimard, 1957. 1785–1788. Print.

Secondary Literature

Asmuth, Bernhard. "Drama". *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik. Band 2: Bie–Eul*. Ed. Gert Ueding. *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*. 2. Ed. Gert Ueding. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1994. 905–921. Print.

—. *Einführung in die Dramenanalyse*. *Sammlung Metzler*. 188. 8th ed. Stuttgart: Metzler, 2016. Print.

Auerbach, Erich. *Philologie der Weltliteratur. Sechs Versuche über Stil und Wirklichkeitswahrnehmung*. 1967. Frankfurt a. M.: Fischer, 1992. Print.

Aust, Hugo, Peter Haida, and Jürgen Hein. *Volksstück. Vom Hanswurstspiel zum sozialen Drama der Gegenwart*. Ed. Jürgen Hein. *Arbeitsbücher zur Literaturgeschichte*. Eds. Wilfried Barner and Gunter E. Grimm. München: Beck, 1989. Print.

Barner, Wilfried. *Barockrhetorik. Untersuchung zu ihren geschichtlichen Grundlagen*. 1970. 2nd ed. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2002. Print.

Bender, John, and David E. Wellbery. "Preface". *The Ends of Rhetoric. History, Theory, Practice*. Eds. John Bender and David E. Wellbery. Stanford, CA: Stanford UP, 1990. vii–xi. Print.

—. "Rhetoricality: On the Modernist Return of Rhetoric". *The Ends of Rhetoric. History, Theory, Practice*. Eds. John Bender and David E. Wellbery. Stanford, CA: Stanford UP, 1990. 3–39; 209–213. Print.

Berger, Jr., Harry. "Sprezzatura and the Absence of Grace". *The Book of the Courtier. An Authoritative Text. Criticism*. 1959. Ed. Daniel Javitch. *Norton Critical Edition*. New York, NY: Norton, 2002. 295–307. Print.

Bers, Victor. "Tragedy and rhetoric". *Persuasion: Greek Rhetoric in Action*. Ed. Ian Worthington. London, UK: Routledge, 1994. 176–195. Print.

Bloemendal, Jan. "Poetiken der Frühen Neuzeit, insbesondere Vossius' *Poeticae Institutiones*, und die Interpretation neulateinischer Dichtung". *Norm und Poesie. Zur expliziten und impliziten Poetik in der lateinischen Literatur der Frühen Neuzeit*. Eds. Beate Hintzen and Roswitha Simons. *Frühe Neuzeit*. 178. Eds. Achim Aurnhammer, et al. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013. 199–209. Print.

—. "Senecan Drama From the Northern and Southern Netherlands: Paganization and Christianization". *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis / Dutch Review of Church History* 81.1 (2001): 38–45. Print.

—. "Transfer and Integration of Latin and Vernacular Drama in the Early Modern Period. The case of Everyman, Elckerlijc, Homulus and Hecastus". *arcadia* 44.2 (2009): 274–288. Print.

Blume, Horst-Dieter. *Einführung in das Antike Theaterwesen. Die Altertumswissenschaft*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1978. Print.

Booth, Wayne C. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. 1961. 7th ed. Chicago, IL: U of Chicago P, 1970. Print.

Borcherdt, Hans Heinrich. *Das europäische Theater im Mittelalter und in der Renaissance*. 1935. *rowohlts deutsche enzyklopädie*. Ed. Ernesto Grassi. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1969. Print.

Boriaud, Jean Yves, and Bernard Schouler. "Persona". Trans. Martin Steinrück and Thomas

Zinsmaier. *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik. Band 6: Must–Pop*. Ed. Gert Ueding. *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*. 6. Ed. Gert Ueding. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2003. 789–810. Print.

Branham, R. Bracht. *Unruly Eloquence. Lucian and the Comedy of Traditions*. *Revealing Antiquity*. 2. Ed. G. W. Bowersock. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1989. Print.

Brogan, T. V. F., Albert W. Halsall, and Jeffrey S. Sychterz. "Prosopopoeia". *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry & Poetics*. Eds. Roland Greene, et al. 4th ed. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2012. 1120–1121. Print.

Buck, August. "Einleitung". *Julius Caesar Scaliger. Poetices Libri Septem. Faksimile-Neudruck der Ausgabe Leipzig von Lyon 1561*. Ed. August Buck. 2nd ed. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: frommann-holzboog, 1987. V–XX. Print.

—. "Humanistische Bildung. Enea Silvio Piccolomini an Herzog Sigismund von Österreich". *Interpretation. Das Paradigma der Europäischen Renaissance-Literatur. Festschrift für Alfred Noyer-Weidner zum 60. Geburtstag*. Eds. Klaus W. Hempfer and Gerhard Regn. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1983. 394–404. Print.

Burke, Kenneth. "Rhetoric and Poetics". *Language as Symbolic Action. Essays on Life, Literature, and Method*. Berkeley / Los Angeles, CA: U of California P, 1966. 295–307. Print.

—. "Shakespearean Persuasion: *Antony and Cleopatra*". *Language as Symbolic Action. Essays on Life, Literature, and Method*. Berkeley / Los Angeles, CA: U of California P, 1966. 101–114. Print.

Carey, Christopher. "Rhetorical means of persuasion". *Persuasion: Greek Rhetoric in Action*. Ed. Ian Worthington. London, UK: Routledge, 1994. 26–45. Print.

Cartledge, Paul Anthony. *Ancient Greek Political Thought in Practice. Key Themes in Ancient History*. Eds. Paul Anthony Cartledge and P. D. A. Garnsey. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP, 2009. Print.

Castillo, David. "Gracián and the Art of Public Representation". *Rhetoric and Politics: Baltasar Gracián and the New World Order*. Eds. Nicholas Spadaccini and Jenaro Talens. *Hispanic Issues*. 14. Minneapolis, MN: Minnesota UP, 1997. 191–208. Print.

Cohen, David. "Classical rhetoric and modern theories of discourse". *Persuasion: Greek Rhetoric in Action*. Ed. Ian Worthington. London, UK: Routledge, 1994. 69–82. Print.

Cornilliat, François. "Ornament". *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry & Poetics*. Eds. Roland Greene, et al. 4th ed. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2012. 985–986. Print.

—. "Rhétoriqueurs, Grands". *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry & Poetics*. Eds. Roland Greene, et al. 4th ed. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2012. 1181–1182. Print.

Crick, Nathan. *Rhetoric and Power. The Drama of Classical Greece*. *Studies in Rhetoric/Communication*. Ed. Thomas W. Benson. Columbia, SC: U of South Carolina P, 2015. Print.

Croally, N. T. *Euripidean Polemic.* The Trojan Women *and the function of tragedy*. 1994. *Cambridge Classical Studies*. Eds. M. F. Burnyeat, et al. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP, 1999. Print.

Curtius, Ernst Robert. *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter*. 1948. 11th ed. Tübingen/Basel: Francke, 1993. Print.

Dockhorn, Klaus. *Macht und Wirkung der Rhetorik. Vier Aufsätze zur Ideengeschichte der Vormoderne*. *Respublica Literaria*. 2. Eds. Joachim Dyck and Günther List. Bad Homburg v. d. H. / Berlin / Zürich: Gehlen, 1968. Print.

Dubischar, Markus. "Der Kommunikationsmodus der Debatte im griechischen Drama (Aischylos, Sophokles, Euripides, Aristophanes)". *Jahrbuch Rhetorik* 25. *Rhetorik der Debatte* (2006): 14–29. Print.

Eden, Kathy. *Friends Hold All Things in Common. Tradition, Intellectual Property, and the Adages of Erasmus*. New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 2001. Print.

—. "Hermeneutics and the Ancient Rhetorical Tradition". *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* V.1 (Winter: 1987): 59–86. Print.

—. *Hermeneutics and the Rhetorical Tradition. Chapters in the Ancient Legacy and Its Humanist Reception. Yale Studies in Hermeneutics*. Ed. Joel Weinsheimer. New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 1997. Print.

—. "Intellectual Property and the *Adages* of Erasmus: *Coenobium v. Ercto non cito*". *Rhetoric and Law in Early Modern Europe*. Eds. Victoria Kahn and Lorna Hutson. New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 2001. 269–284. Print.

—. *Poetic and Legal Fiction in the Aristotelian Tradition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1986. Print.

—. "Rhetoric in the Hermeneutics of Erasmus' Later Works". *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook* 11 (1991): 88–104. Print.

—. "The Rhetorical Tradition and Augustinian Hermeneutics in *De doctrina christiana*". *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* 8.1 (Winter: 1990): 45–63. Print.

Eybl, Franz M. "Jesuitenrhetorik". *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik. Band 4: Hu–K*. Ed. Gert Ueding. Vol. 4. *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*. Ed. Gert Ueding. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1998. 717–728. Print.

Feldman, Martha. "Denaturing the Castrato". *The Opera Quarterly* 24.3–4 (2009): 178–199. Print.

Fischer-Lichte, Erika. *Geschichte des Dramas. Epochen der Identität auf dem Theater von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart. Band 2: Von der Romantik bis zur Gegenwart*. 1990. UTB. 2nd ed. Vol. 2. Tübingen / Basel: Francke, 1999. Print.

—. *Semiotik des Theaters. Eine Einführung. Band 2. Vom 'künstlichen' zum 'natürlichen' Zeichen. Theater des Barock und der Aufklärung*. 1983. 3rd ed. Vol. 2. Tübingen: Narr, 1995. Print.

Fitch, John G. "General Introduction". *Seneca. Tragedies I: Hercules. Trojan Women. Phoenician Women. Medea. Phaedra*. Ed. John G. Fitch. Vol. VIII. *Loeb Classical Library*. 62. Ed. Jeffrey Henderson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2002. 1–33. Print.

Forcione, Alban K. "At the Threshold of Modernity: Gracián's *El Criticón*". *Rhetoric and Politics: Baltasar Gracián and the New World Order*. Eds. Nicholas Spadaccini and Jenaro Talens. *Hispanic Issues*. 14. Minneapolis, MN: Minnesota UP, 1997. 3–70. Print.

Fothergill-Payne, Louise. "The Jesuits as Masters of Rhetoric and Drama". *Revista Canadiense de Estudios Hispánicos* 10.3 (Spring: 1986): 375–387. Print.

France, Peter. *Racine's Rhetoric*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon P, 1965. Print.

Freese, John Henry. "Select Glossary of Technical and Other Terms". *The 'Art' of Rhetoric*. 1926. Ed. John Henry Freese. Vol. XXII. *Loeb Classical Library*. 193. Ed. Jeffrey Henderson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2006. 472–482. Print.

Friedman, Edward H. "Constructing Gracián". *Rhetoric and Politics: Baltasar Gracián and the New World Order*. Eds. Nicholas Spadaccini and Jenaro Talens. *Hispanic Issues*. 14. Minneapolis, MN: Minnesota UP, 1997. 355–372. Print.

Fuhrmann, Manfred. "Persona, ein römischer Rollenbegriff". *Identität*. 1979. Eds. Odo Marquard and Karlheinz Stierle. 2nd ed. *Poetik und Hermeneutik*. 8. München: Fink, 1996. 83–106. Print.

Garver, Eugene. *Aristotle's* Rhetoric. *An Art of Character*. Chicago, IL: U of Chicago P, 1994. Print.

Gil, Alberto. "Rhetorische Figuren und Informationsstruktur im Italienischen am Beispiel der Antithesen von Emanuele Tesauro". *Retorica: Ordnungen und Brüche. Beiträge des Tübinger Italianistentages*. Eds. Rita Franceschini, et al. Tübingen: Narr, 2006. 27–37. Print.

—. "Zur Rhetorik des Discurso Engenhoso bei António Vieira". *Die Rhetorik António Vieiras. Akten der Sektion 'António Vieira und die portugiesische Rhetorik des 17. Jahrhunderts' beim V. Deutschen Lusitanistentag Rostock (25. – 28. September 2003)*. Eds. Alberto Gil and Werner Thielemann. *Romanistische Kongressberichte*. 13. Eds. Alberto Gil and Christian Schmidt. Bonn: Romanistischer Verlag, 2005. 97–123. Print.

Gil, Alberto, and Werner Thielemann, eds. *Die Rhetorik António Vieiras. Akten der Sektion 'António Vieira und die portugiesische Rhetorik des 17. Jahrhunderts' beim V. Deutschen Lusitanistentag Rostock (25. – 28. September 2003)*. *Romanistische Kongressberichte*. 13. Eds. Alberto Gil and Christian Schmidt. Bonn: Romanistischer Verlag, 2005. Print.

—. "Vorwort". *Die Rhetorik António Vieiras. Akten der Sektion 'António Vieira und die portugiesische Rhetorik des 17. Jahrhunderts' beim V. Deutschen Lusitanistentag Rostock (25. – 28. September 2003)*. Eds. Alberto Gil and Werner Thielemann. *Romanistische Kongressberichte*. 13. Eds. Alberto Gil and Christian Schmidt. Bonn: Romanistischer Verlag, 2005. VII–XVI. Print.

Gomperz, Heinrich. *Sophistik und Rhetorik. Das Bildungsideal des ΕΥ ΛΕΓΕΙΝ in seinem Verhältnis zur Philosophie des V. Jahrhunderts*. 1912. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1965. Print.

Green, Lawrence D. "Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and Renaissance Views of the Emotions". *Renaissance Rhetoric*. Ed. Peter Mack. New York, NY: St. Martin's P, 1994. 1–26. Print.

Große, Sybille. "Secretarios, formularios y retórica en la España del Siglo de Oro". *Retórica En Las Lenguas Iberorrománicas. Actas de la sección Retórica en las lenguas iberorrománicas. Una ciencia fronteriza entre Lingüística y Literatura, del XV° Congreso de la Asociación Alemana de Hispanistas, celebrado del 1 al 4 de marzo del 2005 en la Universidad de Bremen*. Eds. Alberto Gil and Christian Schmitt. *Romanistische Kongressberichte*. 15. Eds. Alberto Gil and Christian Schmitt. Bonn: Romanistischer Verlag, 2006. 317–335. Print.

Halliwell, Stephen. "Philosophy and rhetoric". *Persuasion: Greek Rhetoric in Action*. Ed. Ian Worthington. London, UK: Routledge, 1994. 222–243. Print.

Harding, Phillip. "Comedy and rhetoric". *Persuasion: Greek Rhetoric in Action*. Ed. Ian Worthington. London, UK: Routledge, 1994. 196–221. Print.

Harris, Edward M. "Law and oratory". *Persuasion: Greek Rhetoric in Action*. Ed. Ian Worthington. London, UK: Routledge, 1994. 130–150. Print.

Hart Nibbrig, Christiaan L. *Rhetorik des Schweigens. Versuch über den Schatten literarischer Rede*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1981. Print.

Hartmann, Volker. "Personifikation". *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik. Band 6: Must–Pop*. Ed. Gert Ueding. *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*. 6. Ed. Gert Ueding. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2003. 810–813. Print.

Haverkamp, Anselm. "Das Skandalon der Metaphorologie. Prolegomena eines Kommentars". *Metaphorologie. Zur Praxis von Theorie*. Eds. Anselm Haverkamp and Dirk Mende. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 2009. 33–61. Print.

—. *Figura cryptica. Theorie der literarischen Latenz*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 2002. Print.

Heeney, Tom. "Theorizing the Spectacle. A Rhetorical Analysis of Tragic Recognition". *Drama as Rhetoric / Rhetoric as Drama. An Exploration of Dramatic and Rhetorical Criticism*. Eds. Stanley Vincent Longman, et al. *Theatre Symposium. A Publication of the Southeastern Theatre Conference*. 5. Tuscaloosa, AL: U of Alabama P, 1997. 14–28. Print.

Heinimann, Felix. "Eine vorplatonische Theorie der τέχνη (1961)". *Sophistik*. Ed. Carl Joachim Classen. *Wege der Forschung*. CLXXXVII. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1976. 127–169. Print.

Hempfer, Klaus W. "Rhetorik als Gesellschaftstheorie: Castigliones *Il libro del Cortegiano*". *Literarhistorische Begegnungen. Festschrift zum sechzigsten Geburtstag von Bernhard König*. Eds. Andreas Kablitz and Ulrich Schulz-Buschhaus. Tübingen: Narr, 1993. 103–121. Print.

Heudecker, Sylvia, and Jörg Wesche. "Rhetorik und Stilistik der deutschsprachigen Länder in der Zeit des Barock / Rhetoric and stylistics of the German-speaking countries in the Baroque". *Rhetorik und Stilistik / Rhetoric and Stylistics: Ein internationales Handbuch historischer und systematischer Forschung / An International Handbook of Historical and Systematic Research*. Eds. Ulla Fix, Andreas Gardt and Joachim Knape. Vol. 1. *Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft / Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science*. 31.1. Berlin/Boston, MA: de Gruyter Mouton, 2008. 97–112. Print.

Hirzel, Rudolf. *Die Person. Begriff und Name derselben im Altertum. Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-philologische und historische Klasse*. 10. München: Verlag der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1914. Print.

Hunter, George K. "Rhetoric and Renaissance Drama". *Renaissance Rhetoric*. Ed. Peter Mack. New York, NY: St. Martin's P, 1994. 103–118. Print.

Hutson, Lorna. *The Invention of Suspicion. Law and Mimesis in Shakespeare and Renaissance Drama*. 2007. Oxford, UK: Oxford UP, 2011. Print.

—. "Not the King's Two Bodies: Reading the 'Body Politic' in Shakespeare's *Henry IV*, Parts 1 and 2". *Rhetoric and Law in Early Modern Europe*. Eds. Victoria Kahn and Lorna Hutson. New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 2001. 166–198. Print.

Iser, Wolfgang. *Prospecting: From Reader Response to Literary Anthropology*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins UP, 1993. Print.

Jakobson, Roman. *Language in Literature*. Eds. Krystyna Pomorska and Stephen Rudy. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1987. Print.

Jardine, Lisa. "Ghosting the Reform of Dialectic: Erasmus and Agricola Again". *Renaissance Rhetoric*. Ed. Peter Mack. New York, NY: St. Martin's P, 1994. 27–45. Print.

Jauß, Hans Robert. "Epilog auf die Forschungsgruppe 'Poetik und Hermeneutik'". *Kontingenz*. Eds. Gerhart von Graevenitz and Odo Marquard. *Poetik und Hermeneutik*. XVII. München: Fink, 1998. 525–533. Print.

Johnson, Ronald W. "Rhetoric and Drama in Rochester's 'Satyr against Reason and Mankind'". *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900*. 15.3: *Restoration and Eighteenth Century*. (Summer: 1975): 365–373. Print.

Kahn, Victoria. "Humanism and the Resistance to Theory". *Literary Theory / Renaissance Texts*. Eds. Patricia Parker and David Quint. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins UP, 1986. 373–396. Print.

—. *Machiavellian Rhetoric. From the Counter-Reformation to Milton*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1994. Print.

—. "*Virtù* and the Example of Agathocles in Machiavelli's *Prince*". *Machiavelli and the Discourse of Literature*. Eds. Albert Russell Ascoli and Victoria Kahn. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1993. 195–217. Print.

Kahn, Victoria, and Lorna Hutson, eds. *Rhetoric and Law in Early Modern Europe*. New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 2001. Print.

Kallendorf, Craig. "Brevitas". Trans. Lisa Gondos. *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik. Band 2: Bie–Eul*. Ed. Gert Ueding. *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*. 2. Ed. Gert Ueding. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1994. 53–60. Print.

Kegl, Rosemary. *The Rhetoric of Concealment. Figuring Gender and Class in Renaissance Literature*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1994. Print.

Kindermann, Heinz. *Das Theaterpublikum der Antike*. Salzburg: Müller, 1979. Print.

—. *Das Theaterpublikum des Mittelalters*. Salzburg: Müller, 1980. Print.

Knox, Dilwyn. "Order, Reason and Oratory: Rhetoric in Protestant Latin Schools". *Renaissance Rhetoric*. Ed. Peter Mack. New York, NY: St. Martin's P, 1994. 63–80. Print.

Kranz, Walther. "Vorsokratisches IV. Die sogenannten Διοσοὶ λόγοι (Auszug) (1937)". *Sophistik*. Ed. Carl Joachim Classen. *Wege der Forschung*. CLXXXVII. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1976. 629–640. Print.

Küpper, Joachim. *Diskurs-Renovatio bei Lope de Vega und Calderón. Untersuchungen zum spanischen Barockdrama. Mit einer Skizze zur Evolution der Diskurse in Mittelalter, Renaissance und Manierismus. Romanica Monacensia*. 32. Tübingen: Narr, 1990. Print.

—. "Jesuitismus und Manierismus in Graciáns *Oráculo manual*". *Romanistisches Jahrbuch* 58 (2007): 412–442. Print.

Lausberg, Heinrich. *Elemente der literarischen Rhetorik*. 1963. 10th ed. Ismaning: Hueber, 1990. Print.

—. *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*. 1960. 4th ed. Stuttgart: Steiner, 2008. Print.

Lindner, Hermann. "Erhabener und schlichter Stil in der französischen Renaissancelyrik: Parmentier und Ronsard". *Interpretation. Das Paradigma der Europäischen Renaissance-Literatur. Festschrift für Alfred Noyer-Weidner zum 60. Geburtstag*. Eds. Klaus W. Hempfer and Gerhard Regn. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1983. 105–123. Print.

Longman, Stanley Vincent. "Introduction". *Drama as Rhetoric / Rhetoric as Drama. An Exploration of Dramatic and Rhetorical Criticism*. Eds. Stanley Vincent Longman, et al. *Theatre Symposium. A Publication of the Southeastern Theatre Conference*. 5. Tuscaloosa, AL: U of Alabama P, 1997. 5–6. Print.

Lotman, Jurij M. *Die Struktur literarischer Texte*. Trans. Rolf-Dietrich Keil. *UTB*. München: Fink, 1972. Print.

Lowe, N. J. *Comedy. Greece & Rome. New Surveys in the Classics*. 37. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP, 2008. Print.

Mack, Peter. "Introduction". *Renaissance Rhetoric*. Ed. Peter Mack. New York, NY: St. Martin's P, 1994. vii–xi. Print.

—. "Rhetoric in Use: Three Romances by Greene and Lodge". *Renaissance Rhetoric*. Ed. Peter Mack. New York, NY: St. Martin's P, 1994. 119–139. Print.

Mareel, Samuel. "Rederijkers". *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry & Poetics*. Eds. Roland Greene, et al. 4th ed. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2012. 1151. Print.

Marschall, Veronika. "Theater". *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik. Band 9: St–Z*. Ed. Gert Ueding. *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*. 9. Ed. Gert Ueding. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2009. 510–528. Print.

Mayfield, DS. *Artful Immorality – Variants of Cynicism. Machiavelli, Gracián, Diderot, Nietzsche*. *WeltLiteraturen / World Literatures*. 8. Eds. Irmela Hijiya-Kirschnereit, Stefan Keppler-Tasaki, and Joachim Küpper. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2015. Print.

—. "Variants of *hypólepsis*: Rhetorical, Anthropistic, Dramatic (with Remarks on Terrence, Machiavelli, Shakespeare)". *Poetics and Politics. Net Structures and Agencies in Early Modern Drama*. Eds. Toni Bernhart, Jaša Drnovšek, Sven Thorsten Kilian, Joachim Küpper, and Jan Mosch. Berlin: de Gruyter, forthcoming [2017]. Print.

Meerhoff, Kees. "The Significance of Philip Melanchthon's Rhetoric in the Renaissance". *Renaissance Rhetoric*. Ed. Peter Mack. New York, NY: St. Martin's P, 1994. 46–62. Print.

Menke, Bettine. *Prosopopoiia. Stimme und Text bei Brentano, Hoffmann, Kleist und Kafka*. München: Fink, 2000. Print.

Möller, Melanie. "Das distanzierte Leben. Zur pragmatischen Dimension der Rhetorik bei Hans Blumenberg". *Jahrbuch Rhetorik* 32. *Rhetorik und Pragmatik* (2013): 1–15. Print.

Most, Glenn W. *Doubting Thomas*. 2005. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2007. Print.

—. "Rhetorik und Hermeneutik: Zur Konstitution der Neuzeitlichkeit". *Antike und Abendland* 30.1 (1984): 62–79. Print.

Müllenbrock, Heinz-Joachim. "Shakespeare und die Rhetorik". *Die Macht des Wortes. Aspekte gegenwärtiger Rhetorikforschung*. Eds. Carl Joachim Classen and Heinz-Joachim Müllenbrock. *Ars Rhetorica*. 4. Eds. Volker Kapp, et al. Marburg: Hitzeroth, 1992. 47–61. Print.

Niehues-Pröbsting, Heinrich. "Anmerkungen zur Rezeption der Aristotelischen *Rhetorik* im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert". *Jahrbuch Rhetorik* 20 (May: 2002): 131–147. Print.

—. *Der Kynismus des Diogenes und der Begriff des Zynismus*. 2nd ed. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1988. Print.

—. "Rhetorical Turn?". *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Philosophie* 54.6 (2006): 948–954. Print.

—. "Rhetorik und Ästhetik". *Rhetorik* 18 (1999): 44–61. Print.

—. "Überredung zum Glauben". *Jahrbuch Rhetorik* 34. *Rhetorik und Religion* (Nov: 2015): 13–44. Print.

Nienkamp, Jean. "The Rhetorical Self". *Jahrbuch Rhetorik* 30. *Rhetorik und Subjektivität* (2011): 69–79. Print.

Norbrook, David. "Rhetoric, Ideology and the Elizabethan World Picture". *Renaissance Rhetoric*. Ed. Peter Mack. New York, NY: St. Martin's P, 1994. 140–164. Print.

Oesterreich, Peter L. "Person". *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik. Band 10: Nachträge A–Z*. Ed. Gert Ueding. *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*. 10. Ed. Gert Ueding. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2012. 862–872. Print.

Pfister, Manfred. *Das Drama. Theorie und Analyse*. 1988. *UTB*. 11th ed. Fink: München, 2001. Print.

Plett, Heinrich F. "EVIDENTIA. Zur Rhetorik der Präsenz in den *artes* der Frühen Neuzeit". *Norm und Poesie. Zur expliziten und impliziten Poetik in der lateinischen Literatur der Frühen Neuzeit*. Eds. Beate Hintzen and Roswitha Simons. *Frühe Neuzeit*. 178. Eds. Achim Aurnhammer, et al. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013. 255–273. Print.

—. *Literary Rhetoric. Concepts—Structures—Analyses. International Studies in the History of Rhetoric*. 2. Eds. Laurent Pernot and Craig Kallendorf. Leiden/Boston, MA: Brill, 2010. Print.
—. "Rhetorik der Renaissance – Renaissance der Rhetorik". *Renaissance-Rhetorik / Renaissance Rhetoric*. Ed. Heinrich F. Plett. Berlin / New York, NY: de Gruyter, 1993. 1–20. Print.
—. *Systematische Rhetorik. Konzepte und Analysen*. *UTB*. 2127. München: Fink, 2000. Print.
—. "*Theatrum Rhetoricum*: Schauspiel – Dichtung – Politik". *Renaissance-Rhetorik / Renaissance Rhetoric*. Ed. Heinrich F. Plett. Berlin / New York, NY: de Gruyter, 1993. 1–20. Print.
—. "Vorwort". *Renaissance-Rhetorik / Renaissance Rhetoric*. Ed. Heinrich F. Plett. Berlin / New York, NY: de Gruyter, 1993. V–VI. Print.
—. "Vorwort". *Die Aktualität der Rhetorik*. Ed. Heinrich F. Plett. *Figuren*. 5. Eds. Heinrich F. Plett and Helmut Schanze. München: Fink, 1996. 5–6. Print.
Rebmann, Frank. "Pronuntiatio". *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik. Band 7: Pos–Rhet*. Ed. Gert Ueding. Vol. 7. *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*. Ed. Gert Ueding. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2005. 212–247. Print.
Rubin, Patricia. "Raphael and the Rhetoric of Art". *Renaissance Rhetoric*. Ed. Peter Mack. New York, NY: St. Martin's P, 1994. 165–182. Print.
Sánchez, Francisco J. "Symbolic Wealth and Theatricality in Gracián". *Rhetoric and Politics: Baltasar Gracián and the New World Order*. Eds. Nicholas Spadaccini and Jenaro Talens. *Hispanic Issues*. 14. Minneapolis, MN: Minnesota UP, 1997. 209–229. Print.
Sansone, David. *Greek Drama and the Invention of Rhetoric*. Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012. Print.
Schulz-Buschhaus, Ulrich. *Moralistik und Poetik*. *Ars Rhetorica*. 8. Eds. Volker Kapp, et al. Hamburg: LIT, 1997. Print.
Sheppard, Anne. "Rhetoric, Drama and Truth in Plato's *Symposium*". *The International Journal of the Platonic Tradition* 2 (2008): 28–40. Print.
Skinner, Quentin. *Forensic Shakespeare*. Oxford, UK: Oxford UP, 2014. Print.
—. "Hobbes on Representation". *European Journal of Philosophy* 13.2 (2005): 155–184. Print.
Sloan[e], Thomas O. "The Crossing of Rhetoric and Poetry in the English Renaissance". *The Rhetoric of Renaissance Poetry. From Wyatt to Milton*. Eds. Thomas O. Sloan[e] and Raymond B. Waddington. Berkeley, CA: U of California P, 1974. 212–242. Print.
Sloane, Thomas O. "Ethos". *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry & Poetics*. Eds. Roland Greene, et al. 4th ed. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2012. 464. Print.
Sloane, Thomas O., and Walter Jost. "Rhetoric and Poetry". *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry & Poetics*. Eds. Roland Greene, et al. 4th ed. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2012. 1175–1181. Print.
Spadaccini, Nicholas, and Jenaro Talens. "The Practice of Worldly Wisdom: Rereading Gracián from the New World Order". *Rhetoric and Politics: Baltasar Gracián and the New World Order*. Eds. Nicholas Spadaccini and Jenaro Talens. *Hispanic Issues*. 14. Minneapolis, MN: Minnesota UP, 1997. ix–xxxii. Print.
—, eds. *Rhetoric and Politics: Baltasar Gracián and the New World Order*. *Hispanic Issues*. 14. Eds. Nicholas Spadaccini, et al. Minneapolis, MN: Minnesota UP, 1997. Print.
Spang, Kurt. "Literatura y persuasión". *Retórica En Las Lenguas Iberorrománicas. Actas de la sección Retórica en las lenguas iberorrománicas. Una ciencia fronteriza entre Lingüística y Literatura, del XV° Congreso de la Asociación Alemana de Hispanistas, celebrado del 1 al 4*

de marzo del 2005 en la Universidad de Bremen. Eds. Alberto Gil and Christian Schmitt. *Romanistische Kongressberichte*. 15. Eds. Alberto Gil and Christian Schmitt. Bonn: Romanistischer Verlag, 2006. 209–217. Print.

Stampino, Maria Galli. "Epideictic Pastoral: Rhetorical Tensions in the Staging of Torquato Tasso's *Aminta*". *Drama as Rhetoric / Rhetoric as Drama. An Exploration of Dramatic and Rhetorical Criticism*. Eds. Stanley Vincent Longman, et al. *Theatre Symposium. A Publication of the Southeastern Theatre Conference*. 5. Tuscaloosa, AL: U of Alabama P, 1997. 36–49. Print.

—. "The Woman Narrator's Voice: The Case of Lucrezia Marinella's *Enrico*". *Italian Studies* 69.1 (March: 2014): 75–94. Print.

Staub, August W. "The Enthymeme and the Invention of Troping in Greek Drama". *Drama as Rhetoric / Rhetoric as Drama. An Exploration of Dramatic and Rhetorical Criticism*. Eds. Stanley Vincent Longman, et al. *Theatre Symposium. A Publication of the Southeastern Theatre Conference*. 5. Tuscaloosa, AL: U of Alabama P, 1997. 7–13. Print.

Steinbrink, Bernd. "Actio". *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik. Band 1: A–Bib*. Ed. Gert Ueding. Vol. 1. *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*. Ed. Gert Ueding. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1992. 43–74. Print.

Stolt, Birgit. *Wortkampf. Frühneuhochdeutsche Beispiele zur Rhetorischen Praxis. Stockholmer Germanistische Forschungen*. 13. Ed. Gustav Korlén. Frankfurt a.M.: Athenäum, 1974. Print.

Strätling, Regine. *Figurationen. Rhetorik des Körpers in den Autobiographien von Michel Leiris. Theorie und Geschichte der Literatur und der Schönen Künste*. 119. Eds. Aleida Assmann, et al. München: Fink, 2012. Print.

Szondi, Peter. *Die Theorie des bürgerlichen Trauerspiels im 18. Jahrhundert. Der Kaufmann, der Hausvater und der Hofmeister*. Ed. Gert Mattenklott. *Studienausgabe der Vorlesungen*. 1. Ed. Jean Bollack. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1979. Print.

Thielemann, Werner. "Von Ouros und Tesouros: zwischen göttlicher Vorsehung und irdischer Begierde – Antônio Vieira: Sermão da Primeira Oitava da Páscoa (1656)". *Die Rhetorik António Vieiras. Akten der Sektion 'António Vieira und die portugiesische Rhetorik des 17. Jahrhunderts' beim V. Deutschen Lusitanistentag Rostock (25. – 28. September 2003)*. Eds. Alberto Gil and Werner Thielemann. *Romanistische Kongressberichte*. 13. Eds. Alberto Gil and Christian Schmidt. Bonn: Romanistischer Verlag, 2005. 33–70. Print.

Thomas, Rosalind. *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece*. 1992. *Key Themes in Ancient History*. Eds. Paul Anthony Cartledge and P. D. A. Garnsey. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP, 1999. Print.

Titzmann, Michael. "Der Tod als Figur im Drama des deutschsprachigen Gebiets im 16. Jahrhundert: Implikationen und Transformationen". *Interpretation. Das Paradigma der Europäischen Renaissance-Literatur. Festschrift für Alfred Noyer-Weidner zum 60. Geburtstag*. Eds. Klaus W. Hempfer and Gerhard Regn. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1983. 352–393. Print.

Toohey, Peter. "Epic and rhetoric". *Persuasion: Greek Rhetoric in Action*. Ed. Ian Worthington. London, UK: Routledge, 1994. 153–175. Print.

Trüstedt, Katrin. "Novelle der Stellvertretung. Kleists 'Michael Kohlhaas'". *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* 130.4 (2011): 545–568. Print.

Ueding, Gert, ed. *Rhetorik. Begriff – Geschichte – Internationalität*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2005. Print.

—. "Vorwort". *Rhetorik. Begriff – Geschichte – Internationalität*. Ed. Gert Ueding. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2005. V–VI. Print.

Vetter, Helmut. "Wiederkehr der Rhetorik? Zum Verhältnis von Philosophie und Rhetorik und zu den Beiträgen dieses Bandes". *Die Wiederkehr der Rhetorik*. Eds. Helmut Vetter and Richard Heinrich. *Wiener Reihe. Themen der Philosophie*. 8. Eds. Herta Nagl-Docekal, et al. Wien / Berlin: Oldenbourg / Akademie, 1999. 7–27. Print.

Vetter, Helmut, and Richard Heinrich, eds. *Die Wiederkehr der Rhetorik. Wiener Reihe. Themen der Philosophie*. 8. Eds. Herta Nagl-Docekal, et al. Wien / Berlin: Oldenbourg / Akademie, 1999. Print.

Vickers, Brian. "Some Reflections on the Rhetoric Textbook". *Renaissance Rhetoric*. Ed. Peter Mack. New York, NY: St. Martin's P, 1994. 81–102. Print.

Waddington, Raymond B. "Shakespeare's Sonnet 15 and the Art of Memory". *The Rhetoric of Renaissance Poetry. From Wyatt to Milton*. Eds. Thomas O. Sloan[e] and Raymond B. Waddington. Berkeley, CA: U of California P, 1974. 96–122. Print.

Webb, Ruth Helen, and Philip Weller. "Enargeia". *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry & Poetics*. Eds. Roland Greene, et al. 4th ed. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2012. 409. Print.

Wells, Susan. *Sweet Reason: Rhetoric and the Discourses of Modernity*. Chicago, IL: U of Chicago P, 1996. Print.

Wesche, Jörg. "Rhetorisch-stilistische Eigenschaften des Dramas der Gegenwart / Rhetorical/stylistic characteristics of contemporary drama". *Rhetorik und Stilistik / Rhetoric and Stylistics: Ein internationales Handbuch historischer und systematischer Forschung / An International Handbook of Historical and Systematic Research*. Eds. Ulla Fix, Andreas Gardt and Joachim Knape. Vol. 2. *Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft / Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science*. 31.2. Berlin/Boston, MA: de Gruyter Mouton, 2009. 2100–2112. Print.

Wilson, Luke. "Ben Jonson and the Law of Contract". *Rhetoric and Law in Early Modern Europe*. Eds. Victoria Kahn and Lorna Hutson. New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 2001. 143–165. Print.

Worthen, W. B. *Modern Drama and the Rhetoric of Theater*. 1992. Berkeley / Los Angeles, CA: U of California P, 2015. Print.

Worthington, Ian. "The Canon of the Ten Attic Orators". *Persuasion: Greek Rhetoric in Action*. Ed. Ian Worthington. London, UK: Routledge, 1994. 244–263. Print.

—. "Preface". *Persuasion: Greek Rhetoric in Action*. Ed. Ian Worthington. London, UK: Routledge, 1994. viii–x. Print.

Case Studies

Kathy Eden

From the Refutation of Drama to the Drama of Refutation

Every sixteenth-century dramatist, like every sixteenth-century lawyer, was once a sixteenth-century schoolboy; and every sixteenth-century schoolboy learned in his Aphthonius that the whole art of rhetorical composition is wrapped up in refutation, the fifth of the fourteen sequential exercises of the so-called *progymnasmata*—a fifth-century Greek composition textbook that in its Latin and vernacular translations shapes sixteenth-century schooling.[1] In this essay, I argue that the fundamentally legal practice of refutation pervades not only Antiquity's and Early Modernity's curricula, but their literary production, as well; and my argument, in keeping with my title, falls into two parts. In the first part, on the refutation of drama, I rehearse a very small sample of the overwhelming amount of evidence for understanding refutation as one of the key elements of the deep homology between the theater and the law court, dramatic practice and legal procedure.[2] In the second part, on the drama of refutation, I extend the notion of the dramatic, grounded in this homology, and especially in its refutative aspect, to two other literary genres, the dialog and the essay. These two genres are routinely related to one another in the Early Modern period, but they are less often read in light of their intertwined dramatic and forensic affiliations.

In his widely read *Progymnasmata*, Aphthonius characterizes refutation (Gr. *anaskeuē*) as *the* exercise for measuring the skill of young writers, assigning it before confirmation (Gr. *kataskeuē*) in his graded sequence of exercises, presumably on the grounds that the schoolboy will find it easier to dismantle an argument than to construct one.[3] With the students' initiation into these exercises, Aphthonius is readying them for what the rhetorical handbooks will teach them at a later stage of their education. For the most influential Roman

1 On the prominent place of Aphthonius in the sixteenth-century curriculum, see Baldwin (*Shakepere's Small Latine and Lesse Greeke* 288–354), and Eden ("Forensic Rhetoric and Humanist Education" passim).

2 For more on this homology, see Eden (*Poetic and Legal Fiction* passim).

3 For the Greek text of Aphthonius' composition textbook, see Spengel's ed. (*Rhetores Graeci* II. 21–56); for the English trans. (*Progymnasmata* 89–127). Compare Quintilian (*Institutio oratoria* 2.4.18).

Kathy Eden, Columbia University, New York City

rhetoricians, including the anonymous author of the *Ad Herennium*, Cicero, and Quintilian, all agree on the singular difficulty and importance of this oratorical practice. In his *De inventione*, the handbook on invention written in his youth, Cicero considers refutation so crucial to victory in court that he promises to provide separate instructions after profound and arduous thought.[4] Although Cicero never fulfills this promise, Quintilian arguably does in his *Institutio oratoria,* where he explains how to go about refuting an opponent by disclosing the inconsistencies and contradictions in his speech—a practice that requires real artistry (5.13.30). Reminding his readers that all speeches in defense are largely refutative of some accusation, Quintilian further agrees with Cicero, *pace* Aphthonius, that it is easier to accuse than to defend, just as it is easier to inflict a wound than to heal one (*Institutio* 5.13.3). In the oration itself, on the other hand, refutation is usually the fifth part (*pars orationis*), following the introduction (*exordium*), narration (*narratio*), division (*divisio*, *partitio*) and confirmation or proof (*confirmatio, probatio*).[5]

Long before the heyday of either the *progymnasmata* or even the Roman rhetorical manuals most familiar to sixteenth-century dramatists and lawyers, Plato's Socrates draws attention to the status of refutation in Greek rhetorical theory and practice. At the end of the *Phaedrus*, for instance, he includes, in his overview of the arts of rhetoric that he rejects, the work of one Theodorus on the refutation or *elenchos* of both accusation and defense (*Phaedrus* 267A).[6] Aristotle

4 Cicero (*De inventione* 1.45.86).

5 For the arrangement of the parts of the speech, see e.g. Cicero (*De inventione* 1.14.19; also: *Ad Herennium* 1.3.4).

6 Although the earliest context for the verb *elenchein* and its derivatives, including the noun *elenchos*, was arguably not the law courts or legal rhetoric, by Plato's day, as *Phaedrus* 267A makes clear, the method of "testing" was routinely associated with the adversarial "cross-examination" that aimed to disclose inconsistencies and contradictions in the claims and arguments of one's opponent. In the *Gorgias*, as we will see below, Socrates himself identifies the kind of *elenchus* embraced by Polus as a legal practice, which Cicero, in turn, will identify with Socrates when he records in the *Brutus* (8.31) Socrates' skill at refuting (*refellere*) the sophists. For the legal dimension of *elenchus* as refutation or cross-examination, see Ausland ("Forensic Characteristics of Socratic Argumentation" 36–60). Lesher puts "the first signs of a 'legalized' form of *elenchus*, a 'cross-examination'" (25), in Aeschylus' plays (cf. "Parmenidean Elenchus" 19–35). For the forensic dimension of *elenchos* in the *Gorgias*, see Tarrant ("Socratic Method and Socratic Truth" 254–272). In *Plato's Earlier Dialectic*, Robinson distinguishes between a wider and a narrower meaning of "elenchus"; the former he characterizes as "examining a person with regard to a statement he has made, by putting to him questions calling for further statements, in the hope that they will determine the meaning and the truth-value of his first statement", while the latter is characterized as "a form of cross-examination or

references this same Theodorus in his treatment of the parts of the oration at the end of his own art of rhetoric; and he does so to contrast it with his strong preference for a simpler division of a speech into statement and proof—*prothesis* and *pistis* (*Rhetoric* 3.13.4).[7] Those who insist on introductions, statements, proofs, refutations, conclusions, and so on, are pegged as wrong-headed followers of Theodorus and his school (*Rhetoric* 3.13.4–5). In Aristotle's view (*Rhetoric* 3.17.13), on the contrary, the probative value of a strong refutation (*tōn de enthymēmatōn ta elengtika*) is so great that it belongs where it can do the most damage to the adversary's arguments—including at the opening of a speech. As an example of such a strategy, Aristotle cites Hecuba's response to Helen in Euripides' *Trojan Women* (ll. 969–971).

Aristotle's reliance on Euripides to reinforce a rhetorical rule—here a rule about how to refute an opponent—highlights the homology between Attic tragedy and forensic oratory, mentioned above. Readers of these tragedies since Aristotle, including those in Antiquity, Early Modernity, and even post-Modernity, tend to single out Euripides as the most rhetorical of the tragedians; but the dramas of Aeschylus and Sophocles take their shape no less in response to this refutative impulse, as their *dramatis personae* lose no opportunity to pit themselves against one another in a contest of words.[8] One trend-setting example is Aegisthus' stated intention to "cross-examine" the messenger bringing news of Orestes' death in the second play of Aeschylus' Oresteian trilogy, the *Libation Bearers*:

> I wish to question [*elenxai*], carefully, this messenger
> and learn if he himself was by when the man died
> or if he heard but some blind rumor and so speaks. (ll. 851–853)[9]

Here, Lattimore's infinitive "to question" translates Sophocles' aorist infinitive *elenxai*, where the questioning aims to detect inconsistencies and contradictions

---

refutation"; and he concludes, however, that "we may almost say that Socrates never talks to anyone without refuting him" (*Plato's Earlier Dialectic* 7).

7 For the Greek text, see Cope's ed. (*The Rhetoric of Aristotle*); for the trans., see Kennedy's (*Aristotle On Rhetoric*).

8 On the rhetorical dimension of Euripidean tragedy as understood by Ancient and Modern readers, see North ("The Use of Poetry" 1–33, esp. 18–19); Lloyd (*The Agon in Euripides* passim) and Collard ("Formal Debate in Euripides' Drama" 58–71). For a view of the relation between rhetoric and tragedy that credits the shaping influence to tragedy, see Sansone (*Greek Drama and the Invention of Rhetoric* passim).

9 Aeschylus (*Oresteia*); for the Greek, see Page's ed. (*Aeschyli Septem Quae Supersunt Tragoedias*).

in the messenger's report in order to ascertain if it is an eye-witness testimony ("if he himself was by") or hearsay ("some blind rumor"). This elenchic or refutative practice is later institutionalized as part of an evolving legal procedure in the third play of the trilogy, where the Chorus hands over to Athena its right to question or "cross-examine" (*elenchein*) Orestes (*Eumenides* l. 433). When Athena challenges Orestes to defend himself, he begins—as if fully in keeping with Aristotle's advice in the *Rhetoric*—both by refuting Athena's charge that he has come to her as a blood-stained suppliant (a *prostropaios*) and by offering the law as evidence. Only after this refutation of Athena's claim (at l. 453) does he turn to a narration of the events in Argos:

> Lady Athena, first I will take the difficult thought
> away that lies in these last words you spoke. I am
> no supplicant, nor was it because I had a stain
> upon my hand that I sat at your image. I
> will give you a strong proof that what I say is true.
> It is the law that the man of the bloody hand must speak
> no word until, by action of one who can cleanse,
> blood from a young victim has washed his blood away.
> Long since, at the homes of others, I have been absolved
> thus, both by running waters and by victims slain.
> I count this scruple now out of the way. Learn next
> with no delay where I am from. (*Eumenides* ll. 443–454)

With the exchanges between Orestes and the Chorus and between Orestes and Athena, in other words, Aeschylus exploits the dramatic possibilities in claim and counter-claim, considering refutation dramatic, even drama itself. As the extant corpus of Greek tragedy amply illustrates, his exploitation of an adversarial procedure for dramatic purposes is not lost on the next generation of dramatists, including Sophocles.

In *Oedipus the King*, to take just one other high-profile example, Teiresias stubbornly refuses to be "cross-examined" by Oedipus—"Why is it you question [*elencheis*] me and waste your labor?" he asks (l. 333)—while the more conciliating Creon delivers a full defense of his actions in response to Oedipus' accusation of treason.[10] Like Orestes' defense in the *Eumenides* in seeming to follow Aristotle's advice, Creon launches at once into a refutation of the charge, in this case that he has set his sights on his kingly brother-in-law's crown:

10 For the English trans. see Sophocles (*Oedipus the King*); for the Greek, see Jebb's ed. (*The Oedipus Tyrannus of Sophocles*).

> Consider, first, if you think any one
> would choose to rule and fear rather than rule
> and sleep untroubled by a fear if power
> were equal in both cases. (*Oedipus* ll. 584–587)

After taking another eighteen lines to amplify the implausibility of the king's accusation, Creon challenges Oedipus to refute his argument (*Oedipus* l. 603: *kai tōnde elenchon*). In leveling this challenge, however, Creon calls not for a counter-argument but for a visit to the Pythian oracle. If the evidence of the oracle testifies to his guilt, Creon vows to join the city in voting for his own condemnation. Alternating, as tragic episodes regularly do, between longer speeches (or *rheseis*) and the give and take of what comes to be called *stichomythia*, the exchange between the two men in Sophocles' play accommodates both elements of refutative procedure, the sustained dismantling of an adversary's arguments and the questions and answers that uncover his inconsistencies and contradictions. Both elements are theorized in the rhetorical manuals and practiced in the law courts.[11]

Even so, Greek tragedians are not alone among dramatists in making the most of refutation. As Quentin Skinner has recently demonstrated in his *Forensic Shakespeare*, specifically in a chapter called "Refutation and Non-Artificial Proofs", Shakespeare fully integrates this courtroom practice into the dramatic action of both his tragedies and his comedies.[12] In the opening act of the Moor's tragedy, for example, Othello counters Brabantio's charge of witchcraft by delivering a "round unvarnished tale" (*Othello* I.iii.91)—that is, his narration—followed by Desdemona's testimony to her divided loyalty. Confirming the truthfulness of Othello's account, this testimony refutes beyond question her father's accusation against her husband. In the comic *All's Well That Ends Well*, on the other hand, the multiple inconsistencies and contradictions in Bertram's account of the two rings are gradually refuted by the presentation of evidence in the form of witness testimony, given both by those who are in on Hellen's plot to entrap her reluctant husband into keeping his word and those who are not. In staging his refutations, as Skinner also shows, Shakespeare demonstrates a keen understanding of the recommendations of both the anonymous author of the *Ad Herennium* and Quintilian; the latter further recommends for training in

11 On the double procedure of long speeches and question and answer, see Bonner/Smith (*The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle* II, 7–8, 122–124); and Eden (*Poetic and Legal Fiction* 13–15).

12 Cf. Skinner (*Forensic Shakespeare* 269–290). On the inartificial proofs of drama, see also Eden (*Poetic and Legal Fiction* 9–24; 176–183).

courtroom pleading, and especially for legal interrogation (*dicendo ac respondendo*), not only the tragic Euripides but also the comic dramatist Menander. "[A]ssuredly we can find no more perfect model of every oratorical quality", Quintilian maintains, "than the judicial pleadings [*illa iudicia*] of [Menander's] *Epitrepontes*, *Epicleros* and *Locri*" (*Institutio* 10.1.67–68; 10.1.70). The deep structural homology between the theater and the law court, in other words, extends well beyond Athens and well beyond tragedy to not only Ancient comedy but Early Modern drama.

Yet even this extension delimits too narrowly the full reach of either the refutative dimension of drama or the dramatic dimension of refutation; and a prime example of this further reach is the Socratic dialog, which is at once *elenchic* (or refutative) and dramatic. In keeping with its *elenchic* dimension, Aristotle sends his aspiring rhetor who would master the rapid crossfire of interrogation (*erōtēsis*) to Socrates' refutation of Meletus in Plato's *Apology* (*Rhetoric* 3.18.1–4), while Quintilian advises the orator-in-training to read Socratic dialogs for a "first-rate preparation for forensic debates and the examination of witnesses" (*Institutio* 10.1.35–36). Plato's talents as a dramatist, on the other hand, were not only appreciated by Ancient and Early Modern readers but have become the focus of a number of very recent studies, including those of Martin Puchner and Nikos Charalabopoulos.[13]

Among Plato's most dramatic dialogs is the *Gorgias*, whose tragic and comic pedigrees the interlocutors themselves announce.[14] Provocatively calling rhetoric a kind of flattery, Socrates begs Gorgias' pardon if he seems to play the comic dramatist (*to diakōmōdein*; *Gorgias* 462E). Eventually reduced by Callicles' recalcitrance to asking and then answering his own questions, Socrates also performs the recognizably farcical act of playing both parts in the dialog—a performance he identifies with the comic dramatist Epicharmus (*Gorgias* 505E).[15] Despite his unwillingness to cooperate with his eccentric examiner, Callicles is equally attentive to the dramatic elements in their exchange. He even compares it to the debate between Zethus and Amphion in Euripides' *Antiope* (*Gorgias* 484E, 485E, 489E, 506B)—a comparison that locates the contest between two opposing ways of life, the political and the philosophical, in a suitably tragic

13 On the Platonic dialogs as drama, see Puchner (*The Drama of Ideas* 3–35), and Charalabopoulos (*Platonic Drama and Its Ancient Reception* passim).

14 On the dramatic structure of the *Gorgias*, see the ed. by Dodds (6). I have used the latter for the Greek; for the English, the trans. by Lamb.

15 On the Syracusan comic poet Epicharmus and his relation to the Platonic dialogs, see Dodds (*Gorgias* 332), and Clay ("The Origins of the Socratic Dialogue" 23–47; esp. 36–37).

register.[16] For Callicles' predictions regarding the philosopher's inability to defend himself in court presages Socrates' final tragic act in drinking the hemlock.

Like tragedy, moreover, this Platonic dialog falls into discrete episodes differentiated by the changes of interlocutor. It also alternates, like tragedy, like Athenian legal procedure, and like Plato's other dialogs, between longer speeches and shorter exchanges—what Socrates, here and elsewhere, calls *makrologia* and *brachylogia*.[17] Only in this dialog Socrates does more than exploit the dramatic potential of the courtroom-like alternation. He grants it thematic status both by chastising Polus and Callicles for lapsing into longer speeches or *makrologiai* and by defending himself for his own occasional lapses (*Gorgias* 465E). Indeed, Socrates sets himself apart from his interlocutors on the very grounds of his outspoken allegiance to *brachylogia*, the procedure of asking and answering questions, in contrast to the set speeches of the rhetoricians (*Gorgias* 449C, 461D–462A, 465E). According to Gorgias' evolving definition of rhetoric, these longer speeches (or *makrologiai*) aim not only to persuade an audience but, more pointedly, to gratify a large crowd. For this very reason, Socrates counters, they amount to tragedies without the trappings of melody, rhythm, or meter (*Gorgias* 502B). For both rhetoricians and tragedians cater with their pleasing words to the *ochlos*, the crowd. Where speaking is concerned, in other words, audience matters; and where audience is concerned, size matters. Time and again, Gorgias asserts the rhetorician's venue: "the law courts and other large gatherings" (*Gorgias* 454B, 454E), the haunts of the multitude (456C, 457A; cf. 458E, 459A), whereas Socrates, as we will see, values both a different kind of speaking and a different kind of audience.[18]

For the *Gorgias* is not only arguably the Platonic dialog most openly concerned with its dramatic pedigree; it is also the dialog most overtly concerned with refutation. Despite the twists and turns in the conversation and the changes in sparring partners, Socrates never abandons his initial double agenda of examining the claims of his three interlocutors for inconsistencies and contradictions and being examined in turn by them. At the start of the

16 On the relation between this Platonic dialog and the Euripidean tragedy, see Arieti ("Plato's Philosophical *Antiope*: The *Gorgias*" 197–214), and Nightingale (*Genres in Dialogue: Plato and the Construct of Philosophy* 69–92).

17 On Socrates' use of these two forms of speech, *brachylogia* and *makrologia*, see e.g. Plato (*Protagoras* 329B, 334E–335A) and Dodds (*Gorgias* 232).

18 For Socrates on the role played by the size of the audience, see Dodds (*Gorgias* 215).

conversation, in fact, Socrates sounds out his first interlocutor, Gorgias, to make sure he understands the ground rules of this procedure and accepts them:

> Now I am afraid to refute you [*dielenchein se*], lest you imagine I am contentiously neglecting the point and its elucidation, and merely attacking you. I therefore, if you are a person of the same sort as myself, should be glad to continue questioning you: if not, I can let it drop. Of what sort am I? One of those who would be glad to be refuted [*elengthentōn*] if I say anything untrue, and glad to refute [*elenxantōn*] anyone else who might speak untruly; but just as glad, mind you, to be refuted [*elengthentōn*] as to refute [*elenxantōn*], since I regard the former as the greater benefit, in proportion as it is a greater benefit for oneself to be delivered from the greatest evil than to deliver someone else. (*Gorgias* 457E–458B; cf. 506C)

Having just identified rhetoric as an agonistic activity (*Gorgias* 456D) and himself as a rhetorician poised to answer any question, Gorgias is not about to shy away from this *agōn*, although he certainly does not endorse Socrates' preference for being refuted over refuting. Both the formulation of the preference and its paradoxical nature, however, are key; for they parallel the Socratic core value that both Polus and Callicles find utterly repugnant and do their very best to refute: namely, that it is better to suffer wrong-doing than to commit it. As the conversation winds down, Socrates, trying hard not to gloat over his victory, takes a moment not only to make the parallels explicit but to effect their intersection. "But among the many statements we have made", he recapitulates, "while all the rest are refuted [*elenchomenōn*] this one alone is unshaken—that doing wrong [*to adikein*] is to be more carefully shunned than suffering it [*to adikeisthai*]" (*Gorgias* 527B). Fully committed to this position, Socrates is no less committed to the refutative procedure that validates it.

But refutation in the *Gorgias* takes a number of forms, and they do not all interest Socrates equally. So he summarily dismisses Polus' attempt to refute him with ridicule: "What is that I see, Polus? You are laughing? Here we have yet another form of refutation [*eidos elenchou*]—when a statement is made, to laugh it down, instead of disproving it [*elenchein de mē*]" (*Gorgias* 473E). Socrates' "yet another" here alludes to a refutative procedure he has rejected moments earlier, although less summarily, namely, the rhetorical procedure of the law courts:

> For there, one party is supposed to refute [*elenchein*] the other when they bring forward a number of reputable witnesses to any statements they may make, whilst their opponent produces only one, or none. But this sort of refutation [*elenchos*] is quite worthless for getting at the truth; since occasionally a man may actually be crushed by the number and reputation of the false witnesses brought against him. (*Gorgias* 471E)

Like Gorgianic rhetoric, in other words, Polus' procedure depends on large numbers, a crowd—here the number of witnesses—whereas Socrates drastically reduces the size of the audience to one. Only his interlocutor matters, Socrates insists; and the same holds for Polus as far as Socrates is concerned. If Socrates is unpersuaded by Polus' argument, then no number of witnesses in its favor will count for anything:

> But I, alone here before you, do not admit it, for you fail to convince me: you only attempt, by producing a number of false witnesses against me, to oust me from my reality, the truth. But if on my part I fail to produce yourself as my one witness to confirm what I say, I consider I have achieved nothing of any account towards the matter of our discussion, whatever it may be; nor have you either, I conceive, unless I act alone as your one witness, and you have nothing to do with all these others. Well now, this is one mode of refutation [*tropos elenchou*], as you and many other people conceive it; but there is also another which I on my side conceive. Let us therefore compare them with each other and consider if we find a difference between them. (*Gorgias* 472BC)

Like drama, as Quintilian has alerted us, Socratic dialog shares its deepest structures with forensic rhetoric; and so it is not a trivial task to differentiate legal refutation from Socratic refutation. At this point in the dialog, however, Socrates offers as the single most important differentiating factor the size of the audience, one in place of many. This factor is so decisive that Socrates reaffirms it moments later, when dismissing Polus's attempt to refute him by calling on the testimony of those assembled (*Gorgias* 473E), since that is decidedly not the kind of refutation this case requires. "For I know how to produce one witness in support of my statements", Socrates tells Polus, "and that is the man himself with whom I find myself arguing; the many I dismiss: there is also one whose vote I know how to take, whilst to the multitude I have not a word to say" (*Gorgias* 474AB). But even this drastic reduction in audience size eventually proves insufficient. For the kind of refutation Socrates really has in mind can and should be practiced not on one's adversaries at all but on one's loved ones—and ultimately on oneself. Instead of defending ourselves against the accusations of others, Socrates insists, we should become our own most ardent accusers (*Gorgias* 480CD). In other words, the kind of refutation Socrates values most is self-refutation.[19]

19 In contrast to my reading, Dodds (*Gorgias* 257) reads Socrates' position about refuting our loved ones and ourselves as ironic and warns against taking it literally, although he does notice the "theme of self-reform", if not self-refutation, in this dialog as in the *Phaedo* and *Republic* (Dodds *Gorgias* 384).

While Polus remarks on the absurdity of this position, the real measure of its outlandishness is that it draws the recalcitrant Callicles into the conversation, allowing Socrates to cast his third and final interlocutor as someone who must pay a price for holding inconsistent and contradictory positions because he cannot refute either himself or the ones he loves, Demos, and his Athenian counterpart, the crowd (*Gorgias* 481BE).[20] Socrates' beloved, in contrast, is Philosophy, and she is always ready for the give and take of refutation:

> So you must either refute her [Philosophy], as I said just now, by proving that wrongdoing and impunity for wrong done is not the uttermost evil; or, if you leave that unproved, by the Dog, god of the Egyptians, there will be no agreement between you, Callicles, and Callicles, but you will be in discord with him all your life. (*Gorgias* 482B)

Unprepared as yet for self-refutation, Callicles—whether he likes it or not—will have to rely on Socrates to do the job. In light of Callicles' continued resistance, the final act of the dialog features a chipping away at his inconsistencies and contradictions. Like most, if not all, of the interlocutors on the Athenian stage and in the Athenian courts, Callicles—to the bitter end—would rather refute than be refuted.

Early Modern literature, in contrast, is as full of people refuting themselves as it is of those refuting others. On and off the stage, Renaissance heroes regularly confess their wrong-doings and, as part of their confessions, point out the inconsistencies and contradictions in their positions. One of the most influential early models for this literary practice rooted in a legal procedure is Augustine's *Confessions*. Arguably the work with the greatest impact on Petrarch as the author routinely credited with ushering in the Renaissance, the *Confessions* can be read as one long self-refutation.[21] When Petrarch turns to staging his own most sustained self-refutation, his *Secretum*, more than a millennium later, he pays homage (perhaps predictably) both to Plato, by structuring it as an elenchic dialog, and to the *Confessions*, by making the Platonizing Augustine his interlocutor; but Renaissance dialog is not the only genre that follows suit in featuring a Socratic-style self-refutation. So does the essay, often considered an Early Modern innovation. Throughout Montaigne's *Essais*, in fact, the world's first essayist repeatedly refutes himself by drawing attention to his many

20 On the identity of Demos, see Dodds (*Gorgias* 261). On the Calliclean position being refuted, including its contradictions and inconsistencies, see Klosko ("The Refutation of Callicles in Plato's 'Gorgias'" 126–139).

21 Like Cicero, Augustine favors the verbs *refellere*, *reprehendere*, and their derivatives for the practice of refuting. See e.g. Augustine (*Confessions* I.7; I.13; III.7; III.12; V.14).

contradictions and inconsistencies; and in one essay in particular, he reveals not only the Socratic pedigree of these self-refutations but their roots in Plato's *Gorgias*.

"De l'art de conferer" (*Essais* III.8)—"Of the Art of conferring" in Florio's 1603 translation—opens with a passing reference to Plato on judicial correction and self-accusation (cf. *Gorgias* 525BC, 527BC), before coming around to the topic announced in its title. After characterizing *conference* as the "most fruitfull and natural exercise of our spirit [...] more delightsome, then any other action of our life" (*Essays* 3.159), Montaigne closes in on its agonistic, adversarial nature, comparing it to wrestling and jousting.[22] The discursive activity he has in mind, in other words, is not conversation (*sermo*) but disputation (*disputatio*); and he invokes Cicero's authority to back up his fundamentally Socratic claim that "Disputation cannot be held without reprehension"—Florio's translation of Cicero's *De finibus* I.viii.28: "Neque enim disputari sine reprehensione [...] potest".[23] There is no discussion or disputation or *conference* without refutation, what Montaigne sometimes calls *reprehension* and at other times *correction*, recalling the opening of the essay with its reference to Plato on judicial correction. Whereas others go to great lengths to avoid being refuted or corrected—"We commonly shunne correction whereas we should rather seeke and present ourselves unto it, chiefly when it commeth by way of conference" (*Essays* 3.161, *Essais* 2.924)—Montaigne himself claims to welcome the opportunity to be shown the inconsistencies and contradictions in the positions he takes:

> When I am impugned or contraried, then is mine attention and not mine anger, stirred up: I advance my selfe toward him, that doth gainsay and instruct me. The cause of truth, ought to be the common cause, both to one and other[.] (*Essays* 3.161, *Essais* 2.924)

Like Socrates, Montaigne claims to advance the cause of truth—even if it means losing his argument. Indeed, like Socrates, he claims to place a higher premium on being refuted than on refuting, on bending "under the power of my adversaries reason" than obtaining the victory over him (*Essays* 3.162, *Essais* 2.925); and not only does Montaigne, like Socrates, consider the size of the audience a decisive factor—"I love to contest and discourse, but not with many,

22 For *Essais* of Montaigne, I have used Villey's/Saulnier's ed.; for the English trans., see Florio's ed. (*Essays*). On the agonistic as well as the legal dimensions of conversational style as discussed in this essay, see Eden (*The Renaissance Rediscovery of Intimacy* 106–109).

23 On the Ciceronian elements of Montaigne's style, despite his avowed anti-Ciceronianism, see Eden ("Cicero's Portion of Montaigne's Acclaim" 39–55).

and onely for my selfe" (*Essays* 3.160, *Essais* 2.923)—but he looks to Socrates as the model for this behavior. For Socrates, "ever smiling, made a collection of such contradictions as were opposed to his discourse" (*Essays* 3.162, *Essais* 2.925). Also like Socrates, Montaigne admits to being "well pleased to be reproved" (*Essays* 3.162, *Essais* 2.924): "*je preste l'espaule aux reprehensions*"; and, while this eagerness to be *reprehended* or *refuted* makes him like Socrates, it also makes him unlike his contemporaries, who "have not the courage to correct, because they want [sc. lack] the heart to endure correction" (*Essays* 3.162, *Essais* 2.924). Even Montaigne's paradoxical elevation of the passive over the active—suffering correction over doing the correcting—echoes the formulation of his Ancient model. So does Montaigne's stated aim in conferring or disputing with others. "I love to have them entangle and bemire themselves more then they are", Montaigne admits in Florio's translation, "and if it be possible, to wade so deepe into the gulphe of error, that in the end they may recall and advise themselves" (*Essays* 3.177–78). What Montaigne actually writes is "qu'en fin ils se recoignoissent" (*Essais* 2.937)—echoing the Delphic and Socratic *gnōthi seauton*. His stated aim is to bring his interlocutors to a better understanding of themselves: to self-knowledge. So far, then, this essay seems to present a Montaigne who is more preacher than practitioner of self-refutation, for there is arguably more than a little self-commendation—in contrast to self-correction—in his effort to align himself with the wisest man in Athens.

Yet Montaigne does open the essay, as mentioned earlier, by claiming that he "reape[s] more honor by accusing, then by commending myself" (*Essays* 3.158, *Essais* 2.921); and the essay tries to make good on this claim, as Montaigne turns almost immediately to refuting himself for his impatience with stupidity—an imperfection that is only slightly less worthy of condemnation than stupidity itself:

> Sottishness is an ill quality, but not to be able to endure it, and to fret and vex at it, as it hapneth to me, is another kinde of imperfection, which in opportunity is not much behind sottishness: and that's it I will now accuse in myself[.] (*Essays* 3.160, *Essais* 2.923)

Before long, however, Montaigne revises his self-accusation from mere impatience with stupidity to the more reprehensible imperfection, namely stupidity itself. For only a sot, he counters, is vexed by human folly. "Now, what if I take things otherwise then they are?" he asks:

> So it may bee: And therefore I accuse my impatience [...] since there is not a greater fondnesse, a more constant gullishnesse, or more heteroclite insipidity then for one to move or vex himselfe at the fondnesse, at the gullishnesse, or insipidity of the world. (*Essays* 3.166–167, *Essais* 2.928–929)

Making a move to expose this inconsistency in his position, Montaigne not only turns his refutation of stupidity on himself, but he once again singles out Socrates—or, in this case, Plato—as his model in doing so:

> Let us ever have the saying of Plato in our mouthes: 'What I finde unwholesome, is it not to be unhealthy my selfe? Am not I in fault my selfe? May not mine owne advertisement be retorted against my selfe?' Oh wise and divine restraint, that curbeth the most universell and common error of men[.] (*Essays* 3.167, *Essais* 2.929)

Despite the reflexive refrain and the self-recrimination it underwrites, Montaigne is here refuting, as he says, a common or universal folly rather than an idiosyncratic fault. Not just daily, but a hundred times a day, Montaigne maintains, we all unwittingly and stupidly refute ourselves when we laugh at our neighbors—that is, when we practice the very kind of refutation that Polus tries to pull on Socrates, only to have Socrates summarily dismiss it (*Essays* 3.168, *Essais* 2.929). Admittedly, Montaigne does not openly connect our refutative laughter with Socrates' rejection of it in the *Gorgias*; but he does explicitly align this essay not only with the Platonic dialog most obviously focused on refutation but also with its core valuation of refuting oneself over refuting others:

> And Socrates is of opinion, that he, who should find himselfe, and his son, and a stranger guilty of any violence or injury, ought first begin by himselfe, and present himselfe to the sentence and condemnation of the law, and for his owne discharge and acquittal implore the assistance of the executioners hand: secondly for his son, and lastly for the stranger: If this precept take his tone somewhat too high: it should at lest be first presented to the punishment of one's owne conscience. (*Essays* 3.168–169, *Essais* 2.930)

At once embracing the Socratic value and keeping it at arm's length on account of its high-mindedness (presumably in its Brutus-like willingness to condemn one's own children), Montaigne nevertheless holds fast to the so-called internal forum of the mind, the conscience, as our most pressing and powerful judge of wrong-doing. As Montaigne affirms in his essay that bears its name ("Of conscience", II.5, *Essays* 2.44–45, *Essais* 1.366–369), our consciences are ever ready to accuse us. "[F]or want of other evidences", Montaigne declares, "shee produceth our selves against our selves" (*Essays* 2.45, *Essais* 1.367). No small part of the first essayist's agenda, then, is to tap into the drama of the Socratic dialog—a drama rooted in the fundamentally forensic practice of refutation. Taking to heart Socrates' advice in the *Gorgias* to refute himself, however, Montaigne outdoes his Ancient model by practicing in his literary assays or trials what the Ancient Athenian philosopher only preaches in his dialogs. Further diminishing the size of his audience by dispensing with an interlocutor, Montaigne favors the dramatic production that pits the self against itself.

In his rhetorical handbook for the aspiring orator, Quintilian recounts the tragedian Accius' response to someone who wondered aloud why, given his talent for dramatizing adversarial exchanges on stage, he did not pursue a career in the law courts. Because, Quintilian has Accius explain, on stage "the characters said what he himself wanted them to say, whereas in the courts his adversaries would probably say just what he least wanted them to say" (*Institutio* 5.13.43). Quintilian invokes this anecdote to exhort the orator-in-training to learn to anticipate his opponent's arguments so he can refute them; but its invocation also reminds us that *drama* is not just *doing*—as the word itself suggests from the Greek *dran*—but *doing* in the face of resistance, of push-back: and not primarily the push-back of force (*bia*), but the push-back that worried Accius, that of adversarial discourse. This discursive resistance or antagonism both defines the forensic encounter as a whole and takes its fiercest form in the practice of refutation, the rhetorical effort, either in longer speeches or in the exchange of question and answer, to demolish the argument of one's opponent by showcasing its inconsistencies and contradictions. As I have suggested, this practice is not only as fundamental to the dramatic stage as it is to the courtroom, but it lends its drama to other genres as well, including the dialog and the essay. Just as there is—from its earliest instances—something rhetorical about drama, there is something dramatic about rhetoric; and that drama, as I have also shown, owes something in turn to the forensic practice of refutation.

Bibliography

Primary Literature

Aeschylus. *Aeschyli Septem Quae Supersunt Tragoedias*. Ed. Denys Page. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1972. Print.

—. *Oresteia*. Trans. Richmond Lattimore. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1947. Print.

Aphthonius. "Progymnasmata". *Rhetores Graeci*. Ed. Leonard Spengel. 3 vols. Vol. II. Leipzig: Teubner, 1854. 21–56. Print.

—. "Progymnasmata". *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*. Trans. George A. Kennedy. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003. 89–127. Print.

Aristotle. *The Rhetoric of Aristotle*. 1877. Ed. E. M. Cope. 3 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge UP / New York: Arno Press, 1973. Print.

—. *Aristotle On Rhetoric*: *A Theory of Civic Discourse*. Ed. George A. Kennedy. New York: Oxford UP, 1991. Print.

Cicero. *On Invention (De inventione)*. 1949. Trans. H. M. Hubbell. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1976. Print.

—. *On Ends (De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum)*. 1914. Ed. and trans. by H. Rackham. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1999. Print.

—. *Brutus. Orator*. 1939. Ed. and trans. by G. L. Hendrickson and H. M. Hubbell. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1962. Print.

Montaigne, Michel Eyquem de. *Les Essais de Michel de Montaigne*. 1924. Eds. Pierre Villey and V.-L. Saulnier. 2 vols. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1978. Print.

—. *The Essays of Montaigne*. 1603. Trans. John Florio. 3 vols. London: David Nutt, 1892 / New York: AMS, 1967. Print.

Quintilian. *Institutio oratoria*. 1921. Trans. H. E. Butler. 4 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1977. Print.

Rhetorica ad Herennium. 1954. Ed. and trans. by Harry Caplan. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2004. Print.

Plato. *Gorgias*. Ed. E. R. Dodds. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1959. Print.

—. "Gorgias". 1925. Ed. and trans. by W. R. M. Lamb. *Lysis. Symposium. Gorgias*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1983. 247–533. Print.

Shakespeare, William. *Othello*. 1999. Ed. E. A. J. Honigmann. *The Arden Shakespeare*. Eds. Richard Proudfoot, Ann Thompson and David Scott Kastan. 3rd ed. London, UK: Thomson, 2001. Print.

Sophocles. *Oedipus the King*. Trans. David Grene. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1942. Print.

—. *The Oedipus Tyrannus of Sophocles*. 1885. Ed. Richard Jebb. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1975. Print.

Secondary Literature

Arieti, James A. "Plato's Philosophical *Antiope*: The *Gorgias*". *Plato's Dialogues: New Studies and Interpretations*. Ed. Gerald A. Press. Lanham, MD: Rowan and Littlefield, 1993. 197–214. Print.

Ausland, Hayden W. "Forensic Characteristics of Socratic Argumentation". *Does Socrates Have a Method? Rethinking the Elenchus in Plato's Dialogues and Beyond*. Ed. Gary Alan Scott. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State UP, 2002. 36–60. Print.

Baldwin, T. W. *Shakespere's Small Latine and Lesse Greeke*. 2 vols. Vol. II. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1944. Print.

Bonner, Robert J. and Gertrude Smith. *The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle*. 1938. 2 vols. Vol. II. Chicago: U of Chicago P, / New York: AMS, 1970. Print.

Charalabopoulos, Nikos G. *Platonic Drama and Its Ancient Reception*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2012. Print.

Clay, Diskin. "The Origins of the Socratic Dialogue". *The Socratic Movement*. Ed. Paul A. Vander Waerdt. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1994. 23–47. Print.

Collard, C. "Formal Debate in Euripides' Drama". *Greece and Rome* 22 (1975): 58–71. Print.

Dodds, E. R., ed. *Gorgias*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1959. Print.

Eden, Kathy. "Cicero's Portion of Montaigne's Acclaim". *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Cicero*. Ed. William H. F. Altman. Leiden: Brill, 2015. 39–55. Print.

—. "Forensic Rhetoric and Humanist Education". *Oxford Handbook of Early Modern English Law and Literature*. Ed. Lorna Hutson. Oxford: Oxford UP, forthcoming. Print.

—. *Poetic and Legal Fiction in the Aristotelian Tradition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1986. Print.

—. *The Renaissance Rediscovery of Intimacy*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2012. Print.

Klosko, George. "The Refutation of Callicles in Plato's 'Gorgias'". *Greece and Rome* 31 (1984). 126–139. Print.

Lesher, James. "Parmenidean Elenchus". *Does Socrates Have a Method? Rethinking the Elenchus in Plato's Dialogues and Beyond*. Ed. Gary Alan Scott. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State UP, 2002. 19–35. Print.

Lloyd, Michael. *The Agon in Euripides*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1992. Print.

Nightingale, Andrea Wilson. *Genres in Dialogue: Plato and the Construct of Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995. Print.

North, Helen. "The Use of Poetry in the Training of the Ancient Orator". *Traditio* 8 (1952): 1–33. Print.

Puchner, Martin. *The Drama of Ideas: Platonic Provocations in Theater and Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2010. Print.

Robinson, Richard. *Plato's Earlier Dialectic*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1953. Print.

Sansone, David. *Greek Drama and the Invention of Rhetoric*. London: Blackwell, 2012. Print.

Skinner, Quentin. *Forensic Shakespeare*. Oxford, UK: Oxford UP, 2014. Print.

Tarrant, Harold. "Socratic Method and Socratic Truth". *A Companion to Socrates*. Eds. Sara Ahbel-Rappe and Rachana Kamtekar. London: Blackwell, 2005. 254–272. Print.

Martha Feldman

The Castrato as a Rhetorical Figure

What does it mean to think of opera as rhetorical, and specifically of its performers as rhetoricians? I am not thinking here in terms of rhetorical figures as in the tradition of Joachim Burmeister, who in the early seventeenth century tried to transfer Quintilian's figures to music by categorically imposing oratorical tropes on musical analogs.[1] There was a rigidity in the enterprise that says more about the taxonomical fantasies of Burmeister and his age than about the workings of rhetoric on the ground of music-making. Nor am I thinking in terms of affective categories.[2] Rather, I refer to the fact that the operatic genre in which castrati most often sang, called '*dramma per musica*' or later '*opera seria*', was rhetorical through and through. Arranging its many solo arias in a chiaroscuro array of affects, tempi, meters, keys, and orchestrations—a kind of large-scale *varietas*—it suffused each aria with carefully wrought emotional pacing built on carefully modeled syntactic structures, and interlaced them with rhetorically charged recitative, all with an ear forever tuned to the audience.[3] What interests me here is the Ciceronian nature of the castrato *persona* as fundamentally grounded in the dynamics of delivery to a listener. Hence my attention is focused on the body as that vehicle of delivery and the total social phenomenon of which it is a part. While I will not address drama here in a central way, I will think about how this rhetorical castrato ignites the dramatic and makes it persuasive. The

1 See Burmeister (*Musica poetica* passim).

2 For a recent broad view of the relationship of rhetorical persuasion and music, see Haynes/Burgess (*The Pathetick Musician* passim). Starting in the 1740s, Italians received much of their rhetorical learning from Giannangelo Serra's *Compendio della rettorica*, which was reprinted often throughout the century.

3 I expand on this view of *opera seria* in Feldman (*Opera and Sovereignty* esp. ch. 1, 2, 6).

I wish to thank Professor Joachim Küpper for the invitation to the conference and DS Mayfield for his expert conception, organization, assistance, and editorial input. Their solicitation encouraged me to think about a connection within my work which I myself had not explicitly made—namely the connection between the performative and rhetorical nature of the castrato singer and the condition of eighteenth-century opera as a fundamentally rhetorical form and institution. I am especially grateful to Kathy Eden for fascinating ideas about the *ornatus* problem and to Katherine Crawford for pressing me to think more about the gender connection. Thanks also to audiences at Vanderbilt University and La Sapienza, Università di Roma.

Martha Feldman, University of Chicago

puzzle in all of this is how the castrato who operates at the highest echelons could at once function as a sensational stage star, marked as a virtuoso, while still maintaining the Ciceronian precept of *decorum*; and how the tension between virtuosity and *decorum* was raised by increasing critiques of both castrati and rhetoric itself in the later eighteenth century.

Let me lay the groundwork for approaching these questions by exploring the *téchne* of musico-vocal oration: for if the most indispensable tool of the orator was the voice, then no operatic figure was better equipped for the task than the castrato.[4] From a very young age, most had had their voices cultivated at high levels, while singing as boy sopranos in cathedral and church choirs—and in ways girls could not have had, because they were not allowed to sing in church.

Fig. 1: The castrato Nicolini (Nicolo Grimaldi) performing the role of Marciano together with soprano Lucia Facchinelli (called "La Becheretta") singing the title role of Salustia, in Giovanni Battista Pergolesi's opera *La Salustia* (Teatro San Bartolomeo, Naples, Winter 1731).[5]

4 For a fuller discussion of the *téchne* of the performer discussed in this section, see Feldman (*The Castrato* esp. ch. 3).

5 By Anton Maria Zanetti; holding institution: Fondazione Giorgio Cini, Venice; public domain:

With such training, a top boy singer could emit a glorious timbre from quite a flexible apparatus. The best of them were plucked out of local choirs precisely in order that their high, nimble voices might be preserved and mature into adulthood, which was the chief consequence of castrating boys testicularly before puberty. After castration, with growth and intense regimens of further training, a castrato could develop an adult musculature in the diaphragm, thorax, and larynx, which strengthened as the ribcage expanded—indeed, owing to growth abnormalities, many seem to have had chests that reached far larger sizes than normal (see the image of Nicolini with a prima donna in Fig. 1). In addition, the cartilage seems to have remained soft and the whole system of muscles, cartilage, and ligament thus became increasingly agile and powerful with age and training.

All in all, then, an ideal castrato body had an unsurpassed ability to produce a piercing high sound with great vocal nuance and with massive projection into the vast public spaces of Europe's commercial theaters, as well as its churches and oratories. Anecdotal descriptions from the seventeenth century warrant this fact, portraying a singer whose vocal machinery was marked by amazing sophistication, achieved through a combination of inherent physical attributes with training regimens. One of the key witnesses was Giovanni Andrea Angelini Bontempi. In his *Historia musica* of 1695, he described the grueling rigors of the private schools in which castrati studied, and also described one remarkable outcome: that of his Perugian compatriot, the castrato Baldassare Ferri. About Ferri's breath control, Bontempi wrote glowingly:

> In addition to the clarity of his voice, the felicity of his *passaggi*, the beating of his trills, the agility with which he arrives sweetly at whatever pitch he wishes, after the extension of a very long and beautiful *passaggio* in a single measure, *he had no need to take another breath*. He began, *without taking a breath*, a very long and beautiful trill, and from that passed to another *passaggio* longer and more vigorous than the first. (Bontempi *Historia musica* 110; trans. mf; emph. added)[6]

---

https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Nicola_Grimaldi_detto_Nicolino_con_Lucia_Facchinelli,_detta_%C2%ABLa_Becheretta%C2%BB,_che_interpret%C3%B2_La_Salustia.jpg.

6 "Poiche egli, oltre la chiarezza della voce, la felicità de' passaggi, il battimento de' trilli, l'agilità d'arrivar dolcemente a qualsivoglia corda; dopo la continuatione d'un lunghissimo e bellissimo passaggio, sotto la qual misura, altri non havrebbe potuto contener la respiratione, Egli prorompeva senza respiro in un lunghissimo e bellissimo trillo, e da quello passava ad un'altro passaggio assai più lungo e più vigoroso del primo, senza movimento alcuno ne di fronte, ne di bocca, ne di volta, immobile come una Statua".

Not only was Ferri able to project the text with this astounding breath control; he could do so with a nobility of bearing, unmarred by any labored or extraneous physical movements that might distract his audience—"without any movement of the forehead, the mouth or the face, immobile as a statue" (*Historia musica* 110; trans. mf). Ferri carried this off with the highest level of self-assurance, no matter the difficulty, by making

> the descent by trill from half-step to half-step without any insecurity, and with a voice lightly reinforced from the high octave of a''' and g''' to the same a'' and g'' of the Tetrachord [an octave below]—an operation [that], if not entirely impossible, at least was of very great difficulty for any other excellent singer—[but] was nothing to Ferri, since from this he passed without taking a breath to other trills, *passaggi*, and marvels of the art. (Bontempi *Historia musica* 110; trans. mf; emph. added)[7]

To understand the implications of Bontempi's description, it is important to recognize that there is virtually no evidence for low male or women singers performing at this level of difficulty and degree of ease before the second half of the eighteenth century; and certainly none performed at the technical level of the top castrati.

Two systematic singing treatises issued during the eighteenth century—the first of their genre—describe how to begin to attain such Olympian levels of rhetorical fluency: the first is Pierfrancesco Tosi's *Opinioni de' cantori antichi, e moderni* (1723), the second Giambattista Mancini's *Pensieri, e riflessioni pratiche sopra il canto figurato* (1774; revised edition as *Riflessioni pratiche sul canto figurato*, 1777). Importantly, both singing masters were themselves castrati, and Tosi's earlier treatise was almost entirely directed at castrato pupils. Read in combination with anecdotal writings, they show remarkable consistency as regards the performative musico-rhetorical equipment required. The chief factor continued to be consummate control of the breath, which was as essential to good rhetorical phrasing in music as pacing and delivery were in speech. Often breath control was described in terms of the art of *legato* singing—that is, the binding of note to note—albeit with varied, nuanced demarcations of both passing (or "nonessential") and more structural kinds.

---

7 "Il discendere con un trillo da hemituono in hemituono senza alcuna incisura, e con voce leggiadramente rinforzata dall'ottava acuta della ... (aaa) e ... (ggg) alla stessa ... (aa) e ... (gg) del Tetracordo...; operatione, se non affatto impossibile, almeno di grandissima difficultà a qualsivoglia altro valoroso Cantore; al Ferri era un nulla; poiche da quello passava senza respire ad altri trilli, e passaggi, e maraviglie dell'Arte".

Above all, the business of perfecting the breath was obtained through practice of the so-called *messa di voce*, the carefully sustained swelling and diminishing of the voice on a single note, which castrati were expected to practice daily for long periods of time, and to deploy as a way to strike a pose at the beginning of an aria or a reprise of a main section of music.[8]

Inseparable from all of these singerly virtues was the art of *portamento*, the specific practice of sliding almost imperceptibly from one note to the next, which gave continuity to the declamation of words, otherwise differentiated by pitch and rhythm; and likewise the trill. Whereas nowadays the trill is often regarded as a kind of ornamental surplus to structure and meaning, in the Early Modern period it was much more than that. It was an essential demarcator of musico-verbal forms, especially as a point of emphasis at the very rhetorical point of a stanza; and, more generally, it was a key device for punctuating language and signaling prestige.[9]

Other teachings were likewise gauged to calibrate the castrato's musical speech for audiences, and to give it meaning and force. Purity of vowel enunciation, which depended on a generally clear, unobstructed sound, was a *sine qua non* of perfect diction. Hence Tosi's repeated injunctions not to allow the voice to get caught in the throat, or be produced through the nose (*Observations* 1.2, 1.18, 6.26). Control of registral shifts between different parts of the voice, which had to be smoothed at all of their joints, was also essential.[10] Castrato singers were renowned for control of registral shifts, well beyond what could be expected of others, as we will see. To project a given text, a singer also had to be able to combine all these ideal qualities and skills with a resonant voice, and to "make himself be understood with ease" *(Observations* 1.2), with a perfect, uncompromising formation of the vowels (*Observations* 1.23), and with a careful pronunciation of consonants.[11] Perfect intonation was essential, for without it one could not hope to achieve any of the foregoing *(Observations* 1.16). To groom

8 See Tosi (*Opinioni,* 1.29). Natalie Dessay executes a very well-wrought *messa di voce* at the reprise of Händel's aria "Un pensiero voli in ciel", from the 1707 cantata *Da quel giorno fatale (Delirio amoroso)*.

9 On the trill as an emblem of prestige see e.g. Wistreich **(**"'La voce è grata assai, ma . . .': Monteverdi on Singing" 7–19); and Feldman (*The Castrato*, 101–103, 163).

10 Eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century evidence for this is abundant. Cf. Davies (*Romantic Anatomies of Performance* 127). Unlike in today's operatic practice, while the joints between registers had to be smoothed, disparities between distinct registers—principally head and chest, but also other joints—did not have to be hidden, since different registers had distinct qualities necessary for marking different rhetorical shadings and moods.

11 I quote here from the English translation of Tosi, because it includes numbered paragraphs.

himself for all this, a castrato had to learn his letters by studying Tuscan—the glory of vernacular language—and imitating the best possible rhetorical models (*Observations* 6.4–5, 6.7, 6.13–14, 9.38), much as Cicero had championed Demosthenes and Pietro Bembo had modeled vernacular poetry and prose on Petrarch and Boccaccio.[12]

For Tosi, three precepts of Ciceronian rhetoric were fundamental to the execution of arias: *invenzione*, *variazione*, and *decoro* (*inventio*, *variatio*, *decorum*). In applying *invenzione* and *variazione*, a singer would provide the reprise of the *da capo aria* with improvisations and decorations, thereby avoiding a mindless repetition of the A section (*Observations* 7.4–9), and would avoid singing cadenzas that were fixed in advance. Through *decoro*, he would ensure that the execution of arias be done with propriety—meaning that he would attend carefully to the proper affect and genre in which his inventing and varying were done.[13] And to achieve *variazione*, he would see that all were accomplished while modifying the stresses on different affects, moods, and techniques.

Lest we think that Tosi's rhetorical orientation waned in the eighteenth century, we can make recourse to Mancini. In his *Pensieri e riflessioni pratiche sopra il canto figurato* (*Thoughts and Practical Reflections on Singing Polyphonic Music*), he explicitly agitated for castrati to be cultivated as rhetoricians, exhorting them to

> [*l*]*isten to the discourse of a good orator*, and hear what pauses, what variety of voice, what diverse strength he adopts to express his ideas; now he raises the voice, now drops it, now he quickens the voice, now harshens, now makes it sweet, *according to the diverse passions which he intends to arouse in listeners*. (*Practical Reflections* 65; emph. added)[14]

12 See Cicero (*Orator* 76–101); Wooten ("Cicero's Reactions to Demosthenes: A Clarification" 37–43). Pietro Bembo's exposition of his model is given in his *Prose della volgar lingua* (Venice, 1525). On Bembo's Ciceronianism as it pertains to music, see Feldman (*City Culture and the Madrigal at Venice* esp. ch. 5).

13 In all of this, eighteenth-century singing masters were preoccupied with what was thought of as the full, "natural" voice; see Tosi (*Observations* 1.21, etc.), as opposed to the "voce falsa", otherwise known as '*falsetto*'. Paradoxically, the castrato singing voice was regarded as "una voce naturale", because it could be used without recourse to excessive head voice and to "la voce falsa". Elided with this *voce naturale* was the desideratum of an affable and graceful carriage of the head and body, most especially the mouth from which sounds and words issued (Tosi *Observations* 1.26).

14 "Attenti pure al discorso d'un buon oratore, e sentirete quante pose, quante varietà di voci, quante diverse forze adopra per esprimere i suoi sensi; ora inalzi la voce, or l'abassa, or l'affretta, or l'incrudisce, ed or fà dolce, secondo le diverse passioni, che intendere muovere nell'uditore"

This is the very essence of Ciceronian *variatio* in *elocutio*. Mancini's proposed education for vocal students was intended to cultivate their rhetorical intelligence by having them read "Tuscan books" (shorthand for books in an elevated vernacular), acquire knowledge of history, and study grammar—the last because "Grammar teaches the regulated way of reading and speaking", where the pauses and emphases should be made, and how, in this way, meanings are shaped for the listener by means of various forms of expression. Mancini relied on the old Ciceronian idea that meaning was not immanent and immutable in words, but produced in living sound: "The virtue and strength of a word are not always revealed in its nature alone, but often in the manner with which words are pronounced, whence they gain strength" (*Practical Reflections* 65).[15] One should note that Mancini advances these precepts at a moment when attention to the importance of theatrical illusion was starting to grow in reform circles and to challenge rhetorical thinking. Yet rhetorical thinking was hardly ushered out in a single stroke; moreover, for the likes of a traditional castrato singing master, such precepts continued to lie at the foundation of a convincing portrayal on the stage. Hence Mancini's declaration: "When a singer performs well, investing strongly in his character, projecting him naturally with actions, voice, and the proper gestures, and bringing him to life with clarity, the listener will say that this one is truly, for example, Caesar, or that one Alexander" (*Practical Reflections* 65)—two figures much depicted in eighteenth-century opera—for illusion depended on fine rhetorical control.[16]

Of the two modalities that dominated Settecento opera for much of its life—recitative and solo aria—the former might be regarded as the primary carrier of rhetoric in the most obvious sense, since its verbal vehicles not only propelled action forward, but largely carried along the dialog (albeit with various exceptions). Accompanied by gesture, recitative involved what Tosi called (in the words of his English translator J. E. Galliard) a "certain natural Imitation, which cannot be beautiful, if not expressed with that Decorum with which Princes

(*Pensieri* 150). The same was said by Saverio Mattei; see Paolo Fabbri ("Saverio Mattei e la 'musica filosofica'" 611–629).

15 "La virtù, e la forza d'una parola non rilevasi sempre dalla di lei sola natura, ma ben spesso la maniera, con cui viene proferita gli leva, ovvero aggiunge forza" (*Pensieri* 149, § 13).

16 "Recita bene un Attore allor quando, investendosi forte del carattere di quel Personaggio, che rappresenta, lo spiega al naturale e con l'azzione, e con la voce, e cogli affetti propri, e con tanta chiarezza lo ravviva, che l'Uditore dice, questo veramente è, per ragion d'esempio, questo è Cesare: questo è Alessandro" (*Pensieri* 148,§ 13).

speak, *or those who know how to speak to Princes*" (*Observations* 5.3; 67).[17] Accordingly, it engaged in the verbal modality of the court, its chief aim being the Ciceronian one of persuasion. As Tosi wrote: "Let Truth prevail, where Passion speaks, all *Shakes*, all *Divisions* and *Graces* ought to be silent, leaving it to the sole Force of a beautiful Expression *to persuade*" (*Observations* 5.4; 68; emph. added).[18] Tosi was vociferous on the matter, for the recitatives were the bearers of diverse passions—the "lively", the "pathetic", "the vehement", and the "tender". Without knowledge of making the distinctions between them, a singer would be what he called "stupid on the stage and senseless in a chamber" (*Observations* 5.11; 71–72).[19]

Both Tosi and Mancini presumed that fundamental to a singer's rhetoric was that his delivery be vested in exchange. In emphasizing exchange as the basis of musical oratory, castrato singers and teachers were drawing on the more generalized paradigm that underlay the aria, which was rhetorical through and through. All writers about music throughout the eighteenth century—from Heinichen, Mattheson, Scheibe, and Koch in the north, to Tosi, Mancini, and Galeazzi in the south—conceived of the aria as a dynamic form of oratory, articulated in linear time and three-dimensional space, and describable through the grammatical nomenclature of paragraphs, sentences, periods, semicolons, and commas.[20] This was true no matter whether they were composition teachers, rhetoricians, music theorists, or singing masters. For them, to think of the aria as

17 Here Tosi speaks of theatrical recitative as the second of three types, church, theater, and chamber. The full passage reads: "Il secondo è teatrale, che per esser inseparabilmente accompagnato dall'azione del cantante obbliga il maestro d'istruir lo scolaro d'una certa imitazione naturale, che non può esser bella sé non è rappresentata con quel decoro col quale parlano i principi, e quegli che a principi sanno parlare" (*Opinioni* 41).

18 Tosi (*Observations* 68). "E vaglia 'l vero, dove parla la passione i trilli, e i passaggi devon tacere, lasciando che la sola forza d'una bella espressiva persuada col Canto" (*Opinioni* 42).

19 The longer passage reads: "Signori Maestri deboli, che dirigete i principianti senza riflettere all'ultimo esterminio in cui mettete la musìca coll'indebolirgli i principali fondamenti, se non sapete che i recitativi, particolarmente vulgari, vogliono quegl'insegnamenti, che alla forza delle parole convengonsi, vi consiglierei di rinunziare il nome, e l'uffizio di maestri a chi può sostenere, e l'uno, e l'altro in vantaggio de' professori , e della professione; altramente i voftri scolari sacrificati all' ignoranza non potendo discernere l' allegro dal patetico, nè il concitato del tenero non è poi maraviglia se li vedete stupidi in iscena, ed insensati in camera" (Tosi *Opinioni* 44–45). On Tosi's satirical style, much in evidence here, see Durante ("Theorie und Praxis der Gesangsschulen zur Zeit Händels" 59–77).

20 See Heinichen (*Der General-Bass in der Composition* passim); Mattheson (*Das neu-eröffnete Orchestre*, *Der vollkommene Capellmeister* both passim); Johann Adolph Scheibe (*Der critische Musikus* passim); Koch (*Versuch einer Anleitung zur Composition*, part 2); Tosi (*Opinioni* passim); Mancini (*Riflessioni prattiche* passim); Galeazzi (*Elementi teorico-pratici di musica*).

oratory meant conceiving of it both as a set of idealized affects and gestures, and as words delivered strategically to a sensible body—an interlocutor or auditor, but, in any case, an audience with its own space and sensory technology. The notion of absorption, as described by Michael Fried after such theorists as Diderot and Marmontel, did not yet supersede this fundamentally multi-directional, exchange-oriented character of the aria, least of all in Italy.[21]

The exchange dimension of the *dramma per musica* radically complicates the rhetorical model at hand. In an Early Modern, proto-capitalist means of production, considerations of audience are paramount in all five, traditional parts of Classical rhetoric: *inventio*, *dispositio*, *elaboratio* (*elocutio*), *memoria*, and *actio* (*pronuntiatio*). Of course, one might well say the same of many genres of that period. Yet Italian opera stands apart for being a kind of quasi-journalistic institution, one that had almost nothing of the authorial work concept, because stage works were pieced together when the ink was still wet on the page, and with a last-minute system of production that potentially drew in all parties involved (the very opposite of operatic practices in France, for example). The textual production of Italian opera was forever teetering in a balancing act with the star system. Operas failed, if they failed to suit the (respective) voices; hence both premieres and revivals had to include rewrites, cuts, and substitutions that were not just textual, but performative. Whether to put a singer's featured aria at the midpoint or end of an act was thus both a decision about whether to pay homage to that singer, and also a dramaturgically strategic gesture.

Anne Desler does a marvelous job of explaining the strategies and stakes in this process, using the example of the great Farinelli—who sang publicly in the 1720s and 1730s, and whom we might regard as the very *exemplum* of rhetorical prowess. Through careful source work, she demonstrates that Farinelli's fame and technological wizardry demanded that virtually every role he performed be rewritten for him—often necessitating rewrites for the opera as a whole—and that he be an active agent in the compositional process. This was true even for what was effectively a new work, such as Metastasio's and Hasse's *Artaserse*, mounted in Venice in 1730 only two weeks after it had opened in a setting by Vinci in Rome, and even though the leading man at Rome had been of basically the same courtly lover type as was routinely played by Farinelli.[22] To illustrate the interwovenness of the written and performed dimensions of these operas throughout the five stages of the rhetorical process, Desler develops models for what she calls macro-

21 See Fried (*Absorption and Theatricality* passim).

22 See Anne Desler (*'Il novello Orfeo' Farinelli* 180). The castrato playing Farinelli's part of Arbace in Rome was Carlo Scalzi.

and micro-levels of the *dramma per musica*. At the micro-level, it turns out that Farinelli participated in deciding upon (if he did not actually dictate) such poetic elements as conceits and metaphors, and such musical elements as keys, meters, tempi, and instrumentation—all of which were critical to projecting his *persona* within the opera, and accommodating his rank as a superstar. At the macro-level, he was intimately involved in deciding upon kinds of subject matter and selecting roles, as well as settling issues of characterization. Above all, Farinelli's intimate dealings with matters of music and text turn out to have extended to working directly with composers, with whom he chose, groomed, and inserted the kinds of immensely long and murderously difficult *passaggi* he added to his bravura arias.

Two brilliant arias exemplifying Farinelli's rhetorical know-how were produced during his first season in Venice, Carnival 1730, both of them in the opera *Idaspe*, composed by his brother Riccardo Broschi on a libretto by Giovanni Pietro Candi, with revisions by Domenico Lalli.[23] The opera describes the rivalry between the general Dario (Darius) and his brother, king Artaserse (Artaxerxes), for the hand in marriage of Mandane—torn between the attractions of love and status. In the aria ending act 1, sung just after the recitative in which Dario learns that Mandane will become Artaserse's consort, Farinelli trumpeted out two and a half octaves of martial passagework and ferociously difficult registral shifts. With this welter of impossible feats, the aria metaphorized his rage and outrage.[24]

RECITATIVE
Sorte fatal! Mandane a Artaserse
Sposa sarà? Nuncio di queste nozze
Lo stesso al di lei padre
Esser dovrò? Cieli! Perché non tormi
Pria che l'amor la vita? Or non sarei
Condannato a tradir gl'affetti miei.

Dreadful fate! Mandane will be Artaserse's
Spouse? And I myself will have to be
The messenger of this wedding to her father?
Heavens! Why not take life away from me

23 From *Idaspe*, act 1, libretto by Giovanni Pietro Candi, revised by Domenico Lalli. Venice, Teatro San Giovanni Grisostomo, 25 January 1730, staged during Carnival.

24 The aria can be heard on the CD and DVD of Antonio Vivaldi's pasticcio *Bajazet*, featuring Vivica Genaux singing the aria in the role of Irene, albeit in a version of Broschi's aria adapted by Vivaldi in 1735 (CD track 17, DVD track 1). For an explanation of how Vivaldi assembled the pasticcio, see Delamea ("The Noble Death-Pangs of Vivaldian Opera" 11–19, esp. 15–17).

before love? Then I would not be
condemned to betray my affections.

ARIA
Qual guerriero in campo armato
Pien di forza, e di valore
Nel mio core innamorato
Sdegno ed amor fanno battaglia.

Il timor del dubbio evento,
Il dolore, ed il cimento
L'alma mia confonde ed abbaglia.

Like a warrior armed in battle,
Full of force and valor,
In my amorous heart
Disdain and love wage war.

Dread of the shady event,
Grief and grappling
Confound and blind my soul. (*Idaspe* Act I)

The aria's amazing concentration of huge leaps of an octave or more showed off Farinelli's ability to bound between registers—something for which castrati were famous, but which none had ever done to such an extent. On a Vienna copy of the manuscript, many different clefs were used to notate the aria, as a sort of visual representation of the hubristic feat of moving around registers that Farinelli carried off.[25] The leaps here combine with Farinelli's ability to sustain fast and long *passaggi*, in this case filled with mechanistic, instrumental figuration of a kind anticipated by the substantial instrumental ritornello with which the aria opens. The aria was newly written for him and (as Desler shows) was conjured out of elaborate passagework, which he must have had a hand in supplying, since he alone was capable of performing it. All this meant that his audience at Venice's Teatro San Giovanni Grisostomo got to be startled both by his sheer display of vocal 'pyrotechnics', and by the novelty of watching something the likes of which had simply never been accomplished before, even by Farinelli himself.

25 See Desler (*'Il novello Orfeo' Farinelli* 221), on the aria's clef changes, as well as Appendix B 1.29b for the vocal line in transcription, showing original clef (324–325). This version for the 1730 performance is housed in Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek (Mus. HS. 18281, fols. 62v-69v).

Where does this flamboyance leave the Ciceronian ideal of *decorum* and restraint that should have characterized the work of any rhetorical prodigy? The rhetorical notion of *ornatus* (adornment) strikes me as helpful here, for it designates one of the four cardinal virtues of *elocutio*, along with good grammar, comprehensibility, and harmony among parts of speech, or style (*Latinitas*, *perspicuitas*, *aptum*); and of these four virtues, it is particularly *ornatus* that carves out a space for brilliance, and even for the excess(es) of a temporary extravagance.[26] As Kathy Eden has noted, the castrato emphasis on *ornatus* effectively reorganizes the parts of rhetoric in such a way that, where voice (*vox*) had traditionally been one of the two parts of *actio* (together with *corpus*, gesture), now *ornatus* serves as a division of *vox*, thereby unsettling traditional rhetorical hierarchies.[27] The importance of *vox* is raised, since voice is uniquely able to effect nuanced differences—arguably more than gestural *actio*—by calibrating itself in such a direct and finely grained way that it goes right to the heart of the listener.[28]

Yet if *ornatus* was central to Farinelli's vocal practice in "Qual guerriero", it is important to note that the aria had no equal whatsoever elsewhere in an opera that lasted for three hours. If anything, Farinelli was moving away from a surfeit of such big bravura arias in 1730. As Desler shows, it was precisely at that time that he started to reduce the usual two huge bravura arias in his operas—much anticipated by his fans—to only one bravura aria per opera, replacing the missing one with a grand scale, slow expressive aria.[29]

The grandest slow expressive aria in *Idaspe*, "Ombra fedele anch'io", was in fact so exceptionally long, graceful, cantabile, pathos-filled, and open to improvised ornamentation that it served as a kind of counterweight to "Qual guerriero".[30] Like the latter, "Ombra fedele" is sung at a moment when Dario

26 See Lausberg (*Handbook* §538). Quote from Damm ("*Ornatus*: An Application of Rhetoric to the Synoptic Problem" 338–364, here: 339); the other three, as mentioned, are: "Latinitas (proper use of words and grammar), perspicuitas ('comprehensibility')", and "aptum (harmony among components of speech)".

27 I refer here to Kathy Eden's remarks of February 12, 2016, made at the round table following the conference proper, and her private communication to me of March 15, 2016. Cf. Lausberg (*Handbook* §1091).

28 I am grateful to DS Mayfield for his hypothesis that, since "hardly anything can be as extensively modulated as voice itself", it appears to go "straight into the 'system'", "like an aural 'intravenous infusion', as it were" (communication of October 3, 2016).

29 Cf. Desler (*'Il novello Orfeo' Farinelli* Chapter 7).

30 From *Idaspe*, act 2, libretto by Giovanni Pietro Candi, revised by Domenico Lalli. Venice, Teatro San Giovanni Grisostomo, January 25, 1730, Carnival. Score in Vienna, Österreichische

believes he has lost Mandane; in this case, however, the recitative already sets up the languorous cantabile mood of its succeeding aria by turning quickly from rage back to love and loyalty.

RECITATIVE
Vanne ingrate, spergiura, ed infedele.
Non sempre andrai superba.
Del Diadema e del Trono. Il Cielo ch'è giusto
Vendicherà l'amor... Ma no; ch'ancora
L'amo bene sleale; e vò costante
Morir, qual vissi, di Mandane amante.

Go ungrateful, perjured, and unfaithful woman.
You will not always go about so proud
Of your crown and throne. Heaven, which is just,
Will avenge my love... But no! For still
I love my disloyal beloved; and I will die
Loyal, as I lived, Mandane's lover.

ARIA
Ombra fedele anch'io
Sul margine di Lete
Seguir vò l'Idol mio
Che tanto adoro.

Che bella gioia è questa
Che a consolar sen resta
Il mio martoro.

As a faithful shade, I too
Will follow my idol,
Whom I so adore,
To the edge of Lethe.

What beautiful joy is this
That remains to console
My torment. (*Idaspe* Act 2)

Insofar as "Ombra fedele" was meant to amaze, it did so by showing off Farinelli's exceptional range. Where "Qual guerriero" had boasted both soprano and alto ranges, "Ombra fedele" dwelt deeply in the alto range, albeit with a fairly high

Nationalbibliothek (Mus. HS. 18281, fols. 117v–124v); transcription of the vocal line in Desler (*'Il novello Orfeo' Farinelli* 326; Appendix B, 1.30).

extension up to a high f'' in the B section (which was notated in soprano clef in contrast to the alto clef of the A section). It also showcased Farinelli's capacity for beautifully improvised ornamentation in the repeat of the main section, both of which gave the audience an element of surprise that they might otherwise have missed.[31]

Farinelli's attention to moderating *ornatus* would have satisfied Quintilian, with his extensive gloss on Cicero's dicta for rhetorical delivery in the *Institutio oratoria* 11.3. There Quintilian echoes Cicero in gendering rhetoric as masculine, and moderation as a masculine virtue, in keeping with Todd Reeser's appraisal of the culture of Farinelli's time in *Moderating Masculinity in Early Modern Culture* (2006).[32] For Quintilian, rhetoric is a master domain of masculinity. "It is essential", he writes, "to save the voice from dwindling to the feeble shrillness that characterizes the voices of eunuchs, women and invalids" (*Institutio* 11.3.19). The voice should be clear and manly (cf. *Institutio* 11.3.20–21), the body held with a manly inclination (*Institutio* 11.3.122), and the dress of the orator distinguished and manly (*Institutio* 11.3.137). Above all, the orator should avoid the fashion for "violent delivery", which apes that of the stage, and which can only threaten the "man of dignity and virtue" with loss of authority ("perdamus viri boni et gravis auctoritatem", *Institutio* 11.3.184).

During the 1720s, then, Farinelli seems to have teetered at the brink of impropriety and a lack of *decorum*—perhaps rhetoric's most fragile and tenuous dimension, and one still made precarious by his surplus of technological wizardry in the 1730s. Yet all in all, he might be thought to have become a better orator over time, less compromised by virtuosic technique, and more compliant with a regime of *decorum*—his position as a man of the theater notwithstanding. This, in effect, is what he told the music historian Charles Burney in 1770, though he surely bent the historical facts somewhat in attributing his change of course to advice from the emperor Karl VI.[33] In Burney we read:

> His Imperial Majesty condescended to tell him [Farinelli] one day, with great mildness and affability, that in his singing, he neither *moved* nor *stood still* like any other mortal; all was supernatural. "Those gigantic strides, said he; those never-ending notes and passages, *ces*

31 A fine performance of the aria by Ann Hallenberg is currently available online: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5jSem4YHbHU (accessed September 8, 2016).

32 See Reeser (*Moderating Masculinity in Early Modern Culture* passim). My thanks to Katherine Crawford for the reference.

33 Desler notes that Farinelli's visit took place in March 1732 whereas he began to reduce the numbers of bravura arias in his operas in 1730. See Desler (*'Il novello Orfeo' Farinelli* 113–114, and ch. 7; "'The Little that I Have Done'" 215–238; here: 218).

> *notes qui ne finissent jamais,* only surprise, and it is now time for you to please; you are too lavish of the gifts with which nature has endowed you; if you wish to reach the heart, you must take a more plain and simple road". These words brought about an entire change in his manner of singing; from this time he mixed the pathetic with the spirited, the simple with the sublime, and, by these means, delighted as well as astonished every hearer. (Charles Burney *The Present State of Music in France and Italy* 215–216)

Should we conceive of *ornatus* as present only in those bravura arias that Burney glossed as "spirited" and "sublime"? Perhaps, but *ornatus* implies a principle that involves more than a temporarily heightened expression. It represents the possibility of emotional transformation that characterizes rhetoric as a whole: its flow of gestural moods, its tonal shadings, its sense of what is urgent and motivated, hence believable—even if Farinelli's bravura effect goes over the top. It should thus include the big cantabile arias, as well. Above all, however, it inheres in the principle of flux between heightened expression and its contrasts and antonyms. In saying so, I follow Per Fjelstad, who sees *ornatus* as "providing performative relief, with background neutrality or narrative equanimity, to balance out the otherwise urgent emotional intensity" ("Restraint and Emotion" 39–47; here: 41). In speech, *ornatus* accomplishes this through an intensified emotional tenor, but sometimes also by reference to physical pleasures of the human sensorium, produced by allusions to paintings, perfumes, and the like (*De Oratore* 111.97). Wrath, fear, and jealousy are among the emotions that can stimulate the passions of the orator to *ornatus*; but, as Elaine Fantham stresses, *ornatus* only works in limited amounts, tempered by the principles of *varietas* and *satietas*.[34] Perhaps, then, it was not just that the emperor cautioned Farinelli against *ornatus*, but that Cicero's own texts did so, counseling "against [...] unvaried emotional display". In Fjelstad's words:

> the orator who gives audiences a thrill, who appears before them almost as a god, whose style of speaking is ample and ornate, this speaker will keep the emotional energy of the discourse fluid and changing. He will not cheapen that energy by riding it too far or too simplistically, but instead will give proportion and depth, light and shade, to the emotional meaning of a message. ("Restraint and Emotion" 46)[35]

Is it enough to know of Farinelli's pervasive involvement in creating operatic works to accept him and others as foremost musical rhetoricians? I think so. And

---

34 See Fantham ("*Varietas* and *Satietas*" 96–103).

35 Cf. also: "Cicero's theory makes a case for verbal exuberance, even theatrical pyrotechnics, as long as those flashes of emotional performance also are supported and contextualized by more measured and steady discourse" (Fjelstad "Restraint and Emotion" 47).

in any case, in the year 2016, a musicologist should not be surprised to learn how deeply performance and composition interpenetrated and overlapped with one another in the rhetorical process; for the great discovery of twenty-first-century Renaissance musicology thus far has been the extent to which improvisation, performance, and oral transmission were crucial to, indeed inseparable from the compositional process; and, conversely, how much composition developed directly out of performance.[36] Farinelli was himself a composer, as were many other castrati, who had been taught composition, counterpoint, keyboard skills, and figured bass as part of their exceptionally rigorous and elite training as musicians.

Perhaps more surprising is that many castrati were well-lettered men, even 'bookish'.[37] Farinelli, who knew the libretti he sang intimately, oversaw libretto revisions for performances at Madrid in his capacity as Minister of Entertainments. His letters show him to have been educated in matters literary, and even capable of wielding the poetic language of *opera seria*. In 1733, he wrote to his patron Count Sicinio Pepoli about his mad love for a ballerina in language worthy of a Metastasian aria: "Cupido ancora mi tien legato / e Iddio sa quando sarò slegato, / poiché dall'una e l'altra parte, / si soffre, si tace, si pena, / e pure vien gradita tale / dolcissima catena" (Farinelli *La solitudine amica* 124).[38]

Not every castrato could conduct himself with aplomb at such high echelons. Indeed, most were born of low to middling families, and were taught princely graces late in life, if at all. For instance, the great soprano Caffarelli—for whom Händel wrote *Serse* in 1737—often wielded his prodigal gifts like a bad, ill-tempered boy, making faces on stage at other singers, missing rehearsals, and complaining mercilessly. He got into so many scrapes at the Teatro San Carlo in Naples as to have himself put under house arrest—his bodily imitations of other singers and banter with fans in the boxes having offended the sensibilities of his

36 Most importantly, see Canguilhem's work in this respect (*Chanter sur le livre à la Renaissance* passim; "Singing upon the Book according to Vicente Lusitano" 55–103; *L'improvisation polyphonique à la Renaissance* passim). For a review of this development, see Feldman ("Rethinking the Early Modern" passim).

37 The example *par excellence* is Gaetano Berenstadt (1687–1734), on whom see Lindgren ("An Intellectual Florentine Castrato at the End of the Medicean Era" 139–163).

38 I here render the passage in verse to underscore its poetic nature, though Farinelli wrote it in prose, of course: "Cupid still holds me bound and god knows when I'll be unbound; so from every side I suffer, I sulk, I grieve, and yet I welcome such sweet enchainment". That literariness is of a piece with much else his letters teach about him, as do those from the poet laureate of the *dramma per musica* Metastasio, with whom he had a huge epistolary exchange spanning several decades, which is now largely lost.

royal employers, and even many fans. In Venice, Farinelli thought Caffarelli a boor, and made fun of his whining emotional displays in private letters to Pepoli; and, in Vienna, Metastasio complained that in all he sings there is a "sour allegro". Then there is Goldoni, who recounts in his memoirs how, during a salon gathering, Caffarelli and other castrati laughed out loud at Goldoni's youthful attempt at crafting a *dramma per musica*. Caffarelli's preening arrogance repeatedly called his heroic character type into question.

Fig. 2: Portal to the Neapolitan palace of the castrato Caffarelli (Gaetano Majorano, 1703–1783), built in 1754, with a stone pediment that reads "Amphyon Thebas Ego Domum" ("As Amphion built Thebes, so I built this house"). The building has a pointed arch and upper cornice that function as a balcony for the *piano nobile*, inside of which is a great staircase with cross vaulting. Photo by Matteo Piscitelli, Naples.

A portrait he had done of himself, draped in classical garb, is one example of this, as is the outrageously arrogant portal to a majestic house he had built in 1754, whose stone pediment reads: "Amphyon Thebas Ego Domum", "As Amphion built Thebes, so I built this house" (see Fig. 2, above).

All of this underscores the significance of the embodied bearing of the ideal orator—what Erik Gunderson calls "a natural and inalienable possession that confirms the legitimacy of the domination of his station" (*Staging Masculinity* 72).

The pedagogy of the singing manuals undermines the presumption of naturalness precisely by averring that natural graces are learned by labor—even if they routinely refer to the manmade voice of a castrato as "una voce naturale" or "un soprano naturale". Yet a history of music like Burney's, or a set of chronicles by the likes of the flute teacher Johann Joachim Quantz, saw natural graces as equally conveyed by the majesty of the head, profile, or singer's stance, as by the voice.[39] Hence Burney memorialized the profile of the star-studded Carestini as "majestic", and that of Marchesi as "full of grandeur and dignity". Many others had no such natural graces, their bodies ravaged by developmental abnormalities wrought by prepubertal castration: Pellegrino, for instance, with his hulking form and massively overgrown jaw, or Balatri with his outsized height (all too characteristic of many castrati).[40]

No one sustained the illusion of a natural possession of virtues better than Farinelli. Almost uniquely, he was able to establish himself as the paragon of courtly grace. At age nineteen, he stopped playing female roles (which was a rite of passage for young castrati), and went on to play princes and especially devoted young lovers, torn between public duty and private desire. His exchanges with nobles, courtiers, and sovereigns were marked by witty, gracious banter. When, in 1732 at Vienna, the Emperor Francis I told him in dialect "Voi siete Napoliello", Farinelli loosened up the company by replying "I am in indeed one of those true pasta eaters (veri macaroni)"; and when the emperor later asked him about a rumor that he had lost money to a bad creditor, Farinelli answered that since he had earned the money with his trills, he had reason to hope they would bring him more in the future. The emperor and empress then "began to laugh with great gusto" ("si attaccorono [sic] a ridere d'un gran gusto"), and the empress said she had no doubt they would (*La solitudine amica* 101). Eventually, by age thirty-two, he rose high enough to leave the stage, entering the courtly service of king Philip V of Spain. Besides serving as a Minister of Entertainments, his main duty was to rouse the king from his catatonia and fits of madness by means of his remarkable singing, playing not a harp, like David to Saul (cf. *1Sam* 16:14–23), but, rhetorically and in a virtuoso manner, his own innate vocalic body—the immediacy of that body becoming the very instrument of a kind of vocal *actio*. If, in opera, he had functioned as a kind of royal double, replicating sovereignty by embodying its affective and technological powers, after 1737, he was to become a virtual sovereign, with powers that normally belonged to a high-born minister of state; and, in 1750, he was knighted with the venerable Cross of Calatrava to

39 See Kahl ("Herrn Johann Joachim Quantzens Lebenslauf, von ihm selbst entworfen" passim).
40 Cf. Feldman (*The Castrato* 170–171).

affirm the fact. He had already become what I have called a royal and "sacred double", whose offstage *persona* copied his onstage one.[41]

Farinelli's entanglement with the court raises the question of the tension between stage action and rhetoric. For if the castrato was both a rhetorician and an actor, how could he overcome his histrionic aspect, as a good courtier or orator should? We know that actors and orators were taught the same gestures, and that both were held to craft beauty from variety.[42] But confusingly, among castrati we are faced with two opposed paradigms: that of those who "gratified the eye as much by the dignity, grace and propriety of their action and deportment, as the ear" (as Burney put it); and those who stood immobile and statuesque, like Ferri and Farinelli.[43] The acting instructor Roger Pickering satirized Farinelli's acting in his 1755 book *Reflections upon Theatrical Expression in Tragedy*, explaining how he would embark upon an aria

> with long strides advancing a few Paces, his left Hand settled upon his hip, in a beautiful Bend, like that of the handle of an old-fashioned caudle-cup, his right remained unmoveable across his manly breast, til numbness call'd its partner to supply the place; when it relieved itself in the Position of the other *Handle* to the *caudle-cup*. (*Reflections upon Theatrical Expression* 63–64)

Desler is probably on the right track when she suggests that the near-immobility of Farinelli's acting may have been a way of opting out of the theatrical profession in favor of a courtly demeanor; and that such demeanor shifted emphasis from theatricality to something closer to rhetorical *virtù*. Moreover, we should note that this shift was accompanied by a change both from public to private spheres and from a money economy to that of the gift.[44]

---

41 Feldman (*The Castrato* ch. 4, esp. 166–170).

42 See Barnett (*The Art of Gesture* passim), and Bucciarelli (*Italian Opera and European Theatre* 11–21).

43 "Nicolini, Senesino, and Carestini, gratified the eye as much by the dignity, grace and propriety of their action and deportment, as the ear by the judicious use of a few notes within the limits of a small compass; but Farinelli without the assistance of significant gestures or graceful attitudes enchanted and astonished …'[.] 'During the time of his singing, he was as motionless as a statue" (Burney *A General History of Music* Vol. 4, 379). Senesino, who was Händel's leading man, tried to vest the body with an actor-like gestural rhetoric, according to Roger Pickering, who wrote: "At the same time, on the same stage, and in the same Operas [as Farinelli], shone forth in full excellence of theatrical expression, the graceful, the correct, the varied deportment of Senesino" (*Reflections upon Theatrical Expression in Tragedy* 64).

44 Desler ("'The Little that I Have Done'" 220–221). On the shift from money to gift economy, see Feldman (*The Castrato* ch. 4).

Ultimately, it was precisely the castrato's *virtù* that came under public suspicion. For the same reasons that a castrato might be a master rhetorician and unsurpassed virtuoso, he became the target of bottomless resentment, especially from reformers of the mid to late eighteenth century. In 1772, the theater architect Francesco Milizia declared that these "Signori Virtuosi" should—as their "primary virtue"—produce an "exact and docile resignation to what the Poet has expressed in verse and the composer in notes".[45] They were to be textual literalists, not adding, altering, or removing anything. Beyond that, Milizia dreaded the kind of rogue musical rhetoric in which castrati specialized, lamenting that their objective was not to modulate the voice but to "dismember" it, leaping "from note to note, warbling, arpeggiating, and with coloratura passaggi, trills, fragmentations, leaps, [and] flourishes", shattering and disfiguring "every beauty"; and censuring that all their arias resemble one another, like the ladies of France.[46]

Milizia echoes a generation of naysayers, who hastened the decline of the castrato phenomenon, starting in 1755, when Francesco Algarotti issued the first salvo for reform.[47] Yet the castrato body, like other rhetorical bodies, though resilient, had always also been vulnerable, perhaps in inverse proportion to its rhetorical valor. By exposing himself to flattery, the castrato also exposed himself to critique. The "sanctity" of the virtuoso is, like the *vir bonus* of Ciceronian fame, "always at stake in every performance", the category of that "good man" always

45 The full passage makes clear that the issue is the necessary subordination of the singer ("attore") in line with earlier outcries for dramaturgical reform by Francesco Algarotti and others: "Se'l compositore deve essere subordinato al poeta, l'attore devere esserlo all'uno e all'altro. Non basta che una cosa sia ben ideata, è necessario ancora che sia ben eseguita; e l'esecuzione dipende da' nostri signori virtuosi, la prima virtù de' quali deve essere un'esatta e docile rassegnazione a quanto dal poeta è stata espresso in versi, e dal maestro di cappella in note"; "If the composer must be subordinated to the poet, the singer must be subordinated to both. It is not enough that a thing be well conceived, it is necessary still that it be well executed. And the execution depends on our virtuosos, whose first virtue must be an exact and docile resignation to what the poet has expressed in verse and the chapel master has expressed in notes" (Milizia *Del teatro* 52).

46 "il... principale studio [della massima parte de' musici] è di squartare la voce, saltellare di nota in nota, gorgheggiare, arpeggiare, e con passaggi, trilli, spezzature, e volate, infiorano, infrascano, sfigurano ogni bellezza. In questa guisa più non si canta, e tutte le *arie* si rassomigliano come le donne di Francia"; "Most castrati... split the voice, leap from note to note, shake, [and] make arpeggios; and with passaggi, trills, caprices, and leaps [they] make the music florid and overloaded with ornament, and disfigure any beauty. In this guise, they no longer sing, and all their arias resemble one another like the ladies of France" (Milizia *Del teatro* 53).

47 See Algarotti ("Saggio sopra l'opera in musica" 293–294, and passim).

unstable.[48] This is a reminder that the man who performs is not just being enjoyed or innocently observed, but watched in the more sinister sense, so much the more so if that man is a castrated one. There is abundant evidence that many castrati failed at the task of concealing the effort behind their appearances, and exposed themselves to cruel condescension, or simply failed to be seemly or becoming, as was expected of a virtuoso, in accordance with the times.[49] And there is much evidence as the century wears on that increasingly it became impossible for them to avoid such views.

Whatever the case, it is telling that deprecations of castrati were made in the same period when disenchantment with their capacity to create effective illusions was being voiced, and when disillusionment with rhetoric was also growing. By the years around 1800, musical rhetoric tended to be associated with easy listening. Indeed, arias—like their close cousins, concertos—had succeeded precisely on that ground, being perceived as conversationally easy-going, akin to easily intelligible language. The later eighteenth century began to conceive of music, both instrumental and vocal, not as rhetoric but as an object of contemplation that had to pass the test of higher truth. As Mark Evan Bonds shows, the reconceptualization of music as the stuff of higher truth was of a piece with the new valorization of instrumental music, which had previously been of lower status than vocal music, because it lacked clear representational content—recall Fontenelle's famous cry "Sonate, que me veux-tu?" ("Sonata, what do you want from me?"). The view of music, especially of instrumental music, as an object of contemplation was accompanied by the emerging work concept, the notion of the work of art as an autonomous creation independent of performance—a mirage, of course, but one the castrato could nowise support.[50] That the castrato, with his reputation for artful improvisation, should have been a casualty in this reorientation was inevitable. The discrepancy between the sight of the castrato body and the sound of his voice was particularly offensive to notions of truth to nature. Failing to confirm a normative gender, the body of the

48 See Gunderson (*Staging Masculinity* here: 66; cf. also 69, and passim). As DS Mayfield reminds me, this is characteristic of the genre of the epideictic, in which praise and blame are often not all that far apart (communication of October 3, 2016).

49 During the Early Modern period, the rhetorical principle of *celare artem* (cf. e.g. Aristotle *Rhetoric* III.ii.3–7, 1404b; Quintilian *Institutio* 4.2.127) is rendered in courtly terms in Castiglione's 1528 *Il cortegiano* (see *The Book of the Courtier* 32, I.26).

50 See Bonds ("Rhetoric versus Truth" 109–28), and Beghin (*Music as Thought* passim). On the work concept in music, see especially Goehr (*The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works* passim).

castrato was rejected and eventually the soprano voice was newly sutured to the female body.[51]

51 On this development, see Davies (*Romantic Anatomies of Performance* passim); André (*Voicing Gender* passim); Hadlock ("Women Playing Men" 285–307); Ratliff ("Women in Pants" passim).

Bibliography

Primary Literature

Algarotti, Francesco. "Saggio sopra l'opera in musica". 1755. *Opere del conte Algarotti*. Vol. 2. Venice: Marco Coltellini, 1764. 251–327. Print.

Aristotle. *The 'Art' of Rhetoric*. 1926. Trans. John Henry Freese. *Loeb Classical Library*. 193. Ed. Jeffrey Henderson. Vol. XXII. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2006. Print.

Bembo, Pietro, *Prose della volgar lingua.* Venice, 1525. Print.

Bontempi, Giovanni Andrea Angelini. *Historia musica nella quale si ha piena cognitione della teorica, e della practica antica della musica harmonica; secondo la dottrina de' greci*. Perugia: Constantini, 1695. Print.

Burmeister, Joachim. *Musica poetica, 1606: augmentée des plus excellentes remarques tirées de Hypomnematum musicae poeticae, 1599, et de Musica autoschédiastikè, 1601*. Eds. Agathe Sueur and Pascal Dubreuil. Wavre: Mardaga, 2007. Print.

Burney, Charles. *A General History of Music, from the Earliest Ages to the Present*. 4 vols. Vol. 4. London: printed for the author: and sold by T. Becket; J. Robson; and G. Robinson, 1789. Print.

—. *The Present State of Music in France and Italy*. London: Beckett and Strand, 1773. Print.

Candi, Giovanni Pietro. *Idaspe*. Rev. Domenico Lalli. Teatro San Giovanni Grisostomo. Staged Jan 25, 1730. Score in Vienna: *Österreichische Nationalbibliothek*, Mus. HS. 18281, HS. fols. 62v–69v. and 117v–124v. Manuscript.

Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *On the Orator (De Oratore). Books I–II*. 1942. Trans. E. W. Sutton and H. Rackham. Ed. H. Rackham. *Loeb Classical Library*. 348. Ed. Jeffrey Henderson. Vol. III. XXVIII Vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1948. Print.

—. *On the Orator (De Oratore), Book III. On Fate. Stoic Paradoxes. Divisions of Oratory*. Trans. H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library. 349. Ed. Jeffrey Henderson. Vol. IV. Cambridge MA: Harvard UP, 1942. Print.

—. *Brutus. Orator*. 1939. Ed. and trans. by G. L. Hendrickson and H. M. Hubbell. *Loeb Classical Library*. 342. Ed. Jeffrey Henderson. Vol. V. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1962. Print.

Castiglione, Baldesar. *The Book of the Courtier. An Authoritative Text. Criticism*. 1959. Trans. Charles S. Singleton. Ed. Daniel Javitch. *Norton Critical Edition*. New York, NY: Norton, 2002. Print.

Farinelli, Carlo Broschi. *La solitudine amica: lettere al conte Sicinio Pepoli*. Eds. Carlo Vitale, Roberto Pagano and Francesca Boris. Palermo: Sellerio, 2000. Print.

Galeazzi, Francesco. *Elementi teorico-pratici di musica*. Rome, 1791; enlarged 2nd ed. Ascoli, 1817. Print.

Händel, Georg Friedrich. "Un pensiero voli in ciel". *Da quel giorno fatale (Delirio amoroso)*. 1707. *HWV 99*. Sung by Natalie Dessay. *Italian Cantatas: Delirio Amoroso*. Natalie Dessay and Emmanuel Haïm. Virgin Classics, 2005. CD.

Heinichen, Johann David. *Der General-Bass in der Composition*. Dresden, 1728. Print.

Kahl, Willi. "Herrn Johann Joachim Quantzens Lebenslauf, von ihm selbst entworfen". Friedrich Wilhelm Marpurg, *Historisch-kritische Beyträge zur Aufnahme der Musik*. Vol. 1, part 5. Berlin: Schütz, 1755. 197–250. Print.

Koch, Heinrich Christoph. *Versuch einer Anleitung zur Composition*. Part 2. Leipzig, 1787. Print.

Mancini, Giambattista. *Pensieri, e riflessioni pratiche sopra il canto figurato*. Vienna: Ghelen, 1774. Print.
—. *Riflessioni pratiche sul canto figurato*. Milan: Giuseppe Galeazzo, 1777. Print.
—. *Practical Reflections on Figured Singing: The Editions of 1774 and 1777 Compared*. Ed. and trans. Edward V. Foreman. *Masterworks on Singing*. 7. 1967. Champaign, IL: Pro Musica P, 1996. Print.
Mattheson, Johann. *Das neu-eröffnete Orchestre*. Hamburg, 1713. Print.
—. *Der vollkommene Capellmeister*. Hamburg, 1739. Print.
Milizia, Francesco. *Del teatro*. Venice: Giambatista Pasquali, 1773. Print.
[Pickering, Roger]. *Reflections upon Theatrical Expression in Tragedy*. London: W. Johnston, 1755. Print.
Quintilian. *Institutio Oratoria / The Orator's Education. Books 3–5*. Ed. and trans. by Donald A. Russell. *Loeb Classical Library*. 125. Ed. Jeffrey Henderson. Vol. II. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2001. Print.
—. *Institutio Oratoria / The Orator's Education. Books 11–12*. Ed. and trans. by Donald A. Russell. *Loeb Classical Library*. 494. Eds. Jeffrey Henderson and G. P. Goold. Vol. V. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2002. Print.
Scheibe, Johann Adolph. *Der critische Musikus*. 2nd ed. Leipzig, 1745. Print.
Serra, Giovanni Angelo. *Compendio della rettorica nel quale si dà un nuovo, facile ed utilissimo metodo d'insegnare l'arte oratoria e nel quale si trovano raccolti e compilati i più principali e i più pratici insegnamenti di quest'arte*. Faenza: l'Archi impressor vescovile, camerale, e del s. Uficio, 1741. Print.
Tosi, Pierfrancesco. *Introduction to the Art of Singing*. Ed. Julianne C. Baird. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995. Print.
—. *Observations on the Florid Song; or, Sentiments on the Ancient and Modern Singers*. 2nd ed. Trans. Mr. Galliard. London: J. Wilcox, 1743. Print.
—. *Opinioni de' cantori antichi, e moderni, o sieno Osservazioni sopra il canto figurato*. Bologna: Lelio dalla Volpe, 1723. Print.
—. *Opinioni de' cantori antichi, e moderni. Reprint ed. Monuments of Music and Music Literature in Facsimile*. 2nd ed. Music Literature. 133. New York: Broude Brothers, 1968. Print.
Vivaldi, Antonio. *Vivaldi Bajazet*. Directed by Fabio Biondi with L'Europa Galante. EMI Records Ltd./Virgin Classics, 2005. CD/DVD.

Secondary Literature

André, Naomi. *Voicing Gender: Castrati, Travesti, and the Second Woman in Nineteenth-Century Opera*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 2006. Print.
Barnett, Dene. *The Art of Gesture: The Practices and Principles of 18th-Century Acting*. Ed. Jeanette Massy-Westrup. Heidelberg: Winter, 1987. Print.
Beghin, Tom. *Music as Thought: Listening to the Symphony in the Age of Beethoven*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2006. Print.
Beghin, Tom and Sander M. Goldberg, eds. *Haydn and the Performance of Rhetoric*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2007. Print.

Bonds, Mark Evan. "Rhetoric versus Truth: Listening to Haydn in the Age of Beethoven". *Haydn and the Performance of Rhetoric*. Eds. Tom Beghin and Sander M. Goldberg. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2007. 109–128. Print.

Bucciarelli, Melania. *Italian Opera and European Theatre, 1680–1720: Plots, Performers, Dramaturgies*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2000. Print.

Canguilhem, Philippe. *L'improvisation polyphonique à la Renaissance*. Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2016. Print.

—. "Singing upon the Book according to Vicente Lusitano". *Early Music History* 30 (2011): 55–103. Print.

Canguilhem, Philippe, ed. *Chanter sur le livre à la Renaissance: une édition et traduction des traités de contrepoint de Vicente Lusitano. Collection "Épitome musical"*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2013. Print.

Damm, Alex. "*Ornatus*: An Application of Rhetoric to the Synoptic Problem". *Novum testamentum* 45.4 (Oct: 2003): 338–364. Print.

Davies, J. Q. *Romantic Anatomies of Performance*. Berkeley: U of California P, 2014. Print.

Delamea, Frédéric. "The Noble Death-Pangs of Vivaldian Opera". In booklet included with CD and DVD of *Vivaldi Bajazet*, directed by Fabio Biondi with L'Europa Galante. EMI Records Ltd./Virgin Classics, 2005. 11–19. Print.

Desler, Anne. "'The Little that I Have Done Is Already Gone and Forgotten': Farinelli and Burney Write Music History". *Cambridge Opera Journal* 25.3 (2015): 215–238. Print.

—. *'Il novello Orfeo' Farinelli: Vocal Profile, Aesthetics, Rhetoric*. PhD dissertation, U of Glasgow, 2014. Print.

Durante, Sergio. "Theorie und Praxis der Gesangsschulen zur Zeit Händels: Bemerkungen zu Tosis 'Opinioni de' cantori antichi e moderni'". *Händel auf dem Theater: Bericht über die Symposien der Internationalen Händel-Akademie, Karlsruhe, 1986 und 1987*. Vol. 2. Ed. Hans Joachim Marx. Laaber: Laaber, 1988. 59–77. Print.

Fabbri, Paolo. "Saverio Mattei e la 'musica filosofica'". *Studien zur italienischen Musikgeschichte*, *Analecta musicologica* 30 (1998): 611–629. Print.

Fantham, Elaine. "*Varietas* and *Satietas*: *De Oratore* 3.96–103 and the Limits of *Ornatus*". *Rhetorica* 3 (1988): 96–103. Print.

Feldman, Martha. *The Castrato: Reflections on Natures and Kinds*. Oakland: U of California P, 2015. Print.

—. *City Culture and the Madrigal at Venice*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1995. Print.

—. *Opera and Sovereignty: Transforming Myths in Eighteenth-Century Italy*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2007. Print.

—. "Rethinking the Early Modern". *Musicology Now* (February 3, 2016). Accessed Sept. 22, 2016. http://musicologynow.ams-net.org/2016/02/rethinking-early-modern.html.

Fjelstad, Per. "Restraint and Emotion in Cicero's *De Oratore*". *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 36.1 (2003): 39–47. Print.

Fried, Michael. *Absorption and Theatricality: Painting and Beholder in the Age of Diderot*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1980. Print.

Goehr, Lydia. *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works: An Essay in the Philosophy of Music*. Rev. ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007. Print.

Gunderson, Erik. *Staging Masculinity: The Rhetoric of Performance in the Roman World*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 2000. Print.

Hadlock, Heather. "Women Playing Men in Italian Opera, 1810–1835". *Women's Voices across Musical Worlds*. Ed. Jane A. Bernstein. Boston: Northeastern UP, 2004. 285–307. Print.

Haynes, Bruce and Geoffrey Burgess. *The Pathetick Musician: Moving an Audience in the Age of Eloquence*. New York: Oxford UP, 2016. Print.

Lausberg, Heinrich. *Handbook of Ancient Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study*. Trans. Matthew T. Bliss, Annemiek Jansen, and David E. Orton. Eds. David E. Orton and R. Dean Anderson. Leiden: Brill, 1998. Print.

Lindgren, Lowell. "An Intellectual Florentine Castrato at the End of the Medicean Era". *'Lo stupor dell'invenzione': Firenze e la nascita dell'opera*. *Quaderni della 'Rivista italiana di musicologia'*. 36. Florence: Leo Olschki, 2001. 139–163. Print.

Ratliff, Joy. *Women in Pants: Male Roles for the Mezzo-Soprano or Contralto Voice*. DMA thesis. U of Maryland: College Park, 1977. Print.

Reeser, Todd W. *Moderating Masculinity in Early Modern Culture*. Chapel Hill: U.N.C. Dept. of Romance Languages, 2006. Print.

Wistreich, Richard. "'La voce è grata assai, ma …': Monteverdi on Singing". *Early Music* 22.1. Monteverdi II (Feb: 1994): 7–19. Print.

Wooten, Cecil. "Cicero's Reactions to Demosthenes: A Clarification". *The Classical Journal*. 73.1 (Oct–Nov: 1977): 37–43. Print.

Maria Galli Stampino

Family, City or State, and Theater: Carlo Gozzi and the Rhetoric of Conservatism

It might seem odd to utilize rhetorical tools to analyze an Early Modern play written in Venice. Plays are not often framed that way. Furthermore, throughout its 'republican' history (697–1797), Venice did not have a ruling family, a long-standing court, appointed poets or rhetors; indeed, the *serenissima* was not a principality or a monarchy, but rather an oligarchy, in which the Doge was elected by his peers, and where his power was limited in many different ways.[1] This political and cultural situation seemingly negates another condition for rhetorical readings in a particularly Early Modern context: the existence of a court; for courts are believed to have been keen on imbuing with meaning as many events and situations as possible, and with a view to representation. In other words: in an Early Modern setting, but without a court, the postulation of a respective rhetorical intent might seem problematic. Finally, Carlo Gozzi's *Le gare teatrali* (written in 1751, but not printed until 2011) was never performed, and so did not have an actual theatrical audience that might have been convinced.

These are superficial considerations, of course. Neither the genre of a text, nor the existence of a proto-absolutist court, nor the presence of an audience are *sine qua non* conditions for rhetorical acts. In fact, as Brian Vickers pointed out several decades ago, Early Modern culture was saturated with rhetoric; any text, including the ones without actual spectators, was pervaded by "a concept of *elocutio* lost even on modern historians of rhetoric, by which it [sc. the period] meant eloquence, the gift of speech that distinguishe[s] us from animals and ma[kes] us fully human, with great moral and social responsibilities" (498).

1 For a quick introduction to "The Grammar of Venetian Institutions", see Crouzet-Pavan (195–210). The first two chapters of Rosand's *Myths of Venice* offer an excellent primer of how narratives were made visible in Venetian art.

I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Joachim Küpper and the entire DramaNet group for inviting me to Freie Universität, for their wonderful organization, for their warm welcome, and for their work on the conference and on this collection. In particular, I would like to thank Dr. DS Mayfield for his professionalism, prompt replies to all queries, and incisive comments on my essay.

Maria Galli Stampino, University of Miami

Within this cultural and historical framework, the rhetorical underpinnings of a play written in Venice, a self-styled 'republic', cannot be discarded. One must thus begin by bringing the circumstances surrounding this specific text into sharper focus. The time of its penning was the theater season of winter 1750–1751; the place was Venice; and the author was Carlo Gozzi (1720–1806), the scion of a noble Venetian family, who held deeply conservative political and cultural views.[2] Theater seasons had specific opening and closing times (typically, the winter season went from St. Stephen's Day, December 26, to the end of *carnevale*, a moving date that falls between early February and early March); this constraint was keenly felt by professional theater troupes, starting with those of the *commedia dell'arte*; and, by the seventeenth century, also by the members of those Venetian families who had invested in theater buildings: the Grimani at the San Benedetto, the San Samuele, the San Giovanni Grisostomo (now called Malibran, the second opera house for the orchestra of La Fenice), and the Santi Giovanni e Paolo; the Vendramin at the San Luca (also named San Salvador, still utilized today, and the seat of the Teatro stabile del Veneto); the Tron at the San Cassian; the Giustinian at the San Moisé; and the Condulmer at the Sant'Angelo. Renting boxes—referred to as "selling keys" (as we shall see in Gozzi's play), because keys gave access to those privileged viewing spaces—was lucrative as long as new spoken and sung plays attracted audiences; from an economic perspective, and given the aforementioned temporal limitations, the best play was a popular, or, even better, a sold-out one.[3]

By 1751, Carlo Gozzi had at least indirect experience with the world of securing potentially successful scripts and staging plays. As Fabio Soldini relates in his introduction to *Le gare teatrali*, Gozzi's brother (Gasparo) and his sister-in-law (Luisa Bergalli) had tried their hand at managing a theater during the 1747–1748 season, and ultimately failed ("Introduzione" 14–15). As an active member of the Accademia dei Granelleschi, and part of the Venetian *intellighenzia*, Gozzi witnessed the tensions rising during the 1749–1750 season between two opposing camps: one supporting Carlo Goldoni, intent on carrying out what he dubbed a *riforma* (reformation) of theater habits and practices centered upon the playwright's creation of texts, which performers had to memorize; and the other

2 A glance at the entries devoted to him in the *Enciclopedia italiana* and the *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani* would confirm my broad-stroke assessment. In the latter, Alberto Beniscelli states that he transmitted to his *accademia* a "hostility toward ideological and cultural novelties", "ostilità nei confronti delle novità ideologico-culturali" (241; trans. mgs).

3 In Jordan's words: for *commedia dell'arte* troupes "the unavoidable fact of needing to earn a living led to a new, revolutionary imperative: the need to satisfy popular demand" (4). This also applies to Venetian theater-owning families.

rallying behind Abbott Pietro Chiari, who emphasized the actors' freedom to improvise, albeit in an instrumental (rather than ideological) fashion. At the end of that season, audiences took in a reprise of Goldoni's *Vedova scaltra* (*The Shrewd Widow*, first performed at the Sant'Angelo on December 26, 1748); the première of the polemical *Scuola delle vedove* (*A School for Widows*) by Chiari; Goldoni's incendiary *Prologo apologetico* (*A Prologue to Serve as His Defense*), printed and widely distributed around the city; and the farewell to the audience on 10 February 1750 by Teodora Medebach, the *prima donna* of the troupe performing Goldoni's plays. In this traditionally scripted speech, she announced that the troupe would perform a new comedy during each week of the following season. This was an unprecedented challenge, a clear provocation to Chiari and his supporters—and a resounding success. In his *Mémoires*, Goldoni states that, within eight days, the entire theater had been sold out—for the whole season (II.43).

Exceeding even the unparalleled promise Goldoni had made in February, the Medebach troupe actually performed sixteen new plays by Goldoni between October 5, 1750 and February 23, 1751 (twice as many as had been pledged), after two season-opening performances of *Il teatro comico* (*The Comic Theater*), the manifesto (to use an anachronistic term) of Goldoni's reformed theater. In this meta-theatrical comedy, Goldoni enacted the transfer of authorship and authority from actors to playwright, which, of necessity, was also a transfer of economic power. *Il teatro comico* expresses a new idea of what a theatrical text is—and who controls it: not the performers, but the playwright, who has sole authority over character selection, plot development, and the lines to be spoken on stage.[4] The audience's role is also fundamentally altered: no longer able to

4 This is in sharp contrast to the *commedia dell'arte* tradition, in which actors selected bits and pieces of action and speeches on the basis of the rough outline of a topic and the audience's reaction. As Gozzi himself explained in 1772, the "system of our Italian improvised comedy" ("il Sistema della nostra Commedia improvvisa italiana"; *Opere* 41; trans. mgs) rests on the following aspects: "At the moment when they are about to begin a comedy, actors change their roles according to circumstances, their seriousness, and their respective abilities, exchanging names and personalities, bringing that happy plot to its ending. Within this type of performance, some serious [to wit, non-comic] actors, especially women, have a series of different scripted materials memorized"; "Si cambiano sul momento del cominciare la Commedia, le parti agli Attori, secondo le circostanze, il peso, l'abilità proporzionata, con differenza di nome, di carattere, e tuttavia si conduce la Commedia allegra al suo termine. . . Alcuni attori seri di questo genere di spettacolo, e spezialmente le Attrici, hanno un'arsenale [*sic*] di materiali differenti premeditati alla memoria" (*Opere* 40; trans. mgs). Consequently, at the basis of a theater's success and popularity are the performances of great actors: "A playwright, no matter how productive in his writing, will never be as useful to a theater for a long time as a skilled actor good at improvising

influence the play, they now have to pay closer attention to linguistic nuances and character development.[5]

Within this situation—opposing a "progressive", forward-looking, and highly successful author (Goldoni) to another who overtly criticized him (Gozzi)—the latter is typically represented as aligned with conservative positions: when he did offer texts to be performed (the first was not tendered until January 1761), he penned only the scaffolding (in Italian: *canovaccio*, literally 'canvas, skeleton') of plays, which performers would then bring to life on the stage with great leeway in their choice of words and action.[6] Gozzi's own background is also brought to bear on this context: he belonged to an established (if impoverished) Venetian noble family, while Goldoni (though born in Venice) came from a professional family background, and spent many formative years outside the city (in Perugia, Rimini, Chioggia, and Pavia).[7] We know, however, that *Le gare teatrali* (1751)—Gozzi's first foray into playwriting—is formally different from most of his works for the stage; for it is scripted to a large extent, with only a few scenes left to the performers' creativity. As we shall see, it also includes less than

---

and appreciated by the people"; "Uno Scrittore Teatrale, per quanto fertile sia nelle sue produzioni, non sarà giammai per lungo tempo utile ad un Teatro, come lo sarà un Comico valente improvvisatore entrato nella grazia del popolo" (*Opere* 25; trans. mgs). For a short and comprehensive definition of the phrase *commedia dell'arte*, see Kerr (13–14); as Katritzky has pointed out (18–20), the terminology is itself ideologically fraught.

5 Tatiana Korneeva has recently studied the changes in theatrical audiences in Venice in the 1760s; in Goldoni's *Il genio buone e il genio cattivo* (1767), the Venetians attending theater performances are described "as ever changing, inconsistent, and never satisfied", "come volubile, incoerente e mai soddisfatto" (100; trans. mgs), and despised by both Gozzi and Goldoni.

6 Perhaps unsurprisingly, these comic sketches attracted the attention of later authors, who were inspired by interesting plots and able to express their own stylistic abilities and cultural interests. For example, *Turandot* (written and performed in 1762) was adapted in German by Friedrich Schiller (1806), accompanied by Carl Maria von Weber's stage music (1809), made into an opera by Ferruccio Busoni (1917), and again by Giacomo Puccini in 1926 (cf. "Carlo, Conte Gozzi"; Corneilson et al.). This would open up considerable opportunities for comparative studies, which (to my knowledge) have not yet been carried out.

7 See this assertion by Gozzi: "I will forever believe that humankind is always composed of despotic government rulers, the rich, the moderately rich, the poor, and the wretched [...] Mocking the government and the wealthy and turning the populace against them in a theater is a temerity to be punished much more than to be allowed"; "crederò perpetuamente di veder il genere umano esser sempre composto di presidenti al Governo dispotici, di ricchi, di semiricchi, di poveri, e di miserabili [...] che il porre in ludibrio i Governi, e gli agiati, e l'accendere il popolo minuto contro quelli in un pubblico Teatro sia imprudenza da punirsi più, che da permettersi" (*Opere* 17; trans. mgs).

flattering characters drawn from the nobility. While it is not exactly clear why it was never performed—its text is certainly not conducive to being staged, seeing that it is wordy and convoluted—*Le gare teatrali* demonstrates the importance of rhetoric as an ideological mode within the cultural life of mid-eighteen-century Venice, a late Early Modern city, where artistic style and political ideology coexisted and reinforced each other.[8]

Gozzi's first play is built on dual oppositions, which demonstrate a clearly pro- or anti-theatrical ideology, reinforced by a respective rhetoric. *Correctio* and *refutatio* occur constantly in the play, finding their place in the lines uttered by characters in the same scene or following one upon the other. Even more interestingly, given Gozzi's reputation and his earliest forays into writing (Beniscelli 240), we could imagine that the anti-theatrical positions would emerge as successful; but that would not be accurate. *Le gare teatrali* is an excellent piece of epideictic rhetoric, which juxtaposes praise and blame, the two poles along which Aristotle describes the genre in his *'Art' of Rhetoric*. Recalling Vickers' abovequoted words, I will show that the role of *epideixis* is central to this play, because it underscores the dangers inherent in Goldoni's type of theater, not least in that it emphasizes the importance of playacting to a harmonious community. In other words: the vituperative and the praiseworthy are found side by side, thus demonstrating the hidden and pervasive power of the epideictic genre, which is decidedly instrumentalized, here. Through his playwriting, Gozzi aims at *docere*, while the play itself aims at *delectare*, with a view to moving (*movere*) its presumptive viewers to appreciate and thus conserve the order of the city.

Let us now turn our attention to the text. From the very beginning, the topicality of the play is evident, as it takes place during *carnevale* in the fictional city of Ovaia, in Mississippi, in 1751.[9] While the location is remote (even exotic),

8 Soldini offers two hypotheses (36–38), both reasonable and ultimately unprovable in the absence of additional evidence: Gozzi could not find a troupe to stage it; or he decided to rewrite the play in verse, and later abandoned the task. Given the references to contemporary stage culture, timeliness was crucial in order for Gozzi to take part in the polemic coursing through Venice. Issues of copyright or libel were not a consideration, since the former did not yet apply to performance (and it had a limited impact on published texts, as well), and the latter did not deter other writers from attacking enemies in writing or on the stage, albeit in a thinly veiled manner—as Gozzi does in this play.

9 The name of the fictional city is intriguing, as it translates to "ovary". To my knowledge, no one has studied the gender implications of this name; this is not surprising, given what little critical attention has been devoted to this play; it is not possible to perform that task within the scope of this essay.

the time frame is not: indeed, it would have coincided with the first performance of the play, had it been staged soon after being written; and it evokes a specific set of events and occasions that any Venetian acquainted with the recent occurrences in the world of playwriting and acting would have been familiar with. Briefly put, the play is concerned with two playwrights, Pasticcio (that is, 'Mess', a veiled reference to Goldoni) and Girandola ('Windmill' or 'Weathervane', alluding to Chiari)—each of whom is presented as writing for a different theater and troupe, and each of whom is backed by his own group of supporters, exemplified by a couple, whose allegiances are split between the two authors.[10] Each writer and his camp try out various types of mischief (lies, accusations, anonymous pamphlets, and more) to come out on top as the more successful faction; unsurprisingly, neither will win the victory in the end, but their shenanigans comes very close to having dire consequences for playwriting and performance in Ovaia, and for the community as a whole. Gozzi's conservative overall message might be phrased in the following way: words have a far-reaching power, and need to be used with a great sense of responsibility—rather than simply out of a desire for monetary gain or personal fame; playwrights naturally aim at influencing many people, because their audiences tend to be considerable, and because their plays elicit strong emotions—wherefore dramatists must be even more conscientious than other authors.[11]

Le gare teatrali makes this visible by showing—by staging—the profound effects of playwriting and acting on many levels within a community. In Ovaia (as will be evident from the above, very short *précis*), it is entire families who are affected. In the second scene of the play, Windmill states in passing that he has his supporters—the same as Mess has his own: "If he [sc. Mess] has protectors, I will have some too! If he owns count Drum, I own his wife, countess Trumpet,

10 Gozzi mixes things up by portraying Mess as working at Teatro Vecchio (the Old Theater), and Windmill at Teatro Nuovo (the New Theater), perhaps as a commentary on the fact that there is in fact not much difference between the two playwrights, their styles, and their goals, as his play demonstrates.

11 It could be argued that my statement flies in the face of Gozzi's later assertion that "I only tried to have fun, entertain my fellow townspeople, and make some money for a troupe who does not have any faults in the eyes of the audiences that they serve", "Io non ho cercato, che di divertirmi, di spassare i miei concittadini, e di proccurare dell'utile a una Truppa, che non ha demeriti con quel Pubblico, a cui ella serve" (*Opere* 11; trans. mgs). This passage follows the *tópos* of modesty, whereby writers averred to have had much more limited ambitions than their works manifest; this is particularly common in autobiographical contexts such as the one above, penned later on in Gozzi's life.

and then the young countess, who's a real devil!" ("Gare" 128, I.2; trans. mgs).[12] Windmill expresses his satisfaction for what may otherwise be considered a deeply troubling set of circumstances: dissension is tearing an aristocratic couple asunder. In addition, Gozzi's language here is full of sexual double entendre: if we read Windmill's words with care, we see that Drum and Mess are conceivably involved in a homosexual relationship, adding insult to literary injury (by the public value judgments of the period in question); at the same time, Windmill increases his own sexual prowess by expanding his influence to comprise two noblewomen, including the young and unmarried countess, whose virginity is an expensive and coveted prize typically reserved for a husband (again, by the value judgments of the respective period). Windmill's self-interest blinds him to the consequences that the enmity, which he is embroiled in, tends to have within families and traditional settings.

As partisanship becomes ever more radical, Gozzi makes clear that the tension between Drum and Trumpet is not merely a figment of the imagination of the self-aggrandizing Windmill, and that the consequences will be considerable. After disparaging texts have been penned, printed, and distributed throughout the city in support of the Old Theater and its resident playwright (as had actually happened with Goldoni's *Prologo apologetico*), its supporters look to assign guilt to someone, and the following exchange occurs:

Young Countess Spark:	If it was your wife [who was behind this ploy], I wouldn't hold you to be the man I believe you to be unless you stop sharing a bed with her.
Drum:	If indeed it was her, I will divorce her and perhaps I would even try to annul the marriage. ("Gare" 194, II.19; trans. mgs)[13]

This short conversation implies three levels of estrangement: sexual (being mentioned by an unmarried woman), legal according to civil statutes, and legal according to canon law. In a mere two lines, Gozzi powerfully points out that family dissension is spreading to all levels of order within a community—even going as far as sapping the codification of behavior according to church and state. Divorce is here not a private matter, but something openly discussed; and indeed by a woman with a man, who happens not to be her husband. Harmony is

12 "S'egli ha de' protettori, ne avrò anch'io [...] s'egli ha il conte Tamburo io ho la contessa Trombetta sua consorte ch'è tutta mia, e poi la mia contessina ch'è un diavolo".

13 "Favilla: E se è stata vostra consorte, non vi stimo l'uomo che siete se almeno non vi sceparate di letto. / Tamburo: Se è stata lei vo' fare un divorzio e forse vo' tentare scioglimento di matrimonio".

impossible within the walls of Drum and Trumpet's home, as a subsequent scene indicates:

> Drum: Before we divorce, I'll win this battle, you know? Oh yes, I'll assuredly win it—I know what's going on over here.
>
> Trumpet: And I know what's going on on my side, so we'll see...and then indeed we'll divorce. We are no longer children, my dear count. ("Gare" 218, III.9; trans. mgs)[14]

Here we witness two characters belonging to the nobility—hence (traditionally) endowed with specific responsibilities as regards upholding the principles of, and best behavior within, the community—who are now squabbling like children, and using unrefined language ("bollire in pentola", literally "to boil in a pot", was, and still is, a popular phrase, socially beneath the two characters on stage by contemporary standards). Through Trumpet's ironic proclamation at the end of her line, Gozzi seems to emphasize the chasm between what they say and how they behave. This is particularly relevant to my point, since, for Gozzi, playwriting and acting have a fundamental, necessary role within a community: that of representing exemplary behavior to the audience's view. This ideological point is reinforced (and rendered in more comical, but also gloomier terms) by the visual spectacle: the two characters are wearing nightgowns as they are about to retire separately for the night, making the fundamental breakdown of propriety, and of their marriage, manifest on stage. The visual, performance-based element and the ideological, word-based one, reinforce each other, and underscore the censorious aspect of this play.

For Gozzi, the same as for most conservatives, family is the fundamental building block of society; accordingly, any problems in this area will soon spread to the society at large. If husbands and wives do not respect each other, if noblemen and women do not care to be seen in their pajamas, if unmarried women openly discuss divorce, then it is unsurprising that other social boundaries are equally crossed, and proprieties voided. The play stages transgressions of the rhetorical *aptum*, in ways that are apt to its intratextual goal of *movere*. An excellent example is found in the second act, when Trumpet quarrels with a man wearing a mask (as was, of course, customary during *carnevale*), who is selling keys to theater boxes:

---

14 "Tamburo: Prima di fare il divorzio vincerò il mio puntiglio, sapete? Oh lo vincerò lo vincerò, io so ciò che bolle nella mia pentola. / Trombetta: Ed io so ciò che bolle nella mia, vederemo, e poi divorzio pure, non siamo più ragazzi, no signor conte".

The man with the keys:	I understand where you belong socially from the way you talk.
Trumpet:	What do you mean, reckless man?
The man with the keys:	That you talk like a commoner, like riff-raff.
Trumpet:	If only I had a knife... [to Narrow Mind, a marquis who follows Trumpet] What are you doing, Mr. Stupid? Do you let me be offended like that? ("Gare" 204–205, II.24; trans. mgs)[15]

The destabilization of traditional gender roles (already evident in the two examples above) continues, is exacerbated in this snippet of dialog. When visual indications of socio-economic strata are erased (by face masks worn during *carnevale*, or by costumes and make-up on stage), other signals become more important; here, it is particularly the choice of words and inflection, which are crucial. Earlier in the scene, Trumpet addresses the key seller with the respectful "voi"; at this point, she has switched to the familiar "tu". Even assuming that her choice is justified by the occupation of her interlocutor (and that, earlier in the scene, she was merely trying to be accommodating), the insult she directs at her peer, Narrow Mind, is gratuitous, and even dangerous. Moreover, the distance between language and behavioral impropriety is short: we can quibble over Trumpet's choice of words, but her wish to act violently ("If only I had a knife...") marks the breaking down not only of well-mannered behavior by a noble woman, but more generally of the boundaries of legality within the community.

In fact, this seed of violence is present from the very beginning of the play, threatening its rhetorical nature of comedy to turn into tragedy. The first scene of Act I is only partially scripted; it shows Truffaldino, Drum's servant (a key character of *commedia dell'arte*, the perennially hungry servant, whose name derives from *truffare*, 'to swindle') and Brighella (another such character, whose name derives from *brigare*, 'to scheme'), as they are exchanging judgments concerning the plays about to be performed at the two theaters; they proceed to insulting each other, until finally "Brighella slaps him [Truffaldino], and the latter hits him with a club; people wearing masks want to separate them, a melee ensues, and people fall all over"—as the scene comes to an end ("Gare" 125, I.1; trans. mgs).[16] Tensions among playwrights and performers, Gozzi might be seen to imply, are dangerous, because they spill over from the stage into the

15 "Quel dalle chiavi: Vi sento nel parlare. / Trombetta: Che vuoi dire, temerario? / Quel dalle chiavi: Che parlate da pedina e da plebaglia. / Trombetta: Oh se avessi un coltello... Che fate voi, signor stolido, mi lasciate vilipendere? *(a Barbino)*".

16 "Brighella gli dà uno schiaffo. Truffaldino lo bastona; le maschere vogliono scepararli, barruffa, maschere in terra". Gozzi's choice to open his largely scripted play with an *improvviso* scene is noteworthy, as it might be read as an indication of his stylistic predilection, borne out in his later production.

community. In *Le gare teatrali*, physical violence is initially enacted among two servants, is then invoked by the noblewoman Trumpet later, and finally explodes in Act III, when it threatens to destabilize the entire city and community of Ovaia—hence requiring decisive countermeasures. This emerges when the two aforementioned servants—having become even more radical as they observe their masters' opinions regarding Windmill and Mess—decide to settle the matter once and for all:

> Brighella: Ah, murderer! I challenge you and all your followers, supporters of Mess, I challenge you to a Venetian-style war. Tomorrow at sunrise I challenge you to the Bridge of Crazy People.
>
> Truffaldino: Be my guest, come with all your herds, supporter of Windmill; you're all such idiots! ("Gare" 213, III.4; trans. mgs)[17]

If ever we needed confirmation that Gozzi writes "Ovaia" and thinks "Venice", Brighella's verbal slippage gives us an explicit one: he is referring to the long tradition of the "fist wars" fought on the Ponte dei Pugni (still extant today), near Campo San Barnaba in the Dorsoduro neighborhood (*sestriere*), the site of Bakhtinian carnivalesque violence.[18] In *Le gare teatrali*, however, the inevitable fistfight has the potential of involving the society at large, since family tensions had by then leaked outside their more limited domain.

Just as dangerously, violence has the potential of turning into a spectacle, the object of scopophile attention on the part of other social strata, who have been primed by the tensions and inimical actions between the two theatrical camps. This is, in fact, what Gozzi's stage directions indicate:

> Trumpet, Windmill, Cloyingly Sweet [a young countess, the object of Windmill's attention], and Zanetto [the New Theater's impresario] run from one side [of the stage] to see the brawl; Drum, Spark, Mess and Owl [a washer, Truffaldino's wife] run from the other. Nobody talks; they act out their support for Truffaldino and Brighella. Soldiers arrive carrying shotguns and two cannons and take position to fire over the fighters, who split and flee. The soldiers leave. ("Gare" 229, III.21; trans. mgs)[19]

---

17 "Brighella: Ah sassin. Te sfido con tutti i to seguaci parziali de Pastizzo, te sfido a far una Guerra alla veneziana, doman a bonora te sfido al ponte dei matti. / Truffaldino: Vien pur con tutte le mandre, parziale de Girandola, razza de becchi".

18 For a concise and insightful introduction to this "mode of sociability", see Ferraro (95–97), which is tellingly followed by her account of the Venetian tradition of *carnevale*.

19 "Trombetta, Girandola, Milensa e Zanetto da una parte corrono a vedere la zuffa; Tamburo, Favilla, Pasticcio e Civetta dall'altra; nessuno parla ma fanno gesti di parzialità chi per Truffaldino chi per Brighella. Giungono soldati con fucili e due cannoni, si piantano per far fuoco sopra i combattenti, i quali si sceparano e fuggono, i soldati partono".

Windmill's and Mess's plays have elicited such strong emotions and actions that the State needs to intervene directly: first with this show of force, and later with specific forms of legislation, as we shall presently see. Setting aside the fact that this scene would posit some difficulties to its staging, since it requires props and a large number of extras, Gozzi indicates that a certain type of theater encourages a dangerous drift from civic responsibility to personal and emotional responses, including within the upper strata of society—meaning, those on whom the State counts to maintain, and pass on, propriety, legality, community. The intratextual audience, presented here as involved, if from the periphery, in this violence, does not understand this danger. Gozzi's presentation is geared toward raising an awareness thereto in the extratextual audience.

Why is it necessary, then, to have theater at all? Why use a play to lay bare the weaknesses and dangers of theater? This is the crucial paradox of *Le gare teatrali*, fully borne out in the two-part conclusion of the play. First, a decision is rendered and made known by a crier, accompanied by a companion, whose role it is to repeat what the crier states in a louder voice. In what follows, I have connected line fragments in order to compose a more readily comprehensible speech; in Gozzi's original script, each fragment is stated by the crier and repeated by his companion, and therefore amplified and emphasized:

> Crier: With each passing day [...] we continue to uncover a notable, scandal-bearing, [...] ruinous change in the brains [...] of our city's inhabitants, [...] [we see] disputes, discord, [...] and offenses to the reputation and the very lives of both sexes, [...] [we note] licentiousness and immoderation in habits, [...] and from the countless multitude of complaints [...] made to Justice [...] we observe that the source of all disorder [...] are the so-called character comedies [...] by the authors Mess and Windmill [...]. We maturely reflected on this [...] and we decide and order what follows [...]: All the comedies by the abovementioned authors [...] are and will be forever suspended and prohibited [...] from the theaters of this city of ours [...]. However, we do not want to take away [...] a moderate, innocent enjoyment from the population [...] as well as profit from actors and impresarios [...]; we allow the following comedies [...] to be performed [...]: *The Feast with the Great Statue* [...]; *Arlecchino Pretend Prince* [...]; *The Great Bernardo dal Carpio* [...]; *The Glorious Labors of Hercules* [...]; *Roland's Honorable Poverty* [...]; *Pantalone's Thuggish Acts* [...]; *Pantalone, Bankrupt Merchant* [...]; *Pietro Barliario* [...]; *Brighella's Characters* [...]; and all scripted comedies [...] written between 1630 [...] and 1690, included[.] ("Gare" 229–31, III.22; trans. mgs)[20]

20 "Scoprendosi sempre più di giorno in giorno [...] una notabile scandalosa [...] esenziale [*sic*] alterazione nei cervelli [...] degli abitanti di questa città nostra, [...] nascere contese, discordie, offese [...] alle riputazioni e alle vite dell'uno e dell'altro sesso, [...] introdursi libertinaggio e smoderatezza nei costumi, [...] e rillevandosi [*sic*] dalla innumerabile moltitudine di reclami [...] fatti innanzi la Giustizia [...] essere la fonte di tutti i disordini [...] le nuove commedie dette di

These rhythmic repetitions extend and expand the effect of the proclamation for the intra- and extratextual audiences, insisting on the ruler's decision and tautologically instructing those in attendance (both on stage and off) about the seriousness of the situation and of the consequent decision. The problem, according to the (anonymous) ruler (or rulers) of Ovaia, is not theater *per se*, but the newfangled, character-based plays by the two 'recreant' writers. In fact, theater is necessary for the "enjoyment" of "the population" (the rhetorical function of *delectare*), and to support two professional groups: those who run theaters and those who perform there. In this, Gozzi's text is also profoundly Venetian, because (as mentioned above) the economy of performances was based on investments by noble and established merchant families, rather than on courtly or aristocratic sponsorship, as was the case in other Italian cities. Consistent with his choice to write a comedy that disparages and criticizes contemporary plays, Gozzi argues for a compromise: some playwrights are to be sacrificed for peace and harmony to prevail, and for theater to continue to take place. Central authority is needed for this, as well; for the second part of the play's conclusion (the extended last scene: III.26) is built around the actions of the Governor, an enlightened ruler, who imposes measures of reconciliation on previously split couples (both masters and servants), as well as on noblemen and women, who had quarreled, because they did not agree on whom to support. Moreover, he calls Windmill to his court; and exiles Mess, who, before exiting, utters the following line: "I'll find other companions and I'll go to Venice. Comedies, or death! I want to see if I'm capable of making the Venetians go crazy; my heart tells me I'll find my luck there" ("Gare" 238, III.26; trans. mgs).[21] Mess is

carattere [...] degl'autori Pasticcio e Girandola, [...] fatto maturo riflesso [...] deliberiamo e comandiamo come segue: [...] che tutte le commedie dei suddetti autori [Pasticcio e Girandola] [...] siano e s'intendano sospese e proibite [...] per sempre dai teatri di questa città nostra. [...] Non volendo però levare [...] un moderato innocente divertimento alle persone [...] né l'utile agl'impresari e comici [...] permettiamo che siano recitate [...] le commedie che seguono: [...] *Il gran convitato di pietra,* [...] *Arlecchino finto principe,* [...] *Il gran Bernardo dal Carpio,* [...] *Le gloriose imprese d'Ercole,* [...] *L'onorata povertà di Rinaldo,* [...] *Le bulate di Pantalone,* [...] *Pantalone mercante fallito,* [...] *Pietro Barleario,* [...] *I personaggi di Brighella*, [...] e tutte le commedie scritte [...] dall'anno 1630 [...] sino l'anno 1690, inclusive". Note the great, and seemingly random, variety among the titles of permitted comedies: several are clearly specimen of the *commedia dell'arte* tradition (those including Brighella, Arlecchino, and Pantalone); one is recognizably by Molière (*Dom Juan or le festin de Pierre*, first performed in 1655 and printed in 1682, typically translated in English as *Dom Juan or The Feast with the Statue*); others derive from Medieval epic (Bernardo dal Carpio and Roland) or legend (Pietro Barliario), and even Greco-Roman mythology is represented (Hercules).

21 Pasticcio: "Mi procurerò altri compagni e anderò a Venezia. Vo' far commedie se crepassi.

presented as interested solely in effect, rhetorical fireworks, so to speak, without any concerns for content; he is a sophist, to use historico-rhetorical terms. Gozzi's edifying message for his city (the rhetorical function of *docere*) comes to the fore without any metaphorical disguise: what happened in fictional Ovaia is precisely what is happening in his beloved Venice.

Even so, Gozzi's position is remote from those espoused in anti-theatrical writings on the part of post-Tridentine prelates, who were intent on vanquishing, or at least curbing, performances altogether, such as Cardinal Gabriele Paleotti, Cardinal Carlo Borromeo, and Bishop Carlo Bascapè.[22] In fact, his very text demonstrates the positive power of playacting, thus taking the opposite approach to stagecraft, when contrasted with other personalities and orders within the Catholic Church, ranging from the Devotions of the Forty Hours to the use of performances with pedagogical and spiritual goals by the Jesuits.[23] The intended audience for *Le gare teatrali* would be awakened to the dangers their city (Venice) was facing, due to the markedly exaggerated attention paid to theaters, playwrights, and actorial troupes. If we wanted to categorize Gozzi in rhetorical and ideological terms, he utilizes Aristotelian categories and aligns with the Platonic Socrates' stance against the sophists qua (solely) interested in effects for the sake of effects and personal gain. More specifically, his unperformed play puts at its center the community, as well as dangers to it, while referring both to its nucleus (the family), and to its political expression (the Governor). In this it falls squarely within the parameters of the epideictic, whose goal is to praise or blame a person or an action. Let us recall Aristotle's definition of noble actions, worthy of praise:

> Those things of which the reward is honour are noble; also those which are done for honour rather than money. Also, those desirable things which a man does not do for his own sake; things which are absolutely good, which a man has done for the sake of his country, while neglecting his own interests; things which are naturally good; and not such as are good for the individual, since such things are inspired by selfish motives. (*'Art' of Rhetoric* 95, I.ix.16–17, 1366b)

Vo' vedere se so far impazzire i Veneziani; il cuore mi dice che farò fortuna".

22 These texts, and more, are gathered in Ferdinando Taviani's *La commedia dell'arte e la società barocca. La fascinazione del teatro*—an indispensable source for any research concerning performances during the period from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century in Italy.

23 The best introduction to the topic is Bjurström. According to *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, such devotions started in Milan in 1537 ("Forty Hours' Devotion"), only eight years before the earliest extant document related to the *commedia dell'arte*.

Throughout the play, Mess' actions are singled out as being on the opposite end of the spectrum: all he does is for his own material advancement, in a selfish, non-communal manner. Money is a preoccupation of his from the first time he is on stage: when the character Dottore, a printer, asks him to let him publish his plays, he callously replies: "well, my companion, you won't swindle me like you swindle other learned men [...] It'll cost you zecchins!" ("Gare" 137, I.5; trans. mgs).[24] Earlier in this scene, Mess had listed the many jobs he had had before playwriting: "I don't want to tell you how many professions I tried my hand at *making a living*, and I was unhappy in all of them" ("Gare" 136, I.5; trans. mgs; emph. added).[25] Gozzi presents this character as having turned to this job for no other goal than making money.

To ensure that this element fully emerges—and even for a potentially distracted audience member—Gozzi includes a self-referential element in Act II, when Zanetto receives from Narrow Mind a mysterious script, entitled *Le gare teatrali*, which he "received yesterday from Peru":

> Zanetto: Who is its author, my dear marquis?
> Narrow Mind: I cannot tell you. I will only tell you that it was written as a pastime in fifteen evenings, at a small table in a café among laughter, chatter, and the noise of cups banging against each other. You can imagine the type of comedy that it can be! Its style is poor, its scenes disconnected, some characters superfluous, some set changes almost impossible [...] everything that the author's fancy suggested is in it [...]. I will give it to you as a gift [...]. You ought to forget the idea that Mess and Windmill, those poets, inspired in you, and believe that there are poets that write purely for their own enjoyment. ("Gare" 191–192, II.18; trans. mgs)[26]

This is a reference, indeed the only one, to the play we are reading, containing the self-deprecating assessment that it is a somewhat disjointed trifle, written solely for the pleasure and enjoyment of doing so. This, of course, radically sets

24 "Eh compar mio, non la farete mica a me come agl'altri uomini dotti; vorran esser cecchini".
25 "Non voglio dirvi poi a quante professioni m'appigliai per vivere e in tutte me la passai infelicemente".
26 "M'è capitata dal Perù una commedia ieri"; "Zanetto: Chi e l'autor, caro sior marchese? / Barbino: Non posso dirvelo. Vi dirò solo che fu composta per passatempo in quindici sere a una pezzuolo la sera in un caffé fra le risa, il ciarlare e l'urtarsi assieme de' scodellini, figuratevi la commedia ch'ella può essere. Stile cattivo, scene slegate, superfluità di personaggi, mutazioni quasi impossibili di scene e tutto ciò che suggerì il capriccio v'è dentro [...]. Io ve ne so fare un regallo [*sic*] [...]. Bisogna poi alcuna volta dimenticarsi l'idea de' poeti che v'hanno ispirato, Pasticcio e Girandola, e credere che vi sieno poeti che per divertimento puramente compongano".

apart Gozzi—the play's unmentioned author (who, until then, was not known as a playwright)—from Mess and Windmill: he does not need to make money from his work. If intratextually this play is presented as a trifle, as *delectare*-driven for its author, extratextually it embodies the *docere* that a conservative writer such as Gozzi wants to convey. The juxtaposition he sets up with his two adversaries is far more profound than simply that between 'old' and 'new' ways of writing plays; it has to do with 'noble' or 'monetarily disinterested' work, in opposition to the mercenary nature of Mess' and Windmill's; consequently, it is carried out for the betterment of his community, out of a sense of "moral and social responsibility" (to echo Vickers), rather than for pecuniary self-interest, or the desire to acquire fame (which can then be monetarized). This probably points to the ultimate reason for a lack of attribution of *Le gare teatrali* to Gozzi within the play's script: anything else might seem venal or selfish.

In the end, Gozzi's unperformed play shows that his conservatism is cultural, social, and political. Why sap the fundamental traits and organization of playacting, a successful and useful enterprise? Why allow playwrights keen on success and self-advancement to have access to this profession, which should rightly be a pastime for noblemen (and women, as Luisa Bergalli was doing at the time), disinterested in money or fame? Why rattle Venice's political structure and provoke it to strong, military responses? No improvement to theater, no element of self-interest overrides the balanced, harmonious Venetian *status quo*—Gozzi seems to argue. His *epideixis* glorifies Venice, while simultaneously denigrating those who want to revolutionize its playwriting and performance styles.

Bibliography

Primary Literature

Aristotle. *The 'Art' of Rhetoric*. Trans. J. H. Freese. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1926. Print.
Goldoni, Carlo. *Mémoires de M. Goldoni, pour servir à l'histoire de sa vie, et à celle de son théâtre*. 3 vols. Paris: Chez la veuve Duchesne, 1787. Print.
Gozzi, Carlo. "Le gare teatrali". *Commedie in commedia: Le gare teatrali. Le convulsioni. La cena mal apparecchiata*. Eds. Fabio Soldini and Piermario Vescovo. Venice: Marsilio, 2011. 121–240. Print.
—. *Opere del Co. Carlo Gozzi*. Tomo IV. Venice: Colombani, 1772. Print.

Secondary Literature

Beniscelli, Alberto. "Gozzi, Carlo". *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*. Vol. 58. Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana. 2002. 240–247. Print.
Bjurström, Per. "Baroque Theatre and the Jesuits". *Baroque Art: The Jesuit Contribution*. Eds. Rudolph Wittkower and Irma B. Jaffe. New York, NY: Fordham UP, 1972. 99–110. Print.
Corneilson, Paul et al. "Weber". *Grove Music Online*. *Oxford Music Online*. Oxford UP. Nov 2, 2016. http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/40313pg9.
Crouzet-Pavan, Elisabeth. *Venice Triumphant. The Horizons of a Myth*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins UP, 2002. Print.
Ferraro, Joanne M. *Venice. History of the Floating City*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. 2012. Print.
"Forty Hours' Devotion". *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Nov 2, 2016. http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/06151a.htm.
"Gozzi, Carlo". *Enciclopedia italiana*. Nov 2, 2016. http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/carlo-gozzi_(Enciclopedia-Italiana)/.
"Carlo, Conte Gozzi". *Britannica Academic*, *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Nov 2, 2016. http://academic.eb.com/levels/collegiate/article/37561.
Jordan, Peter. *The Venetian Origins of the Commedia dell'Arte*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2014. Print.
Katritzky, M.A. *The Art of Commedia. A Study in the Commedia dell'Arte 1560-1620 with Special Reference to the Visual Record*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2006. Print.
Kerr, Rosalind. *The Rise of the Diva on the Sixteenth-Century Commedia dell'arte Stage*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2015. Print.
Korneeva, Tatiana. "Il pubblico teatrale nel *Genio buone e il genio cattivo* di Carlo Goldoni". *Italian Studies* 70 (2015): 92–115. Print.
Rosand, David. *Myths of Venice. The Figuration of a State*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 2001. Print.
Soldini, Fabio. "Introduzione I: *Le gare teatrali*". Carlo Gozzi. *Commedie in commedia: Le gare teatrali. Le convulsioni. La cena mal apparecchiata*. Eds. Fabio Soldini and Piermario Vescovo. Venice: Marsilio, 2011. 9–51. Print.
Taviani, Ferdinando. *La commedia dell'arte e la società barocca. La fascinazione del teatro*. Rome: Bulzoni, 1969. Print.

Vickers, Brian. “Epideictic and Epic in the Renaissance”. *New Literary History* 14 (1983): 497–537. Print.

Jan Bloemendal

Rhetoric and Early Modern Latin Drama. The Two Tragedies by the 'Polish Pindar' Simon Simonides (1558–1629): *Castus Ioseph* and *Pentesilea*

Introduction

During the Early Modern Age, every piece of literature was rhetorical—as had been the literature of the Classical period. Many Classical authors were trained in rhetoric at school, when attending the lessons of the *grammaticus* and the *rhetor*. These Classical authors were familiar with the rhetorical system, and the five steps to be taken in composing and delivering an oration—or giving a paper. They knew the rules for an effective structure of a speech from *exordium* to *peroratio*.[1] They were also aware of the several stylistic levels they could use, and applied the appropriate one for the purpose at hand, for the kind of speech they were delivering—in the political, juridical, or the laudatory and castigating spheres. Moreover, they were aware of the several arguments one could use—which referred to *ethos* (the characteristics of the speaker), to *pathos* (the emotions), and to *logos* (the rational arguments); and they knew the stylistic tricks that could and should be used.

Among the common exercises was the *declamatio*, a rhetorical drill that could be useful, but perhaps not for anyone—and so made Seneca exclaim: "scholae, non vitae discimus" ("we learn for the school, not for life").[2] The exercises, distinguished as *suasoriae* and *controversiae*, trained the pupils: in the case of *suasoriae*, in giving advice, for instance, to Agamemnon, as to whether he should kill his daughter Iphigeneia or not (something they did not really need in daily life); or, in the case of *controversiae*, to speak for one side or the other in a famous legal case. In Antiquity, another exercise existed, as well: the

1 See e.g. Fuhrmann (*Die antike Rhetorik* passim); Kennedy (*The Art of Persuasion in Greece* passim); Leeman (*Orationis ratio* passim); Volkmann (*Die Rhetorik der Griechen und Römer* passim).

2 Seneca (*Epistulae* 106, 12).

Jan Bloemendal, Huygens Institute, Amsterdam

prosopopoeia ('impersonation'), in which the author imagined himself as being someone else, and spoke or wrote like him or her. Among the most famous examples are Ovid's *Heroides* (*Heroines*)—fictional letters of mythological women to their husbands. Naturally, this touches upon drama, where the author also speaks or writes with a view to 'impersonating' each of the respective characters.

Theory and practice of rhetoric and oratory were closely connected (both in Antiquity and in Early Modern times). Orators were trained in the theory of rhetoric and in the rhetorical system of *inventio*, *distributio* (*dispositio*), *elocutio*, *memoria* and *actio* (*pronuntiatio*); in the three *genera dicendi* and the appropriate styles, the *genus grande*, *medium*, and *humile*. Many Christian preachers were also trained in rhetoric, even though only part of them wrote and spoke (what was considered) 'beautiful' Latin, whereas most of them wished to be clear and, above all, convincing. During the Middle Ages, rhetoric continued to play a part in the teaching of the *artes liberales*. The amount of textbooks, however, was limited: only the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, Cicero's *De inventione*, and parts of Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria* were known.

During the Early Modern period, the attention paid to rhetoric was as important as in Antiquity. Italian Humanists built on the liberal arts tradition, as (re-)established on the basis of newly disclosed texts. Humanists rediscovered Ancient treatises on rhetoric in monasteries, such as Cicero's *Topica* and *De oratore*, and Seneca the Elder's *Controversiae et suasoriae*. In addition, rhetorical handbooks were being produced continually, systematizing rhetorical knowledge and teaching people how to compose and write orations and works of literature.[3] Rhetoric also prevailed in letter-writing manuals, and thus in the actual letters written—and many letters must have been exchanged between Humanists, who wrote and read Latin. The rhetorical means they used for writing letters 'invaded' their minds, and affected their other writings too. At the schools, rhetoric was taught, both in theory and in practice. Moreover, preachers had to learn to speak eloquently and convincingly; it was for them that Erasmus wrote a teaching manual, the *Ecclesiastes* (*The Preacher* of 1535), as well as a practical aid, the *Paraphrases on the New Testament*. So rhetoric was ubiquitous, and every piece of Early Modern literature—certainly the Latin part thereof, but also most of the works in the vernacular—was thoroughly rhetorical, both in its aiming at persuasion, and in its means. This is what made Vossius write that "literature is

3 See e.g. Fumaroli (*L'âge de l'éloquence* passim); Mack (*A History of Renaissance Rhetoric* passim; "Neo-Latin Rhetoric" passim); Monfasani ("Humanism and Rhetoric" passim); Plett (*Rhetoric and Renaissance Culture* passim); Mack ("Neo-Latin Rhetoric 1380–1620" passim).

a second sort of eloquence"; for they have the same basis in the *loci communes*, the *ornatus* and the *genera dicendi*.[4]

The common language (Latin), and the shared rhetorical techniques facilitated that texts, themes, and literary structures traveled throughout Europe, and across denominational divides. Both Protestant authors—such as Daniel Heinsius (1580–1655) and Hugo Grotius (1583–1645) in the Low Countries, and Jacob Locher (1471–1528) in Germany—and Roman Catholic writers, such as the German Jacob Balde (1604–1668) and Nicolas Caussin (1583–1651) in France, wrote tragedies with analogous elements and related themes, using the same Latin language, and similar rhetorical techniques.[5]

Early Modern Latin Tragedy

Vossius' dictum of literature being 'a second sort of eloquence' applies to Early Modern Latin tragedy, written by learned authors, to an even greater extent. Moreover, many of the plays were written in (sometimes relatively close) imitation of the ten tragedies written by (or attributed to) Seneca the Younger (ca. 4 BCE to 65 CE). A few were modeled after Greek tragedies, often by referring to their Latin versions, such as the translations of Euripides by Erasmus, Buchanan, and others.[6] Yet most of the Neo-Latin tragedies were written in the Senecan tradition. Neo-Latin drama began right with the rediscovery of these tragedies in the thirteenth century, after which Alberto Mussato wrote and staged his *Ecerinis* (1315). At the end of the sixteenth century, Latin tragedy found its place in the Jesuit *Ratio studiorum* as an exercise in rhetoric with a view to speaking in public.[7] These tragedies are considered to be highly rhetorical (in terms of *elocutio*), with

4 See Vossius: "poesis sit alterum eloquentiae genus" (*Poeticarum institutionum libri III*. Vol. 1, 96, "Benigne lector"); cf. also: "duplex sit eloquentia, oratorum una, altera poetarum [...]. Oratoria et poetice germanae sunt sorores" (*De artis poeticae natura ac constitutione*, 1, in *Poeticarum institutionum libri III*. Vol. 2, 1724, "Praefatio"). Cf. Fumaroli (*Histoire de la rhétorique* 506–507); and Plett, on the incorporation of rhetoric, especially in matters of style, but also with respect to the invention, disposition and theoretical aspects of the reception of poetry, into poetics and the construction of a 'rhetorical poetics' ("Renaissance-Poetik" 12–13).

5 Such rhetorical techniques were also used in, for instance, the fields of architecture and theatrical events, such as orations and Joyous Entries (which, however, cannot be discussed here). Regarding 'set pieces' and 'theatergrams', see below.

6 George Buchanan translated Euripides' *Medea* and *Alcestis* (*Tragedies* 165–244; 295–331); for Erasmus' translations of Euripides' *Hecuba* and *Iphigenia* (*ASD* I.1. 193–359).

7 Chevalier ("Neo-Latin Theatre in Italy" 74).

their magniloquent style (the *genus grande*) suited for princes and kings. As a result, a rhetorical analysis of Seneca's dramas is very fruitful—and one was offered by Howard Canter as early as 1925.[8] Seneca often aimed at a short, pointed phraseology. One of the dramatic conventions, the stichomythia, also aims at such a pointed style.[9] In these rapid altercations, the interlocutors often taken over one of the words of the other and react on it. On the other hand, there is amplification: an accumulation of words, phrases, and thoughts. This, however, aims at *copia verborum* (an abundance of words) and *varietas rerum* (variety in things presented). Moreover, such devices enhance *pathos*, which is one of the main characteristics of Senecan tragedy.

Another rhetorical feature is the use of *sententiae* (short aphorisms), which help to persuade, move, and delight the audience—the *télea* of effective oratory. It is a question, then, whether the *sententiae* are used to characterize a speaker, or to express ideas he could express; or whether they are uttered almost independently of the situation. Another feature of Senecan drama is the display of erudition. Astronomical, geographical, and anatomical knowledge is frequently brought up. All this will have to be seen with regard to the first-century rhetorical ideal of Asianic style—featuring *figurae mentis* (figures of thought), and *figurae verborum* (figures of speech), referring to ideas and verbal expression. The distinction is made by authors such as Quintilian, but is hard to maintain, although one can say that the figures of thought comprise the *interrogatio*, the rhetorical question, the apostrophe (a figure signifying a turning to someone else), the *exclamatio*, the *gradatio*, climax, and the like. Figures of speech comprise *anaphora*, chiasmus, and *paronomasia* (a play on words). Tropes are used, as well—such as metaphor, synecdoche, and metonymy.

Neo-Latin tragedy also features the stylistic, rhetorical characteristics of Senecan tragedy, with, of course, differences as regards the individual authors. Some of them have a very intricate style, others are more plain. Seneca's tragedies contained chorus songs, and so did many Neo-Latin tragedies, which, in some instances, were even lengthier than the other parts.[10]

Moreover, Neo-Latin poetics dealt with tragedy, which was considered to be one of the most important literary genres.[11] The question is, then, whether such

8 Canter (*Rhetorical Elements in the Tragedies of Seneca* passim). See also Seeck ("Senecas Tragödien" 393–402).

9 See also Wesche's ch. on Gryphius in this volume.

10 On the chorus, see Janning (*Der Chor im neulateinischen Drama* passim).

11 See e.g. Vossius' 1647 *Poeticarum institutionum libri tres* (passim); Heinsius' 1611/1642 *De tragoediae constitutione* (passim).

Early Modern poetical treatises can be used as hermeneutical tools, and if some specific 'rhetoric of drama' can be discerned.[12] The latter question is likely to be difficult to answer, since the orator is a 'protean' character, and rhetoric in itself is manifold and changeable. Above, some rhetorical means used in drama were listed, but these techniques are not exclusive to drama—on the contrary.

The Playwright: Simon Simonides

One of the famous authors of Latin dramas was Simon Simonides.[13] Of Armenian descent, he was born the son of the rector of the cathedral school and city council, Szymon of Brzezin, and his wife Catharina of Śmieszków Gajzlerowej, on October 24, 1558 in Lviv (Lemberg), in Poland, as Szymon Szymonowic; he died on May 5, 1629 in Czerniecin. From 1570 to 1575, he was a pupil of the Lemberg cathedral school, and then studied the *artes* at the university of Kraków, where he received his Bachelor's degree in 1577, at 19 years of age. He continued his studies abroad (probably in France and the Low Countries), and returned to Kraków before 1584. Together with Jan Zamoyski, he founded and arranged the Akademia Zamojska in Zamość (1593–1605); it opened in 1595. 1590 was an important year: he was appointed *poeta Sacrae Maiestatis regiae* (that is, royal poet), was knighted and awarded with a poets' laurel by Pope Clement VIII. He received the laurel for his Latin works, and particularly for his drama, *Castus Ioseph* (*Chaste Joseph* of 1587), later followed by *Pentesilea* (1618).[14] In return, Simonides dedicated his 1593 poem *Ioel propheta* to the Pope. Szymonowic earned great fame as a poet in the vernacular with his poem *Sielanki* (*Pastorals*, published in Zamość by M. Łęski in 1614), which was composed in the tradition of Greek poetry. Partly because of this poem, he was called the Polish Pindar, although it mainly contains reminiscences to the idyllic poetry of Theocritus and Virgil.

Among his learned relations were Isaacus Casaubonus (1559–1614), Janus Dousa (1545–1604), and Justus Lipsius (1547–1606).[15] This brief sketch already

12 See Bloemendal ("The Epigram in Early Modern Literary History" passim).

13 In this respect, see Głębicka (*Szymon Zymonowic: Poeta Latinus* passim) and Winniczuk ("Die lateinische Dichtung des S. Simonides" passim).

14 Simon Simonides, *Castus Joseph* (Kraków: Łazarzowa, 1587); trans. into Polish by Stanisław Gosławski (Kraków, 1597) as *Castus Jozeph*; trans. by R. Zawiliński (Kraków, 1889), *BPP* nr 5; *Pentesilea* (Zamość: K. Wolbramczyk, 1618); Polish trans. by Ksawier Żubkowski (Warsaw, 1778). A modern ed. of the plays with an English trans. is being prepared by the present author.

15 See also IJsewijn (*Companion* I: 234) and Bloemendal ("Central and Eastern European

demonstrates the 'international'—or rather 'supranational'—character of Humanism and the 'supranational' character of the Republic of Letters, within which Neo-Latin drama functioned and moved by processes of transfer and integration.[16]

A Martyr Play: *Castus Ioseph*

Simonides' first drama, *Castus Ioseph* (1587)—concerning the attempted seduction of the Hebrew patriarch Joseph by Potiphar's wife—is an extraordinary play. Until then, the plays on the theme taken from *Genesis* 38 and 39 were *fabulae*—meaning, comedies—both in the sense of having a happy ending, and of being written in the style of Terence's comedies.[17] Even though the choice of the theme may have been inspired by such a *fabula* written and performed in Amsterdam and printed in Antwerp—Cornelius Crocus' *Ioseph* (1535), or by its Polish paraphrase, entitled *Żywot Józefa*, by the important Polish poet and prose author Mikołaj Rej (1505–1569)—Simonides actually wrote a Senecan tragedy with a length of 1757 lines, and a lofty style. It is rather Senecan—except for its Greek (Pindaric) chorus structure of strophe, antistrophe, and epode, instead of a Senecan stichic chorus structure. It may have been written for the Akademia Zamojska.

Castus Ioseph is exceptional for other reasons, as well. One is that the woman is given the name of Iempsar. For this name, there is a precedent in Girolamo Fracastoro's poem *Ioseph* (published posthumously in 1555), but the name is rather rare in Early Modern drama. A second reason is that the play focuses heavily on Iempsar's emotions. In spite of its Senecan tone, the story of *Castus Ioseph* has the same style and structure as Euripides' *Hippolytos*, except for the last 300 lines. For instance, the prolog by the *Malus Demon* (the Evil Demon,

Countries" spec. 645–649).

16 See Bloemendal ("Transfer and Integration" 274–288). The term 'supranational' is used, while being aware that European nation states proper had not yet been established.

17 The story itself was also known from Flavius Josephus' *Antiquitates Iudaicae* II, 4, the *Testamentum duodecim patriarcharum*, and *Ioseph et Asenath*. See Lebeau (*Salvator mundi* 26–28). One of the possible sources of inspiration for Simonides may have been the '*fabula*' *Ioseph* (1535) by the Amsterdam headmaster Cornelius Crocus (ca. 1500–1550), which was paraphrased by the Polish author Mikołaj Rej (1505–1596), and was well-known in Poland; see Borowski (*Iter Polono-Belgo-Ollandicum* 158–159); a modern edition of Crocus' *Ioseph* was prepared by the present author.

meaning, the Devil) closely resembles Aphrodite's opening monolog in *Hippolytos*; the scene of Joseph and his *famuli* (*Castus Ioseph* v.94–236) matches that of Hippolytos and his *therapeuontes* (Euripides *Hippolytos* v.88–120); and the first choral ode (*Castus Ioseph* v.237–92) bears close resemblance to Euripides' first choral ode (*Hippolytos* v.121–75). The intermediary text was the translation by Gasparus Stiblinus (1526–1562?), published by the Basel printer Joannes Oporinus in 1559. The first lines of the first chorus may serve as an example:

Simonides (*Castus Ioseph* B2^{vo}–B3^{ro})	Euripides (Stiblinus *Hippolytus* 177)
Strophe I	
Petra celebris est hic	Petra quaedam dicitur esse,
quaedam, vitrea dis aqua	quae marinas extillet aquas,
fontemque expositum urnis saxo	effundens ex abrupto vertice
iaculans supremo.	fontem replendis urnis uberem.
Apud hanc amica quae-	Ubi quaedam mea amica
dam est mea, flumineis	purpureas vestes
pepla liquoribus	fluvialibus undis
tinguens superque ardua dorsa rupis	lavit et super apricae
in sole aprico expoliens; ea atrum	terga rupis deposuit: a qua
nuntium mihi insusurravit.	ad me fama pervenit
Antistrophe	
	tabido
	reginam decumbere morbo.[18]

For referring to Hippolytus and Joseph as chaste boys seduced by wicked women, one might already compare the preface to Stiblinus' translation of *Hippolytus*:

> Hippolytus innocentiae et castitatis praebet exemplum, quae aliquoties malorum hominum libidine in discrimen vocantur, ita tamen, ut fatigentur, non exstinguantur. Sic Josephus castus in Aegypto impudicae mulieris calumnia valde quidem periclitatus est, sed tandem post afflictiones et carceres eo clarior emicuit. (Stiblinus *Hippolytus* 203)

> Hippolytus gives an example of innocence and chastity, which are regularly brought into danger by the lust of wicked people, but to such an extent that they are fatigued, while never fully destroyed. In the same way, chaste Joseph is endangered by the calumny of an unchaste woman in Egypt, but finally, after afflictions and imprisonment, he shone the more brightly. (trans. jb)[19]

18 As qtd. in Bloemendal ("Central and Eastern European Countries" 647).

19 As qtd. in Bloemendal ("Central and Eastern European Countries" 647). In this, as well as the following trans., I have aimed for (idiomatic) readability, rather than a word-for-word version.

This equation is in line with the exegetical tradition. For instance, St. Ambrose wrote: "Sit igitur nobis propositus sanctus Ioseph tamquam speculum castitatis" ("Thus, saint Joseph should be proposed to us as a mirror of chastity").[20] A typological explanation was given by, among others, St. Isidore in his *Allegoriae*: "Ioseph [...], qui venditus est a fratribus et in Aegypto sublimatus, Redemptorem nostrum significat a populo Iudaeorum in manus persequentium traditum et nunc in gentibus exaltatum" ("Joseph, who was sold by his brothers and exalted in Egypt, signifies our Saviour, delivered into the hands of the prosecutors by the Jewish people, and now exalted among the gentiles").[21]

Głębicka points to another possible interpretation of the play. Simonides had dedicated the play to his teacher Stanisław Sokołowski, Canon of Kraków. The latter was a representative of the Polish Counter-Reformation. This information—combined with the representation of Iempsar as a woman who looks upon Joseph (a prefiguration of Christ) as a beautiful man, and denying his divine nature—may lead to the interpretation of the play as a critique on Arian heretics and other anti-Trinitarians, who denied Christ's divinity and considered him to be merely a human being.

The play is also a plethora of rhetorical devices and techniques. There are all kinds of 'standard elements', such as those which Griffiths called 'set pieces'—meaning: monologs, tirades, stichomythia, messenger speeches (*récit*), and chorus songs, as well as other ones which Louise Clubb labeled 'theatergrams', structural units comparable to set pieces, but also generic elements, sources, plots, and characters like the pastor—features we would call 'dramatic conventions'.[22] In any case these 'set pieces' or 'theatergrams' moved from one cultural and literary field or literary system to another.[23] It might be stated that the omnipresence of rhetoric decidedly advanced the mobility of literature, and also of drama. The choice of the Latin language also contributed to it, since Latin was written and read all over Europe, as well as in the colonies, although differences in pronunciation may have sometimes hindered the communication

20 Ambrose of Milan (*De Ioseph Patriarcha liber unus* 1.2. 642 A), as qtd. in Bloemendal ("Central and Eastern European Countries" 648).

21 Isidorus (*Allegoriae* 107 A), as qtd. in Bloemendal ("Central and Eastern European Countries" 648).

22 See Griffiths (*The Dramatic Technique of Antoine de Montchrestien* passim). See Clubb (*Italian Drama in Shakespeare's Time* passim); also Henke/Nicholson (*Transnational Mobilities in Early Modern Theater* passim).

23 On cultural fields or literary fields, see Bourdieu (*The Field of Cultural Production*, passim; *Les Règles de l'art* passim); Even Zohar ("Polysystem Theory" 287–310; "Factors and Dependencies in Culture" 15–34).

somewhat. Even so, the common language, the rhetorical character, and the dramatic conventions contributed to the spreading of Latin tragedy.

Within the parts of the tragedy, rhetoric plays an important role. A short rhetorical analysis of the first lines of the opening monolog by the *Malus Demon* (the Devil) will illustrate the function of rhetorical techniques as enabling formal and linguistic mobility and flexibility. The *Malus Demon* emerges from hell—just like the Ghost of Tantalus in Seneca's *Thyestes*, and the Ghost of Thyestis in his *Agamemnon*, and many spirits in Neo-Latin tragedies. This dramatic convention of opening a play with the appearance of a ghost, an evil spirit, or a devil 'frames' the play as a tragedy, and so steers the audience's expectations, seeing that they were used to *fabulae* on this particular theme.

Venio, inferûm domos et umbrarum specum
Linquens, ubi telluris in penetralibus,
Superis seôrsum, habemus infimi dii;
Vocare si par infimos, qui maximam
Rerumque honorúmque occupamus gloriam; (5)
Saeclaque hominum universa et hîc viventia
Nostro usu et olim functa capimus mancupi.
Esto creatos esse nos ab altero;
Esto illo ab ipso conditam orbis fabricam,
Caeloque nos pulsos ab ipso eodem et his (10)
Datos locis, ubi horror et squalor vigent;
Esto omnia haec creator et rerum parens
Superbiat scilicet alatque nominis
Vmbram; penes nos interim, solida Imperi
Maneat potestas: templa nobis, victimae (15)
Nobis, sacri nobis dies trophaeaque
Donariaque struantur; ad pericula
Nos invocemur; nos bonarum praesides
Rerum feramur; denique ipsi numina
Celebremur et noscamur; ille incognitus (20)
Caelo exigat saeclum. Parum interest, ubi
Agas loci, at agas qualis, id verò interest. (Simonides *Castus Ioseph* A2^{ro})

Here I come, leaving the dwellings of the nether world and the caves of the shades, where we live deep in the earth, away from the gods above [or: the upper world], we, infernal gods, if it is right to call us infernal, since we claim the highest glory of power and honour; here we capture as slaves for our own use all generations of men, both those who live, and those who have died earlier.
Be it that we are created by someone else; be it that the structure of the world is made by the same [God] and that we were expelled by him too (10), and sent to this region where horror and squalor reign; be it, that the Creator, and Father of all, boasts of all these things, and feeds the pretention of his name; yet, in the meantime, we must keep our ruling power fixed: for us there must be temples, for us there must be victims, sacred days, and for us

> monuments and altars must be built; we must be invoked in perils; we must be called protectors of prosperity; and finally, (20) we ourselves must be glorified and known as deities; and He must live an obscure life in heaven.
> It does not matter where you live, but how you live, that is what matters. (trans. jb)

The entire passage of 22 lines expresses that the Evil Spirit comes from hell, an infernal god who nevertheless has power. While it might be that God created him, he too wants to be worshipped as a deity. The passage consists of three sentences: the initial, longer one (covering v.1–7); the second, even lengthier one (v.8–21a); and the third, short one (v.21b–22). In the first sentence, synonymic rhetorical expressions stress the Demon's awful place of departure. The Devil reckons himself among the "infernal gods", but corrects himself rhetorically (*correctio*): '*if* we can be called infernal gods, since we have so much power on earth'.

The second sentence receives part of its persuasive power from the *anaphora* of "esto" and the repetition of "nos" and "nobis", with *variatio* in "ipsi" (v.19)—and all that in opposition to "ille", God. Here, variation and accumulation is used, as well—such as "creator et rerum pater" ("the Creator and Father of the world"), and "tropaea" and "donaria".[24] Furthermore, the Evil Spirit uses an antithesis to emphasize his wish to be omnipresent (and omnipotent) like God: in peril, we—*pluralis maiestatis*—should be "invoked" and "called protectors of prosperity".

The third sentence—which is very short, most probably for reasons of variation—is a *sententia*, which serves as a kind of conclusion: it does not matter where someone lives, whether in heaven or (as the devil) in hell, but how one lives. Simonides formulates this thought by recourse to an intricate *chiasmus*:

> Parum interest, ubi | agas loci,
> at agas qualis, id verò interest. (*Castus Ioseph* A2ro)

This opening monolog is highly rhetorical (in terms of *elocutio*), persuasive by its emotionality. It foreshadows imminent evil: the Devil is leaving his territory, and is aiming at God's position. Immediately after having spoken these words, the Devil asserts that he will show his power by bringing a Jewish boy—Joseph, of course—to ruins.[25]

---

24 A '*trópaion*' (Greek: τρόπαιον, Latin: *tropaeum*), from which the English 'trophy' is derived, is an Ancient monument set up to commemorate a victory over one's foes. A *donarium* is the part of a temple where votive offerings were made.

25 This resembles the *Scriptural* story of Job, in which there is a temptation on earth, while the actual '*agón*' (see spec. *Job* 1:6–12) is taking place in heaven (thanks to DS Mayfield, who suggested this to me).

The other main character, Potiphar's wife Iempsar, is passionately in love with Joseph. She introduces her state of mind in the following manner:

Suscipite humeris, suscipite aegram,
Tollite fessam, solvor nervis
Omnibus; omnia lapsant membra;
Fulcite caput, fulcite aegra
Colla, rotatur mundus, currit (325)
Terra; cado, cado, pereo, date mî
Date vestram manum;
Suscipite meam, suscipite manum;
Ventum facite, demite taeniam
Capiti; gravis est, gravis est, solvite (330)
Crinem; ach me, ach me. (Simonides *Castus Ioseph* C^{ro})[26]

Take me on your shoulders, [girls] take me, an ill woman, lift me, a tired woman; I am dissolved in all my nerves; all my limbs are collapsing; support my head, support my ill neck, the world is rotating, the earth moving; I fall, I fall, I perish, give me, please give me your hand; and hold mine, please hold my hand; fan me [literally: 'make wind'], take the bandeau (330) from my head; it is heavy, it is heavy, loosen my hair; woe, woe is me. (trans. jb)

Here we hear the emotionality of Iempsar's simple message that she is ill. Although the audience does not know the cause yet, this emotionality is stirred up and increased by repetition and variation: "suscipite", "suscipite", "tollite"; "fulcite", "fulcite", "gravis est, gravis est"; "aegra", "aegram"; as well as the exclamations "cado, cado", "pereo", and "ach me, ach me". All this is rather usual in Neo-Latin tragedy—meaning, as works in which the reception of Seneca is typically visible, and to a far lesser degree the reception of Plautus and Terence. Still, we can speak of intertextuality in these matters, in the sense that a stock of phrases and ways of dealing with things was extant; from these, an author could choose expressions, common situations, and stock characters—such as the *nutrix*, the old woman, who had nursed one of the main characters; the soldier, who is reporting from the battlefield; or other messengers. Rhetorical means also belonged to that general stock, that common intertext.

These passages reveal the tragic concept of this play, which is more concerned with emotions and passions than drama in the sense of doing and action. In addition, it is more of a martyr drama, since Joseph does not make a mistake, nor does he have a *hamartía*, a wrong conception of the situation. If one of the main characters has such a *hamartía*, it is Iempsar. Still, the opening lines

26 Plautus ("Curculio" 314).

evince that the characters are like puppets with whom the Devil is playing his tricks—also merely for showing off his power. That may be part of the didactic aim of the tragedy: to warn the students to beware of the devil's wiles. However, it also poses a question about the relation between the Devil's power and God's rule; and, even more so, about the influence of supernatural powers and a human being's accountability with regard to his or her own deeds.

The play ends with a messenger's speech, relating how well Joseph behaved when taken to prison, and that he even preferred to die innocently for someone else's guilt, rather than commit any wrong—here, a prefiguration of Christ may be seen to shine through. Then, the chorus grieves over Joseph's fate, but is determined to go to the master and declare his innocence. Here the tragedy ends.[27]

Rhetorical devices and techniques play an important part, by raising the pathos of the tragedy in order to stress Joseph's innocence and undeserved fate, and underlining the evil powers that oppose him. By highlighting this very contrast with the respective rhetorical means, Simonides makes readers and spectators receptive to horror and awe, and to the interpretation of Joseph as a prefiguration of Christ.

A Classical Tragedy: *Pentesilea*

Simonides' second tragedy, named after its protagonist *Pentesilea* (1618), deals with the story of the Amazon queen Pentesilea (usually spelled Penthesilea). To some extent, it is inspired by Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica*, Servius' commentary on Virgil's *Aeneid* I, and Dictys Cretensis' *Ephemeris Belli Troiani* (all of which from the fourth century CE).[28] After Penthesilea has killed an allied Amazon queen, she goes to king Priam of Troy with the purpose of being purified

27 Everyone in the audience and every reader knows, or is expected to know, that this 'Joseph' will not suffer Christ's fate to the end; to that extent, Christ is still the 'fulfillment', also of the agony. *Castus Ioseph* is thus a tragedy, which the audience knows will not remain a tragedy. The reason it can be staged as a tragedy is precisely this 'cutting off' at the dramatic climax; the 'being thrown into prison', with the dire consequences only being potential, is the tragic action and climax. It is precisely because of this that the play can and must focus on the language to such an extent, and on the passions of the female protagonist (like in many Senecan dramas), because, without this 'clipping' of the *Scriptural* 'happy ending', there would (arguably) be no tragic tendency (with thanks to DS Mayfield).

28 See Gärtner ("Die Tragödie *Pentesilea*" passim).

from her crime. In return for Priam's help, Penthesilea—during the final year, and after the death of Hector—enters the Trojan War on the side of the Trojans, together with her Amazons. She is ultimately slain by Achilles.[29] In Virgil's *Aeneid*, Aeneas sees this episode depicted on the wall of a temple:

> Ducit Amazonidum lunatis agmina peltis
> Penthesilea furens, mediisque in milibus ardet,
> aurea subnectens exsertae cingula mammae
> bellatrix, audetque viris concurrere virgo. (*Aeneid* I, v.490–494)
>
> Raging Penthesilea leads her band of Amazons with moon-shaped shields, and she radiates in the middle of thousands, while she, a warrior-virgin, fastens a belt of gold around her bare breasts, and it is she, who dares to fight with men. (trans. jb)

The highly rhetorical opening lines of Simonides' second play also 'frame' it as a Senecan tragedy of pathos:

> Te, magne Mavors, sanguinis Sator mei,
> Primum invoco, ut me robore invicto iuves
> Dignamque te parente natam comprobes.
> Fallorne? Num pavoris haec vestigia
> In me emicant signumque dant diri ominis? (5)
> Virtutis an sunt talia haec praeludia,
> Vt vim suam ordiatur a metu ancipe?
> Ne defetisce, anime, nec augurio malo
> Te frange. Non est in manu tua situm,
> Quid fata poscant. Hoc situm est, ut strenuum (10)
> Te praebeas, vel numinum usque ingratiis.
> Caedemne vitas? Quam per arma quaeritas?
> Colo accubandum cum hac fuit sententia.
> Belli aleam belli frequenta moribus.
> Aut perdere aut perdi duelli lex iubet. (15)
> Sed vos sodalitii mei pars unica,
> Adeste, amicae, et consulite quid facto opus.
> Magno in periclo particeps periculi
> Solus sapit. Nil caeterorum desides
> Solertias moror, quibus facti carens (20)
> Diserta lingua futiles volvit sonos. (Simonides "Pentesilea" 178)
>
> You, great Mars, father of my blood, first I invoke you, to help me with your invincible strength and prove me a daughter worthy of you, my father. Am I deceived? Hopefully there are no traces of fear to be seen in me that give a sign of a dire omen? Or are these signs

29 See also Bloemendal ("Latin Drama in Central and East-European Countries" 645–649).

> preludes of virtue that it takes its strength from dangerous fright? Do not become weak, my mind, and do not be broken by a bad omen. It is not in your hands (10) what fate demands. This is in your hands, to strain yourself, even to the point that you are ungrateful to the deities. Do you shun death? [The very death] which you are looking for with your weapons? It is my opinion that you have to face your destiny together with death. You should meet [more literally: frequent] the hazards of war with the customs of war. The law of war commands either to kill or to be killed. Yet you, the only part of my company, come here, my [female] friends, and advise me what to do. In great peril, only he who shares the peril is wise. I am not longing (20) for the lazy shrewdness of others, whose loquacious tongue speaks useless sounds without deeds. (trans. jb)

As a warrior and a daughter of Mars, she invokes this particular god. Such an invocation—often to Jove or God—was also not unusual in Early Modern Latin tragedy. Pentesilea continues her speech with some rhetorical questions: are there no traces of fear to be seen? She addresses her mind ("anime") not to become despondent due to a bad omen. The audience now has an indication that the amazon has experienced precisely such a sign. Even these lines already foreshadow the sad ending. Here, *sententiae* are employed as well: "The law of war commands either to kill or to be killed"; "In great peril, only he who shares the peril is wise". This is not the emotionality of someone who is sick on account of love, or who is in great distress; rather, it is the *pathos* of someone, who wishes to enter the war, and who is used to acting as a leader. When compared to the above passage from the *Castus Ioseph* play, there are far less rhetorical elements (such as repetition, exclamation, *anaphora*, and the like). As the contrast demonstrates, rhetorical devices are being used to characterize a character.

Another character accustomed to acting as a leader is Aeneas. A messenger is looking for the Trojan prince, so that he may turn the tide; a stichomythia between Aeneas and the messenger occurs:

> AEN. Quis est requirens hîc meam praesentiam?
> Num in acie aliquid anceps repentinum accidit, (760)
> Multa evenire qualia hoc ludo assolent?
> Is tu es? Loquere; venisne pugnae ex turbine?
> NVN. Ipsissimis densissimisque ex caedibus.
> AEN. Fugae potitus et neci te subtrahens?
> NVN. Haec probra desertoribus sint congrua. (765)
> AEN. Quae causa te ergo, huc ut venires, perpulit?
> NVN. Feliciter gestae rei essem ut nuntius.
> AEN. Vt tempus est, vix praelium occeptum autumo.
> NVN. Quin tota profligata iam res est prope.
> AEN. Multa inchoantur faustiter, fini occidunt. (770)
> (Simonides "Pentesilea" 204)

AENEAS: Who is requiring my presence here? (760) Has something dangerous unexpectedly happened in the battle line, like many things usually happen in this game? Is that you? Speak, do you come from the turmoil of the fight?
MESSENGER: From the midst of the most intense slaughter.
AEN: Did you flee and evade death?
MESS: (765) Let such reproaches be more fitting for deserters.
AEN: What reason, then, impelled you to come here?
MESS: To be the messenger of a successful war.
AEN: At this hour, I assert that the fight has [just] begun.
MESS: Even the whole business is almost decided.
AEN: (770) Many things start well, but are ruined in the end. (trans. jb)

This passage demonstrates the keyword technique of stichomythia. One of the interlocutors uses a word, and the other resumes it in his or her reaction. This is a very usual dramatic convention. In this stichomythia, the rhetorical style is used to characterize a person—here, Aeneas—or rather, to define his *ethos*. He opens up this dialog in a lofty way: "Quis est requirens?" People have been slaughtered, and Aeneas shows dignity—even in a last *sententia*, which is a kind of pragmatic variation on the sentence 'All's well, that ends well'. The story has a sad ending, since Pentesilea is killed, and Troy is taken. The last lines of utter grief and distress are assigned to the chorus.

European Drama

These rhetorical techniques are featured in many Latin dramas in Early Modern Europe, and also in the New World. Protestant playwrights such as Daniel Heinsius and Hugo Grotius, the Jesuit authors Nicolas Caussin and Jacob Balde, the Benedictine monk Jacobus Cornelius Lummenaeus à Marca, the Scottish playwright in France, George Buchanan—they all wrote highly rhetorical (in terms of *elocutio*), almost always Senecan tragedies in the common language Latin, and used the same storehouse (*copia*) for rhetorical heuristics (*inventio*). Protestant authors also used the pointed style, even though the respective movements often wished to return to the *genus humile* of *Biblical* language. They used that 'humble style' on the pulpit; but their dramatic works were meant for students, who had to learn all styles of Latin; moreover, they may have wished to show off their skills in writing Latin in the *genus grande*. Often the dramas of both Roman Catholic and Protestant playwrights had the same formal, Senecan, five act structure—with stichic chorus songs between the acts, and not ending with an exodus of the chorus, as in Greek drama. They also used the 'set pieces' of monolog, *récit* or messenger speech, chorus, stichomythia, and the like in terms

of rhetorical *dispositio*. This formal standardization, the *lingua franca*, and the shared rhetorical techniques facilitated the 'traveling' of various materials. Books and other artifacts moved throughout Europe, were present on a shared European market; they moved with churchmen, traders, and diplomats, who traveled from one country to another; with companies such as those performing the Italian *commedia dell'arte*, itinerant actors from England and other countries traveled throughout the European continent and staged all kinds of plays; *rectores gymnasii* and *professores* at the universities exchanged materials for the performances they produced with, and for, their students.[30] All these kinds of movements were enabled and furthered by the aforesaid common ground (comprising the Latin language, the system of rhetoric, etc.). They even facilitated an (if temporary) bridging of the denominational divide: Protestant *gymnasia* could perform Roman Catholic tragedies—with the obvious exception of Saint plays—and vice versa.

Concluding Remarks

In this chapter, a rhetorical analysis of selected passages from a Polish playwright were offered. Such an analysis could be given of thousands of Neo-Latin tragedies, composed by Humanists, who stressed the values of Classical Antiquity, and written by both Protestant and Roman Catholic authors—the Jesuits were of particular import in the production of Latin tragedies. Of course, there are many different approaches to the concept of tragedy, also in Latin drama, and the differences might appear so great, that the playwrights could be seen to have been divided even by a common language; but they had that common language indeed, as well as a universal rhetorical 'toolkit'—serving as a huge literary, virtual network, a shared intertext. Research into the cultural web of Latin drama is well underway. One of the *pia vota* is to have an electronic database of as many Latin dramas as possible, including vernacular dramas, so as to investigate, for instance, the mobility of certain phrases, ideas, themes, and to trace them as closely as possible. One might wonder what the exact place of rhetoric is. Two metaphors could be used to characterize its function. The first is that of Neo-Latin drama as a kind of 'salad bar', from which each playwright may choose (*inventio*) his ingredients—some lettuce, nuts, meat or fish, and dressing (that is, rhetorical devices)—in order to craft and to arrange (*dispositio*) his or her

30 Cf. IJsewijn ("The Coming of Humanism" passim). See also Küpper's ch. in this volume.

own salad (for instance, the respective play). In this image, rhetoric qua *elocutio* would be the dressing that pervades and seasons everything; accordingly, the function of rhetoric as embellishing every piece of literature—including drama—would be highlighted. This embellishment could well be a collective knowledge allying the literatures of several (European) countries—including the respective dramatic works, both in Latin and in the vernacular languages. A second metaphor could be Neo-Latin drama as a 'universal web', with rhetoric being the 'glue' keeping all of the threads together. This image would stress the social and literary function of rhetoric qua making and maintaining relationships between authors, countries, and (various vernacular) languages. Thus, Simonides may well have been inspired by a Latin play by a Dutch author, Crocus' *Ioseph*, through the familiar language and the stimulating theme, and by other Neo-Latin Senecan tragedies, through that same language, and the similar rhetorical techniques being employed.

Bibliography

Primary Literature

Ambrosius (Ambrose of Milan). *De Ioseph Patriarcha liber unus*. Vol. 1.2. *Patrologia Latina*. 14. Ed. Jacques Paul Migne. Paris: Migne, 1845. Print.

Isidorus (Isidore of Seville). *Allegoriae*. *Patrologia Latina*. 83. Ed. Jacques Paul Migne. Paris: Migne, 1862. Print.

Buchanan, George. *Tragedies*. Ed. Peter Sharratt and Patrick G. Walsh. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1983. Print.

Crocus, Cornelius. *Ioseph (1535)*. Ed. Jan Bloemendal. Amersfoort: Florivallis, 2010. Print.

Erasmus, Desiderius. *Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami* (ASD). Vol. I.1. Eds. Jean-Claude Margolin and Pierre Mesnard. Amsterdam: North Holland Publishing Company, 1969. Print.

Euripides. Hippolytus. *Euripides poeta tragicorum princeps, in Latinum sermonem conversus […] cum annotationbius et praefationibus*. Ed. Gasparus Stiblinus. Basel: Ioannes Oporinus, 1559 174–203. Print.

Heinsius, Daniel. *De tragica constitutione* / *De constitutione tragoediae*. 1611. Leiden: Elzevier, 1642. Print.

—. *De constitutione tragoediae / La constitution de la tragédie, dite La poétique d'Heinsius*. Ed. Anne Duprat. Geneva: Droz, 2001. Print.

Plautus. "Curculio". *Casina. The Casket Comedy. Curculio. Epidicus. The Two Menaechmuses*. Ed. and trans. Wolfgang de Melo. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2011. 219–313. Print.

Seneca. *Epistulae morales ad Lucilium*. Ed. and trans. Richard M. Gummere. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1920. Print.

Simonides, Simon, *Castus Joseph*. Kraków: Łazarzowa, 1587. Print.

—. *Castus Jozeph*. Trans. into Polish by Stanisław Gosławski. Kraków: w drukarni Łazarzowej, 1597. Print.

—. *Castus Jozeph*. Trans. Gosławski. Ed. Roman Zawiliński. *BPP* nr 5. Kraków: Czasu, 1889. Print.

—. *Pentesilea*. Zamość: K. Wolbramczyk, 1618. Print.

—. *Pentesilea*. Trans. into Polish by Ksawier Żubkowski. Warsaw, 1778. Print.

—. "Pentesilea". *Simonis Simonidae* […] *Opera omnia*. Ed. Angelo Maria Durini. Warshaw: Mitzler, 1772. 177–231. Print.

—. *Pentesilea*. Transcription by Jan Wilhelm Beck. Regensburg, 2006. Oct 16, 2016. http://www.uni-regensburg.de/Fakultaeten/phil_Fak_IV/Klass_Phil/Latein/Beck/Fabulae/Simonides,%20Pentesilea.pdf .

Vossius, Gerardus Johannes. *Poeticarum institutionum libri III / Poetical Institutions in Three Books*. Ed. Jan Bloemendal and Edwin Rabbie. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2010. Print.

—. "De artis poeticae natura ac constitutione". *Vossius Poeticarum institutionum libri III*. Vol. 2. Ed. Jan Bloemendal and Edwin Rabbie. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2010. 1715–1945. Print.

Secondary Literature

Bloemendal, Jan. "Central and Eastern European Countries". *Neo-Latin Drama and Theatre*. Eds. Jan Bloemendal and Howard B. Norland. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2013. 633–656. Print.

—. "The Epigram in Early Modern Literary History: Vossius's Poeticae Institutiones". *The Neo-Latin Epigram. A Learned and Witty Genre*. Eds. Suzanna de Beer, Karl Enenkel, David Rijser. *Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia*. 25. Leuven: Leuven UP, 2009. 65–79. Print.

—. "Transfer and Integration of Latin and Vernacular Drama in the Early Modern Period. The case of *Everyman*, *Elckerlijc*, *Homulus* and *Hecastus*". *Arcadia* 44.2 (2009): 274–288. Print.

Bloemendal, Jan and Howard B. Norland, eds. *Neo-Latin Drama and Theatre in Early Modern Europe. Drama and Theatre in Early Modern Europe*. 3. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2013. Print.

Borowski, Andrzej. *Iter Polono-Belgo-Ollandicum. Cultural and Literary Relationships Between the Commonwealth of Poland and the Netherlands in the 16th and 17th Centuries*. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka, 2007. Print.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*. Ed. Randall Johnson. Cambridge, UK: Polity P, 1993. Print.

—. *Les Règles de l'art: Genèse et structure du champ littéraire*. Paris: Seuil, 1992. Print.

Canter, Howard Vernon. *Rhetorical Elements in the Tragedies of Seneca*. *University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature*. 10.1. Urbana, IL: U of Illinois P, 1925. Print.

Chevalier, Jean-Frédéric. "Neo-Latin Theatre in Italy". *Neo-Latin Drama and Theatre in Early Modern Europe. Drama and Theatre in Early Modern Europe*. 3. Eds. Jan Bloemendal and Howard B. Norland. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2013. 25–101. Print.

Clubb, Louise George. *Italian Drama in Shakespeare's Time*. New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 1989. Print.

Even Zohar, Itamar. "Factors and Dependencies in Culture: A Revised Draft for Polysystem Culture Research". *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature / Revue Canadienne de Littérature Comparée* 24 (1997): 15–34. Print.

—. "Polysystem Theory". *Poetics Today* 1 (1979): 287–310. Print.

Fuhrmann, Manfred. *Die antike Rhetorik: Eine Einführung*. Düsseldorf: Artemis & Winkler, 2011. Print.

Fumaroli, Marc. *L'âge de l'éloquence*. Paris: Albin Michel, 1994. Print.

—. *Histoire de la rhétorique dans l'Europe moderne: 1450–1950*. Paris : Presses universitaires de France, 1999. Print.

Gärtner, Thomas. "Die Tragödie *Pentesilea* des polnischen Humanisten Szymon Szymonowic im Vergleich zu den *Posthomerica* des Quintus von Smyrna". *Eos* 97 (2010): 277–287. Print.

Głębicka, Ewa Jolanta. *Szymon Zymonowic: Poeta Latinus*. *Studia Staropolskie Series Nova*. 2.58. Warsaw: Instytut Bad literckick Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 2001. Print.

Griffiths, Richard. *The Dramatic Technique of Antoine de Montchrestien: Rhetoric and Style in French Renaissance Tragedy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970. Print.

Henke, Robert and Eric Nicholson, eds. *Transnational Mobilities in Early Modern Theater*. Farnham and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2014. Print.

IJsewijn, Jozef. "The Coming of Humanism to the Low Countries". *Itinerarium Italicum: The Profile of the Italian Renaissance in the Mirror of its European Transformation: Dedicated to Paul Oskar Kristeller on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday*. Eds. Heiko A. Oberman and

Thomas A. Brady, Jr. Leiden: Brill, 1975. 193–301. Print. Also in: *Humanism in the Low Countries: A Collection of Studies*. Ed. Gilbert Tournoy. Leuven: Leuven UP, 2015. 77–188. Print.

—. *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies: Part 1: History and Diffusion of Neo-Latin Literature*. Leuven: Leuven UP, 1990. Print.

Janning, Volker. *Der Chor im neulateinischen Drama: Formen und Funktionen*. Münster: Rhema, 2005. Print.

Kennedy, George A. *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*. London: Routledge, 1963. Print.

Lebeau, Jean. *Salvator mundi: L'Exemple de Joseph dans le Théâtre Allemand au XVIe siècle*. 2 vols. Utrecht: HES & De Graaf, 1977. Print.

Leeman, Anton D. *Orationis ratio: The Stylistic Theories and Practice of the Roman Orators, Historians and Philosophers*. 2 vols. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1963. Print.

Mack, Peter. *A History of Renaissance Rhetoric 1380–1620*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011. Print.

—. "Neo-Latin Rhetoric 1380–1620". *Brill's Encyclopaedia of the Neo-Latin World Online*. Eds. Philip Ford, Jan Bloemendal and Charles Fantazzi. Leiden: Brill, forthcoming. http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/browse/encyclopaedia-of-the-neo-latin-world.

Monfasani, John. "Humanism and Rhetoric". *Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms and Legacy*. Ed. Albert Rabil, Jr. Vol. III. 3 vols. Philadelphia, PA: U of Philadelphia P, 1988. 171–235. Print.

Plett, Heinrich F. *Rhetoric and Renaissance Culture*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004. Print.

—. "Renaissance-Poetik. Zwischen Imitation und Innovation". *Renaissance-Poetik / Renaissance Poetics*. Ed. Heinrich F. Plett. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994. 1–20. Print.

Seeck, G.A. "Senecas Tragödien". *Das römische Drama*. Ed. Eckard Lefèvre. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1978. 378–426. Print.

Volkmann, Richard E. *Die Rhetorik der Griechen und Römer in systematischer Übersicht*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1885. Print.

Winniczuk, Lidia. "Die lateinische Dichtung des S. Simonides (1558–1629)". *Renaissance und Humanismus in Mittel- und Osteuropa*. Vol. II. Ed J. Irmscher. Berlin: Akademie, 1962. 139–148. Print.

Jörg Wesche

Verse Games. Meter and Interactional German in the Baroque Plays of Andreas Gryphius

Since the eighteenth century, the plays of Andreas Gryphius (1616–1664)—one of the most influential German writers during the seventeenth century—have been seen as typifying an alleged 'frozen artificiality' of German Baroque drama. For the most part, the consistent metrical form of his tragedies (dialogic 'alexandrines') was—rather rashly—seen as causative thereof. As of the eighteenth century, poetic drama was generally and increasingly being pushed back by the respectively prevalent poetics (cf. Leeming *Poetic Drama* 1–22; Zymner *Versdrama* 764). Contrary to this still prevalent bias, the following analysis takes up the idea of metrical flexibility in Alexandrine verse (cf. Tarot *Der Alexandriner als Sprechvers im barocken Trauerspiel* 399): it offers insights into the playful interaction between the metrical shaping of speech, and the rhetorico-theatrical stylization of orality in the dramatic dialogs of Gryphius' plays. This interaction pertains to a central aspect of the relation between German Baroque drama and seventeenth century rhetoric.

The subsequent line of argument will be taking three steps: initially, it will briefly reflect on the rhetorical power of meter in general; by means of two examples, the second part will instance certain interactional techniques in the dramatic speeches of Gryphius' plays, including a metrical experiment aimed at producing an effect of acoustic mimesis by linguistic signs; the third and last section offers a close reading of a longer sequence from the chorus in Gryphius' tragedy *Catharina von Georgien* (1657), which will demonstrate how Gryphius uses his metrical scope, in order to attune the poetic form to the dynamics of dialog, as well as to the internal tensions of the protagonists.

Jörg Wesche, Universität Duisburg–Essen

The Persuasive Power of Meter in Baroque Rhetoric

In contrast to innumerable other texts pertaining to the German Baroque, Paul Fleming's sonnet "To myself" is still present in Germany's cultural memory:

An sich.
Sey dennoch vnverzagt, gieb dennoch vnverlohren,
Weich keinem Glücke nicht, steh' höher als der Neid,
Vergnüge dich an dir / vnd acht' es für kein Leid,
Hat sich gleich wider dich Glück' / Ort vnd Zeit verschworen.
Was dich betrübt vnd labt / halt' alles für erkohren,
Nim dein Verhangnüß an, laß alles vnbereut.
Thue / was gethan muß sein / vnd eh man dirs gebeuth.
Was du noch hoffen kanst / das wird noch stets gebohren.
Was klagt? Was lobt man doch? Sein Vnglück vnd sein Glücke
Jst jhm ein jeder selbst. Schaw alle Sachen an,
Diß alles ist in dir. Laß deinen eiteln Wahn /
Vnd eh du förder gehst, so geh' in dich zurücke.
Wer sein selbst Meister ist vnd sich beherschen kan /
Dem ist die weite Welt vnd alles untertan.
(Fleming in: Wagenknecht *Gedichte 1600–1700*. 111)[1]

This celebrated sonnet is not only typical, but downright iconic for Baroque Neo-Stoicism (cf. Kühlmann *Selbstbehauptung* passim). Like the verses in Gryphius' tragedies, it is written in alternating alexandrines, in accordance with the poetic reform by Martin Opitz. The opening of the poem is well-known, and begins with a parallelistic formula of affirmative repetition that marks the linguistic Stoicism of Fleming: "Sey dennoch vnverzagt, gieb dennoch vnverlohren" (cf. Althaus *Wiederholungen* 34).[2] This opening is mirrored by the overall composition: it appears in a strictly metrical and (to use a musicological analogy) *legato*, a 'self-

1 "To myself. | Be undaunted even so, even so, do not give up, | Avoid no good fortune, rise above envy, | Take pleasure in your self / and do not consider it a misery, | If luck, place and time | Have all conspired against you. | What saddens and gladdens you / deem it all predestined, | Accept your fate, do not repent of anything. | Perform / what must be done / and before you are required to do it. | What you may still hope for / is invariably still to come. | Why lament? Why indeed does one praise? His misfortune and bliss | Each is unto himself. Behold all things, | All this is within you. Let go of your vain delusions / | And before you advance further, retreat into yourself. | The wide world and everything is subject to him / | Who is master of and able to command himself" (trans. dsm).

2 "Be undaunted even so, even so, do not give up".

possessed' type of verse. Arguably, Fleming exploits the full linguistic power of the alternating alexandrine as a medium for representing a Stoicizing self-command in the form itself. This culminates in the concluding couplet: "Wer sein selbst Meister ist vnd sich beherschen kan / Dem ist die weite Welt und alles untertan".[3] In this respect, the iambic alexandrine's metrical repetition (meaning, the alternation of stressed and unstressed syllables) appears as an element of a verbally composed Stoicism. Fleming uses iambic alternation as a consistent and persistent ('*beharrliches*') means of repetition: the latter opposes the temporal progression of language, and might therefore be said to have been employed as an element of formal Stoicism in this sonnet (cf. Wesche "Wíederhólung" 60).

Against that background, metrical repetition (here: iambic alternation) is to be regarded as an immediately effective ('*eingängig*', 'captivating', 'memorable'), hence persuasive phenomenon. The power of rhythm—whether in music or literature—results from a frequent iteration of parallel (or similar) metrical units or repetition with (slight) variation, which indeed overwhelms the audience. '*Oratio ligata*'—the rhetorical term typically used for language in verse during Early Modern times—is highly perceptive, as it suggests spoken language as the basis of language that is connected or 'linked' by means of meter. From this perspective, verse itself tenders a persuasive foundation for any literary artifact so conceived, seeing that a repetition of acoustic elements will have an emphatic effect. The metrical accent—meaning, where the stress falls in a given verse—resembles the act of deliberately raising one's voice with a rhetorical aim (such as emphasis).

As *oratio ligata*, poetry is a special form of arranging language in order to generate the acoustic vigor of verse. Being conceived of as rhetoric's 'sister art' during the Baroque era, language in verse is closely linked to a comprehensively rhetorical understanding of language. Speaking in verse is just that: speaking, spoken language; this aspect must not be forgotten: one is not only dealing with the practice and display of verbal art in the narrow sense. *Oratio ligata* represents a special form of linguistic practice, which can be purposefully attuned to spoken language; modern linguistics describes this as 'interactional language', which consists of a specific utilization of linguistic features such as discourse markers, modal particles, sequences of question and answer, collaborative ways of expressing or referring to certain circumstances, a frequent change of speaker,

3 "The wide world and everything is subject to him / | Who is master of and able to command himself".

anacolutha or ellipses (cf. Imo *Sprache in Interaktion* 195–199; Psathas *Talk-in-Interaction* 27–44).

The Use of Meter in Interactional Speech and Acoustic Mimesis. Three Basic Forms in Gryphius' Plays

Interactional Stylization of Stage Speech Without Metrical Means: The Use of Discourse Markers

In the opening lines of Gryphius' *Absurda Comica. Oder Herr Peter Squentz* (1658) the particle "Nur" serves as a discourse marker without a graphic marker. In this function, this particular particle is a typical element of spoken language, from the perspective of linguistics (cf. Imo *Diskursmarker* 73–76). How is this discourse marker scenically contextualized in the dialog? In the ensuing scene, Squentz—the intra-textual director of the *Pyramus and Thisbe* play—and his companion, who plays the role of the moon (Kricks), are discussing the fact that a lantern should be used to represent the moon:

KRICKS.	Ja! wenn der Strick zuriesse / so fille ich herunter und bräche Hals und Bein. Besser ist es / ich stecke die Laterne auff eine halbe Picken / daß das Licht vmb etwas in die Höhe kommet.
PETER SQUENTZ.	*Nec ita malè*. Nur das Licht in der Laterne muß nicht zu lang seyn / denn wenn sich *Thisbe* ersticht / muß der Mond seinen Schein verlieren / das ist / verfinstert werden / vnd das muß man abbilden mit Verleschung des Lichtes. Aber *ad rem*. Wie werden wir es mit der Wand machen? (Gryphius *Dramen* 586f.)[4]

Kricks refuses to follow the instruction: he does not want the moon to be a lantern on a cord (which, he fears, might tear). Instead, he articulates a counterproposal: the lantern should be placed on top of a lance, and be held up manually. The

4 "KRICKS. Indeed! were the rope to rip / I would fall and break my neck and bones. It is better / that I place the lantern on half a lance / so that the light is somewhat elevated. / SQUENTZ. *Nec ita malè* [sc. 'not bad indeed']. Still, the light in the lantern must not reach too far, / because, when *Thisbe* stabs herself / the moonlight must lose its luster / meaning / it must be darkened / and this one must represent by extinguishing the light. But *ad rem* [sc. 'to the case at hand']. What will we do about the wall?" (trans. jw).

comical effect arising from the situation on stage is to be understood as a parody of the allegorical mode that is characteristic of Baroque drama. Squentz accepts the proposal with the Latin phrase "*Nec ita malè*"; his comic use of language displays his pretensions to erudition. He stresses that the lance cannot be too long, since Kricks will have to extinguish the light later in the play. In order to turn from consenting to commanding, Squentz uses the adversative discourse marker "Nur" ('still'). The particle is set apart from the actual sentence, and offers an instruction as to how one might understand the following words. From the perspective of interaction studies, "Nur" is here only used to announce new aspects of a given topic or a certain action. In the above example, "Nur" separates the communicative action of 'consent' ("*Nec ita malè*") and 'objection or amended afterthought' ("das Licht in der Laterne muß nicht zu lang seyn"). In this 'spoken play', Gryphius uses the respective reference to a marker of oral discourse, in order to produce a comic effect in the intratextual 'rehearsal'; the latter results from the total lack of poetic awareness on the part of the craftsmen: all they focus on are quasi-mechanical matters of staging. The entire play is conceived as a satire on sixteenth century doggerel verse.

Interactional Meter in Alexandrines as the Dialogical Verse Scheme of Gryphius' Plays: The Use of Ellipsis

There is a vast range of different uses of ellipses in interactional language. The next example points to the form of the so-called 'Mad Magazine Sentence', which results from a juxtaposition of two nominal phrases such as 'What—me worry?' or 'The president? An impostor?'.[5] Gryphius uses this structure quite often. The following passage offers an instance from scene III.5 in the tragedy *Leo Armenius* (1650), in which a sentinel informs the conspirator Michael that the emperor had come down to the dungeons. At first, Michael does not want to believe him:

WÄCHTER. Die helffte diser Nacht war / wie mich dunckt / verlauffen:
Als unversehns der Fürst durch die bewehrten Hauffen
Biß in den Kercker trat. MICH. Jst diß woll je erhört!
Kenst du ihn? WÄCHT. So als mich. MICH. dich hat ein Dunst bethört.
WÄCHTER. Warumb doch glaubt mein Herr / daß ich / was falsch / berichte?
MICHAEL. **Der Kayser? in der Nacht?** / es dunckt mich ein Gedichte /
WÄCHTER. Mein Herr / was brächt es mir / Nutz oder Schaden ein?

5 Other terminological suggestions are 'Incredulity Response Construction', or 'Incredulity Infinitive' (cf. Bücker *Sprachhandeln* 6f.).

> MICHAEL. Wer schloß den Kercker auff? WÄCHT. Er selbst. MICH. Kam er allein? (Gryphius *Dramen* 74; emph. added)[6]

As mentioned above, elliptic structures such as "Der Kayser? in der Nacht?" are termed 'Mad Magazine Sentences' in linguistics. From a functional perspective, such constructions display a high level of interactionality in conversations, they work as structuring devices, which, like a 'hinge', link one thing to another. Typically, they are used in arguments, verbal quarrels, or humorous contexts. It is precisely this that applies to the dialogic technique in the above, which shapes and explores tensions between the respective protagonists: Michael marks the sentinel's words as problematic and implausible, and demands that he elaborate on his report. From a dramaturgical viewpoint, Michael's incredulity is an example for the verbal stylization of spontaneity and surprise. It is a rhetorical *in situ* technique, which provides the scenic representation with a verbal climax, and is expressive of the emotional tension within the protagonist (cf. Fill *Das Prinzip Spannung* 93)—who is kept in custody in this dungeon by order of the emperor, and who naturally fears torture. This is echoed and reaccentuated by the formal or aesthetic aspect of Gryphius' representation of spoken language, which he skillfully adapts to the alternating verse scheme. Most adroitly, he employs the alexandrine in a flexible manner, so as to stage spoken verse. From the opening of the scene, swift exchanges—shifting speakers taking turns within a single verse (the technical term being 'antilabe')—as well as many interjections and repetitions, produce dynamic effects of stage play in and by language itself, and so contribute to the impression of a lively drama by means of verse.

In addition to such interactional functions, verse in Gryphius' dramatic work also produces an acoustic mimesis based on a symbolic production of sounds. The following offers a brief glance at this phenomenon, in order to show the intensity with which Gryphius aims at crafting scenic effects on stage by the use of meter.

---

6 "SENTINEL. Half of this night / it seemed to me / had passed: | When unexpectedly the prince entered all the way into the dungeon / right through the armed host. | MICH. That is unheard of! Do you know him? / SENT. As sure as I know myself. / MICH. You were deceived by some vapor. | SENTINEL. Why is it that my Lord believes / me / to be reporting something wrongly. | MICHAEL. The emperor? in the night? / it seems like a fabrication to me. | SENTINEL. My Lord / what gain or harm / might I derive from that? | MICHAEL. Who unlocked the dungeon? SENT. He himself. MICH. Did he come alone?" (trans. jw).

Forged Revenge. Acoustic Mimesis by Means of Meter

One of the best examples can be found in Gryphius' last tragic play, *Papinianus* (1659). The dramatist takes advantage of the customary metrical flexibility, especially with regard to the chorus, in German Baroque drama (cf. Steinberg *Reyen* 121), so as to produce a mimetic sound. In the fourth appearance of the '*Rasereyen*' ('Furies'), Gryphius employs the dactylic verse, which is rather exceptional. In this scene, the audience perceives the emperor Bassian, sleeping in a chair; "*Several winged spirits bring an anvil with hammers onto the stage / whereon the Furies forge a dagger*" (*Dramen* 399; trans. jw).[7] The chorus sings a song of revenge:

> Rüstig jhr Schwestern / es fordert die Rache /
> Gläntzende Dolche beschleunigt die Sache /
> Leget die dampfenden Fackeln bey Seite /
> Biß man das Werckzeug der Straffen bereite. (*Dramen* 399f.)[8]

Then, the chorus repeats the refrain three times (the verse scheme is – vv – v [|] v – vv – v):

> So wie die Schläg auff diß Eisen abgehen
> Müsse wer schuldig die Hämmer außstehen
> So wie die Funcken umbfligen und springen
> Müsse der Blitzen sein Hertze durchdringen
> So wie sich Feuer und Stahl hir vermählen
> Muß jhn der Fluch auch durchbrennen und quälen. (*Dramen* 400)[9]

This unique meter captures and echoes the thunderous acoustic force of the Furies, forging their steel of revenge: the two unstressed syllables of the dactyl render the resounding of the hammer, after it has struck the anvil (cf. Wesche *Literarische Diversität* 193f.). This technique can be called verbalized acoustic

---

7 "von etlichen geflügelten Geistern wird ein Amboß mit Hämmern auff den Schaw-Platz bracht / auff welchem die Rasereyen einen Dolch schmiden".

8 "Come on, ye sisters. Revenge demands / | Polished daggers: speed up the case at hand / | Put away the fuming torches / | Until the instruments of punishment have been prepared" (trans. jw).

9 "As the blows strike this very iron | So those who are guilty must endure the hammers | As the sparks fly around and leap | So the flashes must pierce through his heart | As fire and steel are here being wedded | So the curse must also sear and torment him thoroughly" (trans. jw). The notation (here and throughout) is in accordance with Latin metrics, respectively the German understanding thereof, in the seventeenth century ('–' = stressed / 'v' = unstressed).

mimesis (cf. "Vers" 405). The above example demonstrates how an *in situ* effect is produced in drama by means of meter.

With these three features (discourse markers, ellipsis, acoustic mimesis), the systematic foundation is in place, and it will be possible to perform a more detailed analysis of a longer dialogical sequence, in order to show how interactional verse techniques evolve over the course of an entire scene.

Persuasive Use of Verse in the Speech Duel of Love and Death as part of Gryphius' *Catharina von Georgien*: Question and Answer Constellations

The following tenders a highly sophisticated example of verbal art in a question and answer constellation as part of a section spoken by the chorus. This '*Reyen*', arranged as an interlude, may be found in Gryphius' martyr tragedy, *Catharina von Georgien* (1657; cf. Arend *Rastlose Weltgestaltung* 85–124). The interlude expediently demonstrates the functioning of the interaction between dialogic shaping, situational orality, and metric variation in dramatic verse.

At the outset, it will be helpful to have a look at the end of the fourth act in Gryphius' tragedy, which is situated right before the chorus sequence to be analyzed in greater detail. This part of the drama is of particular import as regards the functional overlap of the metrical development of the plot and the design of the roles; for it demonstrates the dramatic contrast between the outward tension in terms of the plot ('suspense'), and the mental 'tension' within the characters, by the use of different metrical forms. Right before this scene, the hopes that Catharina, empress of Georgia, might be saved, have been thwarted. She is a captive of the Muslim Emperor of Persia, Chach Abas, who wants to coerce her into giving up her Christian faith, and then marry him. Shortly before, right after consenting to a peace treaty between Persia and Russia, the Chach broke his vow to free the Queen. As a consequence, Catharina gave up the plan of consenting to the proposed marriage, and ascending to the Persian throne. At this point in the drama, it is clear that she is destined to die. The plot reaches its climax when the executioner takes Catharina away at the end of the fourth act. In this situation, as Catharina is facing death, she holds a Stoic monolog. This climactic scene typifies Catharina as a "Beyspill unaußsprechlicher Beständigkeit" ("an example of inexpressible constancy"; Gryphius *Dramen* 119)—also in the eyes of the historical author. Shortly after, she will ascend to Heaven as an exemplary martyr (cf. Niefanger *Geschichtsdrama* 120–124). The fifth act opens with a messenger,

reporting the shameless torture of the Queen, which places her in the *imitatio Christi* tradition (Kaminski *Andreas Gryphius* 110). Before this, the chorus takes the stage between the acts, with the allegorical interlude "*Reyen der Tugenden / des Todes und der Libe*"—the "*Chorus of the Virtues, of Death and of Love*" (thus the stage directions in Gryphius *Dramen* 203)—so as to reflect, and reflect on, the dramatic action.

Verse Scheme:

v – v – v – v | v – v – v –	a
v – v – v – v – v	b
v – v – v – v – v	b
v – v – v – v | v – v – v –	a
v – v – v – v – v	c
v – v – v – v – v	c
v – v – v – v | v – v – v –	d
v – v – v – v – v	e
v – v – v – v – v	e
v – v – v – v | v – v – v –	d
v – v – v – v – v	f
v – v – v – v – v	f
v – v – v – v – v	g
v – v – v – v – v	g

Gryphius employs the chorus right at the moment of highest agitation. Apart from Catharina's ghostly return in the last scene, this is the audience's last encounter with the heroine—right before her torture commences. What are the dramatic consequences of this special arrangement?

At first, the chorus' function seems to be a retardation only, expressing that the play is at its dramatic peak. The plot is interrupted, and somewhat calmed down by the interlude of the chorus. Even so, the artistic effort Gryphius employs to effect this change on the level of verse is rather striking. It is not simply a lyrical insertion with the aim of reflecting on the action so far. In contrast to the prevailing tradition in Baroque tragedy, which customarily signals the transition to chorus sequences by means of a change in verse (a metrical differentiation of fictional levels)—the chorus of the Virtues in Gryphius' tragedy takes up the alexandrine right after Catherina's farewell:

CATHARINA. [...] Vnd uns im Tod erquick' und rett' aus allem Leid /
Ade mit disem Kuß biß in die Ewikeit.

Reyen der Tugenden / des Todes und der Libe.

DIE TUGENDEN. Erschreckte Sterblichen; welch Zittern stöst euch an? (*Dramen* 203)[10]

The story and the chorus are metrically interrelated, formally linked by the meter: under the immediate impression of the distressing farewell (*phóbos*), the rhetorical questions of the Virtues encourage a Stoic calmness. Beginning with the second verse, the meter changes to iambic tetrameter. Given this setting, the chorus unfolds a peculiar stanza in long verse, which varies the alexandrine with iambic tetrameter, and which features two enclosing rhymes, the first followed by a couplet, the second by two (forming a quatrain):

DIE TUGENDEN. Erschreckte Sterblichen; welch Zittern stöst euch an?
Wenn man dem zarten Fleisch zusetzet /
Vnd Schwerdter auff die Hälse wetzet;
Wie daß ihr so verzagt ob dem was tödten kan!
Muß man diß leben-lose Leben /
Den Jahren nicht zur Beute geben?
Warumb denn so gelibt was man verlihren muß?
Wie daß ihr doch nicht auff wolt setzen /
Vor diß was Ewig kan ergetzen;
Die Unruh / dise Last / die Thränen / den Verdruß!
Erbebt vor dem / der Leib und Seele
Kan in des grausen Abgrunds Höle
Durch ein erzörntes Wincken stürtzen
Vnd euch was ewig lebt abkürtzen. (*Dramen* 203)[11]

10 "CATHARINA [...] And revitalize us in death and deliver us from all that pain / | With this kiss, farewell, until eternity. | *Chorus of the virtues / of death and of love.* | THE VIRTUES. Frightened mortals; what makes you tremble so?" (trans. jw)

11 "THE VIRTUES. Frightened mortals; what makes you tremble so? | If one assails the tender flesh / | And whets swords upon the necks; | How is it that you quail when faced with what may slay! | Is it not so that one must inevitably give this lifeless life / | As prey to time? | Why love so dearly what you must lose | How is it that you do not wish to rely on | What will bring eternal bliss; | All that disquiet / this burden / the tears / the vexation! | Instead, you should quake at the one | Who is able to plunge body and soul | Into the den of the appalling abyss | By a wrathful gesture of the hand | And cut you off from eternal life" (trans. jw).

Verse Scheme:

v – v – v – v – v	a
v – v – v – v – v – v	b
v – v – v – v – v – v	b
v – v – v – v – v	a
v – v – v – v – v – v	c
v – v – v – v – v – v	c
v – v – v – v – v	d
v – v – v – v – v – v	e
v – v – v – v – v – v	e
v – v – v – v – v	d
v – v – v – v – v – v	f
v – v – v – v – v – v	f
v – v – v – v – v – v	g
v – v – v – v – v – v	g

Addressing the "Sterblichen" ("mortals") at the beginning of the scene has a double function: within the play, the Virtues turn to the virgin Catharina, left behind in terror, as precondition for a State of Grace (cf. Borgstedt *Angst* 578–580); in the theatrical space, this simultaneously addresses the audience (*parábasis*). Accordingly, the change in meter moves the play to a level beyond the illusion of the dramatic action, and so conveys an aesthetic distance to the affect produced or felt. The protagonist's steadiness, which is portrayed in the play, is reflected on the level of the dramatic structure, when the dramatic action (like a *pictura*) and dissociating chorus (like a *subscriptio*) alternate in an emblematic way (cf. Schöne *Emblematik* 162–184). The Virtues literally calm the affects produced by transposing Catharina's Stoic repose onto the audience. The cathartic moment of change from fear (*phóbos*) to equanimity (*ataraxía*) formally corresponds to the transition from spoken verse to chorus verse.

Nevertheless, the drama goes beyond this theatrical demonstration of a Baroque control of affects. If Stoic self-control is to guarantee the martyr her exemplary status, the character's credibility must seem true to nature, and cannot appear to be beyond human capacities. For this reason, she needs to receive a certain motivation from the fact that there is indeed a possible escape. In the play itself, the consolation comes from the Christian promise of salvation. Horrible shock and cathartic steadiness are the most important preconditions for ultimately clearing the view, and revealing the theological horizon of salvation. The play conceives of catharsis as comfort (cf. Schings "Consolatio" 37).

This is the aesthetic logic of effect, along which Gryphius now presents the allegories of Death and Love, after having staged the allegories of the Virtues. Their interaction is performed as a duet, an interplay reflecting Catharina's

process of salvation. Once again, this is represented at the level of the verse—now by alternating trochaic tetra- and trimeter. The antiphon consists of tetrameters with cross rhyme:

TOD. Diser Pfeil der mit dem Blutt
Gottes selbst genetzt /
Der mich umbpfing euch zu gutt
Heilt wenn er verletzt!
LIBE. Diser Pfeil der durch das Hertz
Gottes selber drang /
Tödtet Furcht / und Qual / und Schmertz
Vnd der Folter Zwang. (Gryphius *Dramen* 203f.)[12]

This kind of stanza is repeated fourteen times. Each stanza comes with cross rhymes and a continuous change in length of the respective lines. Finally, Gryphius uses the antithetic structure to separate and distribute the rhymes between the two roles:

TOD. Was ist stärcker als der Tod?
LIBE. Libe gilt noch mehr!
TOD. Der Tod endet Leid und Noht.
LIBE. Libe krönt mit Ehr! (*Dramen* 205)[13]

The rhetorical question in the initial line articulates both a statement and a challenge: it opens a verbal contest, in which Love and Death struggle for primacy. In the manner of an academic dispute, Gryphius shapes this bipartite contest as a rhetorical combat (*agón*), duel, or game—with arguments (*probatio*) and counterarguments (*refutatio*)—while either party aims to persuade or convince the other. The stanza, which had initially been repeated, is now segmented into stichomythia, thereby forcing the agonistic quarrel to an extreme precisely by the use of meter (and specifically by dynamic stichomythia). A rhetoric of outperformance (with a view to convincing or persuading the other party) is effectively staged by verbal interruptions on the part of the disputants, who aim at evading a stichomythic equilibrium by interjections:

12 "DEATH. This arrow wetted with | God's own blood / | Who embraced me for your sake | Heals when it hurts! LOVE. This arrow that pierced through | God's own heart / | slays dread / and agony / and pain | And torture's duress" (trans. jw).

13 "DEATH. What could be stronger than death? | LOVE. Love prevails! | DEATH. Death ends suffering and need. | LOVE. Love crowns with glory!" (trans. jw).

TOD. Wenn sein Pfeil in vollem Lauff;
LIBE. Den die Libe bricht.
Reine Lib' herscht für und für.
TOD. Die durch mich bewehrt. (*Dramen* 205)[14]

The breaking of the arrow of death in full speed corresponds to Love interrupting Death's speech. That Love 'claims' the next verse results in a spontaneous anacoluthon, and so forces Death to try out a new argument. In this dialogic position of defense, Death can find a way out by using the same technique of a double contradiction. Death turns Love's weapon against her, and puts himself back into the advantageous primary position of the challenger:

LIBE. Trägt der ew'gen Crone Zir.
TOD. Die durch mich beschert.
Hab ich nicht Gott selbst bezwungen? (*Dramen* 205)[15]

In a way, the dispute becomes harsher, but is finally moderated—according to the fundamental role model—by Love, who offers a reconciling gesture ("Jch bott dir die Hand", *Dramen* 206). The two sides approach each other in the end, and find a common ground in the temperate tone of the rhyming couplets of the alexandrine:

TOD. Rechtschaffne Libe wird nur in dem Tod erkennet.
LIBE. Wer libt wird durch den Tod von Libe nicht getrennet.
TOD. Der libt ohn alle falsch wer biß zum Tode libt.
LIBE. Wer libend stirbet wird nicht durch den Tod betrübt. (*Dramen* 205)[16]

Several times, this dialogic dispute articulates the *caritas* ideal of the *New Testament* ('*reine Liebe*', '*rechtschaffne Liebe*', '*Liebe ohne alle falsch*'; cf. *1Cor* 13:1–13.). This ideal is at the center of the conflict; and it is in clear contrast to Chach Abas' lust. In the end, the Virtues chime in, stating that salvation effected by God's unending love (αγάπη) is the valid conclusion.

The above examples were selected to highlight the underlying dialogical techniques, and to demonstrate that Gryphius' use of language in drama is

14 "DEATH. When its arrow is flying; | LOVE. Which love breaks. | Pure love reigns supreme for all eternity. | DEATH. It is proved true by me" (trans. jw).
15 "LOVE. Wears the adornment of the eternal crown. | DEATH. Which was bestowed by me. | Was it not me who overcame God himself?" (trans. jw).
16 "DEATH. Honest love is only discerned in death itself. | LOVE. Those who love will not be separated from love by death. | DEATH. He loves honestly who loves until death. | LOVE. Those who die with love will not be afflicted by death" (trans. jw).

closely attuned to the genre and its medium. Gryphius does not use rhetorical figures and metrical styles in a monotonous manner. On the contrary, the dramatist's work displays a high degree of interactional stylization. As regards future research, it is rather likely that Gryphius' dramas will no longer be considered as a guideline for declamatory theater and allegorical allurement. Instead, his dramatic work actually seems to be based on the idea of staged language, portraying the ideal of spoken German in the seventeenth century. There is research on the variability of alexandrines from the perspective of literary studies, and on rhetorical techniques in dramatic dialog from a linguistic perspective.[17] Yet the above analyses should underline the heuristic potential of combining historical information concerning meter with current linguistic theories regarding interactional speech—the latter approach being almost unknown within literary studies, so far. With such a synergy, it becomes possible to understand how effects of insinuating orality were crafted in German Baroque drama. Rhetoric and Drama: in the case of Gryphius' plays, this correlation is a question of interactional stylization, also by means of a flexible use of verse, conducted with a view to the concept of orality.

17 Cf. Tarot (*Individualisierung* passim; *Kunst* 141–154); Betten (*Analyse literarischer Dialoge* 525–535); Fischer/Uerpmann (*Rhetorisches Sprechen* 281–290).

Bibliography

Primary Literature

Gryphius, Andreas. *Dramen*. Ed. Eberhard Mannack. *Bibliothek der Frühen Neuzeit*. 3. Frankfurt a.M. 1991. Print.

Wagenknecht, Christian, ed. *Gedichte 1600–1700. Deutsche Lyrik von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*. 4. München: dtv, 2001. Print.

Secondary Literature

Althaus, Thomas. "'Ich sage noch einmahl' – Paul Flemings Wiederholungen". *Was ein Poëte kan! Studien zum Werk von Paul Fleming (1609–1640)*. Eds. Stefanie Arend and Claudius Sittig. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012. 17–34. Print.

Arend, Stefanie. *Rastlose Weltgestaltung. Senecaische Kulturkritik in den Tragödien Gryphius' und Lohensteins. Frühe Neuzeit*. 81. Eds. Achim Aurnhammer and Friedrich Vollhardt. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2003. Print.

Betten, Anne. "Analyse literarischer Dialoge". *Handbuch der Dialoganalyse*. Eds. Gerd Fritz and Franz Hundsnurscher. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1994. 519–544. Print.

Borgstedt, Thomas. "Angst, Irrtum und Reue in der Märtyrertragödie. Andreas Gryphius' *Catharina von Georgien* vor dem Hintergrund von Vondels *Maeghden* und Corneilles *Polyeucte Martyr*". *Daphnis* 28 (1999): 563–594. Print.

Bücker, Jörg. *Sprachhandeln und Sprachwissen: Grammatische Konstruktionen im Spannungsfeld von Interaktion und Kognition*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012. Print.

Fill, Alwin. *Das Prinzip Spannung. Sprachwissenschaftliche Betrachtungen zu einem universalen Phänomen*. Tübingen: Narr, 2003. Print.

Fischer, Hans-Dieter and Horst Uerpmann. "Rhetorisches Sprechen in den Tragödien des L.A. Seneca und des A. Gryphius. Vergleichende Beobachtungen am Beispiel der *Amplificatio*". *Wirkendes Wort* 41 (1991): 276–292. Print.

Imo, Wolfgang. *Sprache in Interaktion: Analysemethoden und Untersuchungsfelder*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013. Print.

—. Wortart Diskursmarker? *Nicht-flektierende Wortarten*. Ed. Björn Rothstein. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012. 48–88. Print.

Kaminski, Nicola. *Andreas Gryphius*. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1998. Print.

Kühlmann, Wilhelm. "Selbstbehauptung und Selbstdisziplin. Zu Paul Flemings *An sich*". *Gedichte und Interpretationen* 1. *Renaissance und Barock*. Ed. Volker Meid. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1982. 160–166. Print.

Leeming, Glenda. *Poetic Drama*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1989. Print.

Niefanger, Dirk. *Geschichtsdrama der Frühen Neuzeit. 1495–1773. Studien zur deutschen Literatur*. 174. Eds. Wilfried Barner, Wolfgang Braungart and Conrad Wiedemann. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2005. Print.

Psathas, George. *Conversation Analysis: The Study of Talk-in-Interaction*. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 1995. Print.

Schings, Hans-Jürgen. “Consolatio tragoediae. Zur Theorie des barocken Trauerspiels”. *Deutsche Dramentheorien. Beiträge zu einer historischen Poetik des Dramas in Deutschland*. Vol. 1. Ed. Reinhold Grimm. 3rd ed. Frankfurt a. M.: Athenäum, 1980. 1–44. Print.

Schöne, Albrecht. *Emblematik und Drama im Zeitalter des Barock*. 3rd ed. München: Beck, 1993. Print.

Steinberg, Hans. *Die Reyen in den Trauerspielen des Andreas Gryphius*. Göttingen: Huth, 1914. Print.

Tarot, Rolf. “Die Individualisierung des Alexandriners in Goethes *Die Laune des Verliebten*”. *Denken und Geschichte*. Eds. Hans-Günther Schwarz and Jane v. Curran. München: Iudicium, 2002. 92–107. Print.

—. “Der Alexandriner als Sprechvers im barocken Trauerspiel”. *Studien zur Literatur des 17. Jahrhunderts*. Ed. Hans Feger. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1997. 377–401. Print.

—. “Die Kunst des Alexandriners im barocken Trauerspiel. Andreas Gryphius *Papinian*”. *Simpliciana* 19 (1997): 125–154. Print.

Wesche, Jörg. *Literarische Diversität. Abweichungen, Lizenzen und Spielräume in der deutschen Poesie und Poetik der Barockzeit. Studien zur deutschen Literatur*. 173. Eds. Wilfried Barner, Wolfgang Braungart and Conrad Wiedemann. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2004. Print.

—. “Vers”. *Metzler Lexikon literarischer Symbole*. Eds. Günter Butzer, Joachim Jacob. Stuttgart / Weimar: Metzler, 2008. 404–406. Print.

—. “Wíederhólung und Verstheorie”. *Wiederholen/Wiederholung*. Eds. Rolf Parr, Jörg Wesche, Bernd Bastert and Carla Dauven-von Knippenberg. Heidelberg: Synchron, 2015. 57–70. Print.

Zymner, Rüdiger. “Versdrama”. *Reallexikon der Literaturwissenschaft. Neubearbeitung des Reallexikons der deutschen Literaturgeschichte*. 3. Ed. Jan-Dirk Müller. Berlin / New York: de Gruyter, 2003. 763–765. Print.

Joachim Küpper

Rhetoric and the Cultural Net: Transnational Agencies of Culture

Conditions of Possibility for Cultural Production and Circulation

Early Modern European drama owes its remarkable transnational persistence and consistency—hence (formal) comparability—to various factors, among which a widespread set of rules concerned with how to formulate texts dedicated to specific purposes (that is, a standardized rhetorical system) is certainly not the least important one. If rhetoric is, by definition, a system based on the question of how to convey a certain, preconceived message (or intention) to a specific audience in the most effective way conceivable, one might ask in which way this applies to drama.[1] Evidently, audiences were highly diverse (in terms of their social status and level of education, for instance); elocutional preferences tend to vary, and are multifarious on the whole; tastes have always differed; hence what is considered an exaggerated rhetoricization (in terms of *léxis*, *elocutio*) in one place, might have been welcome in another as 'quite right' (sc. *prépon*, *aptum*)—meaning, as being in accordance with the audience's preconceived expectations as to how a well-wrought text (whether a play or an oration, a dialog or a sermon, etc.) should sound and look like.

The following essay suggests hypotheses as to the conditions of possibility both of cultural production, and of the latter's mobility (circulation) within a conceivable 'virtual network of culture'. The thesis at the basis of this essay can be characterized as follows: it was not a (somewhat abstract and lofty) common Humanistic ideal of a well-wrought text shared throughout (Early Modern) Europe that constituted the basis for the factual omnipresence of a shared set of rules for formulation (sc. the *rhetorikè téchne*). Rather, the permanent and sustained activities (whether deliberate or accidental and incidental) of a plethora of transcultural agents and agencies (monastic, regal, economic, etc.) yielded the basis for this common system—initially, in terms of its dissemination

1 Generally thereto, see Küpper (*Diskurs-Renovatio* 300).

Joachim Küpper, Freie Universität Berlin

and circulation; and then, for its being widely practiced and embraced until what is called the age of Romanticism. Typically (at least in the period under scrutiny here), the floating of cultural material within what I term the 'virtual cultural net' is mediated by human beings, such as merchants and missionaries, tutors, diplomats and spouses, warriors, courtiers and courtesans, skilled artisans and artists—among which are, also and of course, theater troupes, playwrights, actors—etc.[2]

This enumeration is evidently heterogeneous, seeing that it comprises both active and deliberate agents of cultural transfer (such as missionaries, actors, artists), and individuals or groups, who effectively act in this capacity, but without the above intention; in other words: they evince a (relatively) high mobility, and their travels indeed facilitate and promote the circulation of cultural material, albeit incidentally. Since the latter (such as merchants and warriors) are also human beings—meaning, individuals with a cultural 'background'—it is inevitable that they not only transport goods or arms, but also the entire range of cultural material they 'carry' in their minds: words (idiomatic expressions, verbal and textual structures, rhetorical devices and techniques), local recipes and practices, social norms, patterns of behavior, culturally conditioned tastes, body language and prosody, as well as the memory of works of art appreciated in the past (and retained to some extent).[3] One might be tempted to state that, during the greater part of human history, much (if not most) cultural transfer took place in (literally) such a 'by the way' fashion; in other words: it occurred without the (conscious) intention of causing such, or indeed any, circulation of cultural material.

The entire historical process providing the basis for (what later became, and we now call) Europe is produced, at least in its beginnings, by such 'accompanying', incidental 'export' of culture. When the Romans first conquered present-day France, and then parts of what are now Britain or Germany, their intention was not primarily to disseminate Greco-Roman culture.[4] Initially, they wanted (and needed) to stop the barbarian incursions into Roman territories,

2 A book containing the comprehensive theorizing of cultural development by way of the metaphor of a (virtual) cultural network is forthcoming in 2017.

3 Typically, the elements of structure—formal composition (patterns), arrangement of content (plot)—tend to be a most memorable aspect; this immediately relates to the rhetorical *téchne*.

4 Naturally, economic interests played a significant role, specifically in later times of relative peace: one might mention the flourishing trade along and across the so-called '*limes*', which indubitably facilitated a transfer both of goods (consumables, but also tools and even arms), and of cultural (including ritual) matters—and not simply for properly material reasons only, but also with a view to more abstract aspects such as personal or collective prestige, etc.

which were typically motivated by material greed.[5] Still, the prerequisite for sustaining the *pax Augusta* was to definitively subjugate these limitrophe tribes—that is, to install Roman garrisons on foreign territory, to construct and maintain a well-kept network of (initially military and supplies-related, then also trade) roads.[6] Since these *coloniae* were places where Roman troops lived on a permanent basis, there was a need for 'Roman' culture—in terms of the everyday (supplies, tools), but also (and increasingly so) for its more sophisticated facets, such as arenas and amphitheaters qua places suited for public performances of various kinds. As time went by, the subjugated locals began to take an interest in these (cultivated, urbane) instances of Mediterranean civilization and culture transferred to Western and Northern Europe. Some centuries later, when the Roman Empire collapsed under the military pressure exerted by tribes from parts of present-day Europe that had not been conquered (mainly from the East and North, from Scandinavia), the people in what are now France, England, Southern and Western Germany had assimilated Roman culture—initially imposed by way of a violent military conquest—to such an extent that they considered it their 'own'; and they even succeeded in convincing the newly arrived 'barbarian' tribes likewise to adopt this very culture—the origins of which largely lie in Mesopotamia, Egypt, present-day Israel, and Greece.

Cultural exportation as a decided and deliberate pattern of behavior seems so natural to present-day Westerners that it might be difficult to conceptualize to what extent it is a highly specific way of dealing with culture. I would hypothesize that there is one indispensable prerequisite for intentionally propagating one's culture beyond its 'original' area of influence: this requirement is the notion of universalism—meaning, the (at least conceptual) conviction that all human beings are equal (in theory, anyway), and are thus potentially capable of living

5 Later movements and 'Barbarian Invasions'—such as those of the Migration Period (*Völkerwanderung*)—had additional, and perhaps more (self-)defensive reasons, of course, seeing that local (Germanic) tribes had increasingly come under pressure by raids from further East, and ultimately from Asia. Indubitably, it is also the mobility due to flight (and not only conquest or domination) that shaped modern-day Europe, considering e.g. the transfer of cultural aspects (certainly semantic, and also governmental structures, perhaps) by the Visigoths across Europe, as far south as Andalusia and even Northern Africa. This form of necessitated or enforced cultural transfer or exchange was certainly of a very different nature when compared to the more lasting forms on the parts of the Romans and the Arabic or Berber tribes later; yet it cannot be discounted.

6 It is by no means incidental that Germanic languages immediately in contact with the *imperium* adopted a Roman term to refer to an excellent road network ('*Straße*', 'street' ‹ '(*via*) *strata*').

within comparable, if not identical cultural frameworks. This idea—revolutionary in the history of humankind—seems to have first originated as a tendency within certain philosophical schools in Greece (particularly the Stoa), while owing its definitive breakthrough and universal prevalence to the emergence and ascendancy of Christianity. The concept of '(universal) human rights' is not based on the notion of a corporeal, but on an 'essential' equality of all human beings. Whatever this essence might be, its postulation is mapped onto the level of observable phenomena as the assumption of cultural equality: that is, (equal) rights, (equal) wishes and aspirations, (equal) norms of 'good and evil'. One might gain the impression that, in regions of the planet where an autochthonous ideological universalism does not seem to have emerged (India or China, for instance), deliberate and calculated forms of cultural exportation do not seem to be observable to such a pervasive degree as those which originated in the West.

Seeing that (at least in principle) the timeframe under consideration here is not only the past 2000 years, but an era commencing with the emergence of the first beings of the *genus homo sapiens sapiens* (for the purposes here, roughly 150,000 years), it is important to accentuate that most cultural transfer is a 'parasitic' phenomenon. As an intentional overall agenda and particular activity, it is bound to specific ideological constellations. Moreover, it is not without reason that today's global culture is a (predominantly) Western phenomenon. In principle, Islam could become the hub of a universalistic global culture, as well.[7]

Selected Agents of Cultural Circulation in Europe and Beyond: the Church, the Nobility, Scholars, Academies, the Jewry, Merchants

The Church

When limiting the scope to the age of universalism, one might add the (verifiable) existence of agencies of transculturation to the panorama of features facilitating the floating of material in the virtual network of culture. Within the work of the research group 'DramaNet' (providing the larger context for this essay), one study may be of particular importance as far as the issue under scrutiny here is

7 However, it may be held back by its tradition; as to possible reasons for this difference between cultures with a Christian, and such with an Islamic background, see Küpper ("Säkulare Welt" passim).

concerned; for to consider the *Škofjeloški pasijon* (the *Škofja Loka Passion Play*)—the earliest dramatic text in the Slovene language still extant (1725–1727)—may be expedient to illustrate a constellation that is frequently overlooked in a period whose basic parameters continue to be heavily influenced by the notion of 'national cultures'.[8] As the title establishes, the text in question is a Passion play that, in this specific case, was performed during a procession. It evinces many peculiar characteristics that render it a useful source to be studied within a project on Early Modern European drama; these pertain not only to content (which is obvious), but also to its respective rhetoricization. In a more theoretical perspective, it is crucial that the play's plot has nothing particularly 'Slovene' about it, and that a procession play—which levels or at least significantly reduces the distance between stage and audience, leading to an enhanced emotional involvement of the latter—is nothing that would pertain to a specifically Slovene culture. From the Middle Ages onward, plays representing Christ's Passion are documented in many European countries; and their being performed during processions—which may have existed everywhere in the West—is particularly well-documented for Spain, and also Southern Germany, for instance.[9]

This state of affairs will not be unfamiliar to a scholar of the historical and literary scenario in question. Even so, it is frequently 'forgotten' or passed over when talking about (European) culture as such. One will have to take into account that cultural items were not only transported (more or less intentionally) by traveling individuals (merchants, courtiers). In Early Modern Europe, there were various transnational cultural agencies, for whose (economic, diplomatic, etc.) activities 'national' and linguistic borders were hardly insurmountable; on the contrary, cultural osmosis was a conscious aim. In the epoch under scrutiny, the Roman Catholic Church is by far the most significant and effectual of such agencies conceiving of cultural transfer as a major task—and not, as in the case

8 Thereto, cf. Drnovšek (passim). With regard to the rhetoric of this and similar passion plays, one will have to take into account their indebtedness to Baroque sermons in terms of structure and the rhetorical devices employed (vis-à-vis '*docere*'). As to *elocutio*, the primary means are admonitions and exhortations immediately directed at the audience. In terms of *dispositio*, a Passion play's content, its sequence and arrangement is, of course, predetermined by the *Scriptural* account, with the crucifixion as the climactic event (vis-à-vis '*movere*'). I am indebted to Jaša Drnovšek for the above remarks regarding the rhetorical dimension of this specific drama.
9 As to the latter, one well-known event staging a passion play in the form of a procession continues to flourish in Southern Germany until today: the *Oberammergauer Passionsspiel*, performed every ten years. In terms of its current function, it has (at least to some extent) turned into an element of today's visual 'event culture', where the religious or ritual background is of secondary import only (if that).

of other (economic, political) organizations, as a concomitant feature of several diverse activities. Its dogma is always already universalistic, seeing that it expressly intends to divulgate the Christian belief to all human beings, regardless of their language and ethnicity. Right from its establishment as the 'official' Church of the Roman Empire (that is, from the fourth century onward), the Catholic Church—due to its radically 'global' attitude—was a most powerful agent in terms of decidedly expanding the cultural net (both in its virtual and in its physical structures), and of promoting the floating processes within.

Without doubt, the system of rhetoric proved a most expedient tool facilitating these dynamics: it was (emphatically) taken up from Greek and Roman educational systems, and refunctionalized for Christian purposes, such as the divulgation of the gospel (say, in the writing of epistles, sermons, and *consolationes*), or the (partial) refutation and (selected) incorporation of pagan elements (most notably by, arguably, that most 'Ciceronian' Church Father of all, Augustine of Hippo); in this way, decidedly rhetorical structures entered the corpus of Christian literature from the outset. At the same time, and concomitant therewith (typically to suit hermeneutic and productive needs), the *rhetorikè téchne* also became an indispensable part of the Christian education (not only in letters); for even during and after the age of the denominational wars and the eventual Schism, this framework structure remained in place as a dependable basis (with variants in the details, of course).

The literally and assertively 'universal' (sc. 'Catholic' ‹ *καθολικός*, *katholikós*) Church not only exported its 'cultural' material—the same as its facilitating structures, and the forms for shaping it—from its main 'seat' (the see of the Roman bishop) to all European countries. After the (Spanish and Portuguese) conquest of other parts of the world, this agenda of dissemination and propagation entered virtually any kind of regional or 'national' culture. Accordingly, Christian didactic drama (and its rhetorico-structural design) was not only 'exported' to Latin America after 1492; the respective plays were also being performed in the more 'exotic' parts of the world: in Goa (India), in Macau (China), or on the Japanese Isles, for instance.

As an aside, it may be worth noting that, in the aforesaid Slovene Passion play, allegories of the non-European continents (America, Asia, Africa) appear on stage, in order to express their gratitude for the 'grace' evinced by the fact that Catholicism brought salvation to their respective people.[10] This straightforward

10 The motif as such seems to have been widespread—also beyond the dramatic genre. A similar agenda is presented in the fresco, which Tiepolo painted onto the cupola overarching the central staircase at Würzburg Residence (Germany) in 1752/1753: the personified continents, depicted

universalistic message is all the more remarkable, since Slovenia was by no means involved in the process of spreading Christian-European culture all over the world.

The human agents of the Church's 'networking' activities were mainly supplied by various monastic orders (the Capuchins, the Jesuits later). As a matter of course, dignitaries from the ecclesiastical hierarchy—such as bishops—also featured prominently; for these were individuals whose self-description was not primarily focused on their 'national' (let alone 'ethnic') belonging; instead, they tended to accentuate their calling as 'ministers' (that is, 'servants') of a God that, according to their belief, had created, and then redeemed all humankind through the self-sacrifice of His son.[11] Those who, by Divine Grace, had been given access to the revealed truth had to then (and continually) earn (*mereri*) this Grace—one way being that of promulgating the gospel to those who had not been granted the privilege of (a) 'first' access.

There is one additional point to be made with regard to this most powerful and transnational cultural agency of the period in question. The institution of the Church is linked to a specific ideology. Consequently, it has a strong tendency not only to work as a propagator of cultural material, but also as an agency of regulation, monitoring, and censorship. What was actively circulated by the Roman Church was a carefully chosen and prudently shaped set of cultural features.[12] Since the circulation was mainly facilitated, and in fact performed, by human beings (and not only by simply 'shipping', say, rhetorical manuals or dramatic textbooks per se)—by monks or ecclesiastical dignitaries from Spain, Italy, France, who (frequently) traveled or even 'migrated' to countries like Slovenia, Goa, Brazil, or Japan—it was more or less inevitable that they also carried their local, personal, educational, intellectual background (that is, their 'mental' valises, their *memoriae*) with them; rather naturally, the latter also 'contained' all sorts of (virtual) cultural material that might actually have been considered problematic from the viewpoint of a strictly defined religious

with an animal (Africa on a camel, Asia on an elephant, America on an alligator), point to Europe; cf. http://www.residenz-wuerzburg.de/englisch/residenz/treppe.htm.

11 Nor was this attitude without ecclesiastico-historical precedent (one might adduce Paul of Tarsus, Gregory of Nazianzus, John Chrysostom, Augustine of Hippo, and virtually any other).

12 Needless to say, the system of rhetoric proved highly instrumental in the formal, structural aspects thereof (specifically: *dispositio*, *elocutio*); certain genres immediately related to these dynamics (sermons and epistles, above all) are always already conditioned by the rhetorical *téchne* to an exceptional degree.

orthodoxy.[13] While the primary focus of their deliberate cultural activities was certainly on propagating a specific message, and on 'controlling' any potential heterodoxy, it may very well have been the case that an unintentional dialectics was at work, here. For, in the final analysis, even a highly 'orthodox' person can be so only by constantly repressing anything that might not be systematically orthodox within his or her own thinking; consequently, such a person inevitably becomes a vehicular device for cultural material exceeding the (rather severe) limits of religious orthodoxy.

This predicament (from an orthodox viewpoint) is reinforced by one central characteristic of the Christian religion that may seem to distinguish it, at least to some extent, from the second universalistic religion: its 'absorptive' attitude with regard to previous traditions, in particular Jewish and pagan Mediterranean ones. The dogma itself, its ritualistic practices (including some holidays) and religious arts (architecture, painting, catechizing texts, performances), are all assembled from preexisting material, with a very limited set of additional, 'novel' concepts—and even the latter are usually not at all 'new' in an emphatic sense, but only with respect to the different context, into which they were transplanted and (to a certain extent) integrated.[14] Since Christianity emerged on the terrain of a firmly

13 In the age of Humanism—but also before, and certainly after the Council of Trent—the pagan *litterae* would, at least in a non-redacted or expurgated form, prove a stumbling block also as such. (In terms of rhetoric, one might adduce Augustine's Cicero once again; or, more generally, the evidently needful 'Christianization' of pagan texts as evinced in the Medieval *Ovide moralisé*). Generally thereto, see Küpper (*Diskurs-Renovatio* passim). On the whole, the (standardized) rhetorical education—necessary (as part of the *trivium*) for any (including ecclesiastic) official of Late Antiquity, the Middle Ages, and the Early Modern time—inevitably carried along standard and exemplary writings taken from a non-Christian (Greco-Roman, pagan) background, which had literally become 'textbook' instances; along with their rhetorical form (which will have been the primary aim of studying them), the sedimented contents (typically problematic from a Christian perspective, even if subjected to rigorous redaction and hermeneutic ingenuity) were inevitably also retained and transported.

14 To give but one example: the ethical component of Christianity may be described as a continuation and partial radicalization of the set of norms contained in the Decalog—that is, of the Jewish tradition; the emerging religion detaches this ethical fund from the overall complex of ritualistic practices, into which it had been embedded in the source context. To this residual ethical component, it adds elements derived from Eastern Mediterranean mystical religions, mainly of an Egyptian hue (cf. the aspects of divine incarnation by way of 'regular' birth, of resurrection and eternal life). In order to clearly distance itself from the (ultimately tribalistic) Jewish religion, it attaches vaguely elaborated universalistic tendencies implied in other cults widespread at the time (Isis, Mithras) to this assemblage, while simultaneously fusing them with Monotheism, leading to their radical accentuation. In addition, certain Greek tendencies towards universalism—metaphysically articulated in Plato, and rendered functional for this

established script culture—which, for that very reason, had also developed techniques and locations for 'storing' cultural material, such as libraries—the elements from which the Christian discourse had been (and continued to be) assembled, remained present (and literally 'current') within the cultural net in their non-assimilated version also. As may be extrapolated from European cultural history, this presence '*sub utraque specie*' was a permanent invitation to all users of the cultural net to disassemble the cultural syndromes constituting what we have become accustomed to call Christianity, and to make use of these elements for secular purposes.[15]

Considering the facilitation of, and immense contribution to, the literal 'transport' and virtual conveyance of diverse cultural materials in either direction (from the 'West' to the colonies, and vice versa), and performed by members of the various religious orders—above all, by the Jesuits—one might think that Catholicism, when compared to Protestantism, was (and perhaps continues to be) the by far more influential human 'device' enabling and propelling the dynamics of material (virtually) floating in the cultural net.[16] Indeed, the (in)direct consequence of a Protestant accentuation of a believer's immediate access to Divine revelation (as mediated by *Scripture*) was (and is) that all Reformed denominations are ultimately linked to specific linguistic communities. The Protestant pretense to universalism—which, in principle, is a feature of Christianity in general—tends to be restricted by the abolishment of the mediating role of the clergy in connection with the access to the Divine; the result is an individualism translating into a (relative) parochialism at the level of the respective communities.[17] In addition, the Reformation had allowed religious officials to have families; consequently, it was to a considerably lesser degree that Protestant ministers were ready (or able) to dedicate their energies to the

world mainly by the Stoa—might also be noted, specifically as far as the initial phase of consolidation of the Christian dogma is concerned; see Paul's epistles passim, and *John* 1:1.

15 A prime example is the 'subjugation' of Greek myths by way of allegorizing—and the 'liberation' of the mythical fund from this (Christianizing) superstructure, which occurred in the era we are used to call 'the Renaissance'; thereto, see Küpper (*Diskurs-Renovatio* 94–229 passim).

16 For the Jesuit case, see e.g. Fothergill-Payne (passim); as well as Küpper ("Jesuitismus" passim).

17 As a variant of Christian belief, Protestantism shares the universalistic frame of Christian monotheism; but one of its basic tenets, namely, the accent on *Scripture* and the ensuing postulate that every believer should read the Holy Text by himself, hence, the various vernaculars as primary means of inner-Protestant communication, make Protestantism into one of the most powerful agents of the emergence of separate 'national cultures'.

interaction with the believers (both actual and potential), when compared to Catholic priests, monks, or nuns.[18]

This constellation notwithstanding, there were significant Protestant missionary activities in 'non-Western' regions. The cultural transfer processes attending these activities had, in part at least, a slightly different profile from those accompanying Catholic proselytizing. The marital status allowed Protestant missionaries to have children; the latter typically grew up in parts of the world whose cultural parameters differed (often rather drastically) from those of the West. Almost all of them were educated; some actually became ministers, and many of them chose to work in the secular realm; as is the case in the 'homelands' of Protestantism, quite a few became scholars or scientists. In a considerable number of cases, they remained in the countries where they had been born and raised; as a consequence of this chain of conditioning factors, many became 'professional' agents of cultural transfer. They taught the locals the Western sciences and concept of the humanities, and they turned the local flora, fauna, and human culture into objects of Western-style scientific or scholarly scrutiny. As regards 19th century China in particular, the role of these descendants of Protestant ministers for the (scientific, scholarly) opening up of a community, which had retained its self-sufficiency much longer than Western cultures, seems to be of considerable significance. The structural difference between the mediating activities of this group and the Catholic missionaries will be that the former were 'professionals' in their respective fields, whereas the latter were dilettantes in the very literal meaning of the term.[19] Specifically in an age when

18 As to the rhetorical training Protestants received during and after the Reformation, and specifically in the form initiated and promoted by Melanchthon, see e.g. Knox (passim).

19 Generally thereto, see Burckhardt's remark in defense of a 'dilettantism' in this sense: "Of course, 'with all that, much d i l e t t a n t i s m is indeed being planted, which takes pleasure in that wherein others laudably toil!' The word ['dilettantism'] has fallen into disrepute due to [its implication in] the arts, where, of course, one will either have to be nothing, or a master and give [one's] life to [one's] task, seeing that the arts essentially presuppose perfection. In scholarship ['den Wissenschaften'], however, one can only be a master in a very limited area, namely as a specialist, and, somewhere, one m u s t be [a specialist]. Yet so as not to forfeit the capacity of a more general overview, [and] indeed the appreciation thereof, one should also be a dilettante in as many other areas as possible, at least on one's own account, for [purposes of] expanding one's own insights and enriching [one's] perspectives; otherwise one will, in that which exceeds one's specialty, remain an ignoramus, and perhaps an unrefined fellow on the whole. Conversely, the dilettante, seeing that he loves the things [he deals with], may very well, over the course of his life, also be able to actually attain to a certain depth [sc. deepen his knowledge] in various areas" (22f.; trans. dsm). "Freilich 'mit alledem wird ja lauter D i l e t t a n t i s m u s gepflanzt, welcher sich ein Vergnügen aus dem macht, woraus sich

(Western) research (both scientific and scholarly) was systematized according to identifiable disciplines—that is, from the early 19th century onward—the 'floating' of the cultural material in question, which was mediated by these professionals, might have had a (significantly) greater impact than had been the case with the earlier, 'dilettante' variant; and this particularly, since these individuals (or groups) did not primarily (let alone exclusively) transport 'contents', but also methodological (scientific), that is, transferable parameters, patterns, techniques.

The Nobility

Apart from the Roman Church, a number of other transnational cultural agencies are to be mentioned as effectual during the period in question; these display a much greater ideological flexibility than the Roman Church. At first sight, such may seem to render them more important factors of transnational 'floating', when compared to a (relatively) rigorous Ecclesia; even so, their effective impact is limited by the fact that, in contrast to the Church, these agencies are 'elitist' in terms of their self-description, and as regards their interactions with the respectively local, receiving societies at large.

While restricted in numbers, the upper strata of the ruling class should not be neglected as a vital agency; as far as the European higher nobility is concerned, 'nationality' did not count as a feature of their self-description at all. If deemed politically opportune, their members were ready to migrate to, and dwell in, any part of the 'civilized' world—as spouses of kings, queens, or as heirs to thrones, for which there was no legitimate or acceptable successor in the realm in question.[20]

---

andere löblicherweise eine Qual machen!' Das Wort ist von den Künsten her im Verruf, wo man freilich entweder nichts oder ein Meister sein und das Leben an die Sache wenden muß, weil die Künste wesentlich die Vollkommenheit voraussetzen. In den Wissenschaften dagegen kann man nur noch in einem begrenzten Bereiche Meister sein, nämlich als Spezialist, und irgendwo s o l l man dies sein. Soll man aber nicht die Fähigkeit der allgemeinen Übersicht, ja die Würdigung derselben einbüßen, so sei man noch an möglichst vielen anderen Stellen Dilettant, wenigstens auf eigene Rechnung, zur Mehrung der eignen Erkenntnis und Bereicherung an Gesichtspunkten; sonst bleibt man in allem, was über die Spezialität hinausliegt, ein Ignorant und unter Umständen im ganzen ein roher Geselle. Dem Dilettanten aber, weil er die Dinge liebt, wird es vielleicht im Lauf seines Lebens möglich werden, sich auch noch an verschiedenen Stellen wahrhaft zu vertiefen" (22f.).

20 It will hardly need to be mentioned that this indifference as to 'national belonging' was balanced—to a considerable degree, at least—by the specifically universalistic (that is, Christian)

This is also of particular import with regard to both rhetoric and drama; for, being the elite, the aristocracy was, as a matter of course, highly educated, and their public appearances and relations, including their semiotic (also verbal) comportment, were closely observed—and, of course, imitated (for reasons of flattery, and of taking on some of their external, 'rhetorical' color with a view to status). Moreover, it was particularly the nobility that had an (*ut ita dicam*) 'existential' need to adequately represent itself—and see itself represented—in public; as the historical evidence evinces (with Renaissance Italy, Elizabethan England, and Baroque Spain as particularly striking examples), dramatic works—conceived of as 'mirroring' life, the respective society—were exceptionally highly valued, and consequently tended to be lavishly subsidized; this would lead to a flourishing (even hypertrophy) of the rhetorico-verbal *ornatus* (in terms of *elocutio*), as well.

To return to the aspect of the nobility's mobility, one might hint at some particularly important cases—in addition to those everyone knows (the two Italian Medici, who became queens of France; the German princess that became tsarina). In the period in question, Spain's global empire was governed by a German dynasty, the Habsburgs, whose members were rapidly Romanized, creating a Latinized variant of Teutonic culture that is still extant today, and which differs from German culture overall, namely Austria. For this very reason, individual emperors such as Charles V (Carlos I of Spain)—emphatically reigning over 'an empire where the sun never sets' (as the saying went)—traveled all over and across Europe (due to wars, diets, treaties, administrative and judiciary duties, etc.), and with him veritable legions of courtiers, clerics, clerks, etc. At the

framework, within which these forms of mobility took place. For this reason, I label this highly mobile higher nobility 'European'. There does not seem to be a comparable set of data with regard to the marriage practices of Non-European dynasties; one reason might be that monogamy (if it existed notionally in the respective parts of the globe at all) was not practiced with the same rigor as under the rule of Christian morals. I am not aware of a well-documented case where a Chinese emperor would have proposed to a Japanese or Indian princess (or vice versa); and when such exogamy indeed occurred, it was an exception—and registered and treated as such: Alexander the Great's marriage to the 'barbarian' princess Roxane thoroughly scandalized his Greek compatriots. Yet the above is not concerned with the exceptions; for pan-European 'migration' is a normal and regular pattern of behavior within the European ruling class, historically traceable at least to a period around the year 1000 CE; and there is a *terminus ad quem* as well, for this practice disappeared with the shift of power from the aristocracy to the bourgeoisie. In constitutional monarchies, the waning of this mobile mode in marriage matters seems to be bound up with the complete loss of political power that occurred after World War II. Marriage practices in Europe's 'ruling' dynasties today typically follow the same 'Romantic' patterns that might apply to any other Western individual.

end of the period in question, the British invited a German prince to become their king (from the House of Hanover). Marie Antoinette, the last queen of pre-revolutionary France, was a Habsburg princess, the same as King Louis XIV's mother, Anne. Henry VIII's first wife, Catherine, was of Spanish origin; and so on. The transnationality of the ruling class was significantly greater during the ages of Feudalism and Absolutism, when compared to the period commencing with the French Revolution.

Regardless of their hardly 'tribal' self-description, all of these 'migrating', highly mobile princesses and princes were, of course, deeply imbued with their local origins, the 'national' cultures (tastes and education) of their countries of birth. When leaving their homeland, and typically without rendering problematic their mobility—without thinking or talking about 'hybridity' or 'internationalization'—they inevitably brought their cultural background (including their schooling) with them as part of their 'mental valise', 'unpacking' it in the places where they settled down. During the Early Modern period, a significant degree of cultural exchange is facilitated and promoted by this highly mobile, transnational ruling class. While it should be taken into account that such forms of circulation primarily affect artifacts as appeal to the social elite, a ruling class is able to maintain its position only if it has at its disposal effective techniques for controlling the *vulgus* (the 'masses', the common people). Accordingly, it seems likely that power techniques utilizing any form of 'culture'—and including such (virtual) artifacts as might target, and be deliberately aimed at, a non-elite audience—will have circulated via the same aristocratic (physical and virtual) networks qua routes of exchange; specifically, the respective *modi* and *artificia* would also comprise various semiotic (verbal) forms of public relations and manipulation—including manifold types of self-representation (also, and *par excellence*, in and via plays), as well as politico-rhetorical manuals, such as the widely circulated (and translated, reproduced and reprinted) 'mirrors for princes'.[21]

21 That peculiar manual on the part of the arch-sophist and -rhetorician of the Early Modern Age (sc. Machiavelli) spread most rapidly all over Europe; and to such an extent that e.g. the (politically motivated) rumor intimating that Catherine de' Medici had brought *The Prince* to France, applying it in the St. Bartholomew's Day massacre, seems to have been utterly plausible from the viewpoint of certain or many contemporaries. At the (apparently) other end of the ethical spectrum, one might also mention Castiglione's highly rhetorical (in terms of its content) and rhetoricized (as to its form) *Il Cortegiano*; this might pertain to what one could call a 'rhetoric of comportment' (the ties with the respective tradition being specifically localizable in the term '*decorum*', as well as associated areas).

Scholars

The third agency of 'transculturation' one will have to draw attention to—and one particularly relevant for both rhetoric and drama, as well as their nexus—is the decidedly pan-European community of scholars, often referred to as the *res publica litteraria*.[22] Rather than the vernaculars, their common language was the *lingua franca* Latin. Already in Medieval times, but certainly during the period in question, the institutions of higher education—mainly universities, but colleges as well—displayed a homogeneity of organization that by far exceeds what has been attained today, in this (so-called) age of 'globalization'. During the Early Modern Age, the biographies of eminent humanists, scientists, and artists—including architects, (military) engineers and inventors, the same as painters or sculptors—evince an often strikingly high mobility and transnationality. Having been a student in Bologna, to then accept a position in Paris or Oxford, while ending one's life as a professor in Prague, Heidelberg, or Wittenberg, was hardly unusual during that period. Naturally, the main reason for these and comparable constellations was that, in terms of its self-conception, (humanistic) scholarship and the emerging natural sciences thought of themselves as universal (it is not without reason that we still call the respective institutions 'universities'). In particular, the *studia humanitatis* were not concerned with contemporary phenomena; the study of literary texts written in the various vernaculars acceded to the status of university disciplines only in the first half of the nineteenth century. The Early Modern humanities were directed at the patrimony shared by all European 'nations': the two Classical languages and the latter's systems of diction (both grammar and rhetoric), as well as Christian theology and Greek philosophy (particularly dialectic). There was absolutely no reason during that age to conceive of a particularly British or French style for performing the *studia humanitatis*. There were no (significant) differences as to the material studied, nor as to the devices whereby it was studied (dialectic and rhetoric, but also grammar, via *Scriptural* and Ancient *exempla* textually preserved). As stated already, the homogeneity was facilitated by the existence of an academic *lingua franca* (Latin), as well as by a structurally standardized *cursus* (here specifically: the Medieval *trivium* of grammar, dialectic, and rhetoric) that, in variations, persisted well into Early Modern times.

In terms of spatial and social reach, the vehicular effects produced by the aforesaid, highly mobile scholars were more limited than those produced by the Roman Church, for the same reasons mentioned with regard to the nobility. This

22 Thereto, see Bloemendal's contribution in this volume.

limitation is balanced by the fact that people living in the ivory tower tended to be the educators of the younger generation at the time—not in its entirety, but certainly of all those who, later in their lives, would be socially placed to have a significant influence on cultural production. The relatively standardized system of rhetoric here served as one crucial vehicle, seeing that its terms and structures were, on the whole, being taught in a comparable fashion, and were generally being applied in a recognizable manner throughout all disciplines, regardless of the specific local, vernacular, and even denominational background. To précis the above: while the recipients of what scholars transported in their 'mental valise' are thus restricted in quantity, the role and prestige of academics as active means and facilitators of the vehiculation of cultural material cannot be underestimated. Naturally, the latter remark holds true for the nobility, as well.[23]

Academies

As regards literary culture in particular, one important institution 'propelling a floatation of material in the virtual network of culture' in the age under scrutiny are the academies proper. They first came up in Cinquecento Italy, as a vague or suggestive imitation of the Classical Greek academies established by Plato or Aristotle. In Renaissance Italy, their primary task was to incite their members to produce literary texts also in the vernacular, to discuss the respective drafts in manuscript form, and then to improve the texts before they were widely circulated in print. The academies provided an institutionalized 'infrastructure' for cultural production; again, the system of (particularly Ciceronian) rhetoric proved vital, both as a standard blueprint for the corresponding poetics, and as a system providing certain hermeneutic tools for decoding the respective productions. Moreover, if individuals within the academies shared a 'style', it was the rhetorical (or rhetoricized) dialog or (Humanistic) *disputatio*; in other words: in the form of going about their 'business', they did not differ, whatever their content-related differences may have been.

It was not only the 'output' of these institutions that circulated beyond the borders of particular vernaculars or (geo-)political regions, but also the abstract idea underlying such institutions. Only roughly seven decades after their emergence in Italy, one may observe the rather sudden flourishing of a number

23 As may be observed in the case of Russia, one single princess from abroad who succeeds in ascending to the throne—as Catherine the Great—might change the cultural map of her host country in a most dramatic way.

of academies in Spain—a country closely linked to parts of (present-day) Italy by political (during the age in question: by dynastic) bonds—followed by the establishment of what, to this very day, is the most famous academy of all times, the *Académie française* (1635).[24] It will not be necessary here to demonstrate the scope of the influence that the French academy had on the country's cultural production. The latter case immediately renders patent that these institutions simultaneously served as sites of a particularly intense and systematic circulation and resynthesizing of cultural material, and also as instances controlling the output from at least three, closely intertwined points of view: the aesthetic, moral, and political perspective. In that sense, academies differed from the other aforesaid agencies (specifically: the Church, the nobility, individual scholars): for it is hardly possible to overestimate their role as an institutionalized site of (programmatically) intense production based on exchange and transfer—which is basically neutral to the material absorbed, and then resubmitted to an ongoing circulation. At the same time, the difference is a qualitative one: since academies tended to be strictly linked to the political sphere, they also served as instruments defining 'national' borders in terms of culture. This said, the quantitative aspect seems to be the more important one: from the age of the academies onward, cultural production—at least in Europe—is transformed from what was typically a random or commissioned (patron-induced), that is, occasional process (of writing, painting, composing) into intentional processes of systematic production. In terms of both quantity and quality, the invention of such institutionalized knots or nodes marks a decisive threshold with regard to the productivity and mobility within the cultural net.

During the age of Romanticism and after, the traditional academies lost their influence, being judged places where ingenuity is repressed by formal and aesthetic 'rules', as well as by the principle of authority. Even so, the abstract concept of institutionalized infrastructures for cultural circulation and production persists. Such institutions take on a more flexible shape, which might, at times, veil the fact that they are institutions—meaning, rather restricted circles of human beings working together according to relatively strict rules, and with (more or less) well-defined goals or purposes. This would apply to literary or cultural festivals, to the ramified systems attributing (cultural, including literary, scholarly) prizes and awards, etc.

The possible consequences of the remodeling of the 'original' Italian version of the academies qua institutions under Spanish and French auspices is a

24 See the detailed studies by Gvozdeva (passim) and Bung (passim).

separate question, and cannot be discussed in detail.[25] To illustrate the point in question with one sentence: the highly centralized French variant—one sole academy, controlled by the King and his acting 'prime minister'—differs dramatically, both from the polycentric Italian pattern and from the even more 'fluid' shape the concept of such '*academias*' took on in Spain. In accordance with this state of affairs, there is a rather clear-cut idea of what 'French' literary culture is or means, while there hardly is such a representative concept—rendering conceivable the encapsulation of the 'entire' cultural production of the country in question—in the cases of Italy, or (and even more so) of Spain and Germany.

The Jewish Population

The fifth agency of transculturation to be mentioned is the Jewish population of that age.[26] Historically, it was their fate to live under diasporic conditions. From an external perspective, the combination of a strongly particularistic self-description (meaning, cohesion) and enforced de-autochthonization led to a situation that rendered the European Jewry a very powerful instrument of transnational cultural exchange. Even most dire events, such as persecution and expulsion (of the English Jewry after 1290, of the French Jewry after 1306, of the Rhineland Jews in the course of the crusades, of the Spanish Jewry after 1492) may have had remarkable long-term effects—from the viewpoint of a conception of culture as a process of ongoing floatation regardless of 'national' borders. It was only the emancipation of Jewish people from their status as second-class citizens, as well as their ensuing assimilation into the various national cultures of Europe, which may have reduced (while not annihilated) their role as active (and partially inadvertent) instruments of transnational cultural floating processes.[27]

---

25 These and other relevant questions are discussed within the framework of the aforementioned studies by Gvozdeva and Bung.

26 Relevant information may be gathered from Ruderman (passim).

27 In a way, this process was inverted by the fact that Nazi Germany coerced people of Jewish origin into returning to tribalism. The survivors of the holocaust are much less committed to the 'national' cultures of their (European) countries of residence than, say, French or German Jews had been before 1933; for the latter often conceived of themselves as 'patriots', that is, as citizens not only in legal terms, but also as emotionally committed to their country. After the Shoah and until today, people of Jewish origin have become what are perhaps the most active and engaged human agents of cultural exchange. Their commitment to the culture of their respective country

Tying in with the above paragraph, this may seem to be the appropriate place to insert a brief excursus discussing the intricate question of 'negative' variants of mobility, including cultural ones. As problematic, even devastating, as such enforced mobility is likely to have been for the individual human beings involved—from the perspective of cultural history, one will have to state that even forms of mobility caused by physical enforcement tend to have far-reaching repercussions on cultural history. One decisive example from Occidental history would be the 'floating' of Classical Greek philosophy, and specifically the work(s) of Aristotle, from the Eastern Mediterranean to the Christian West, which took place along with the Muslim conquest of Northern Africa and the Iberian Peninsula—events which were certainly bellicose and most aggressive. Cultural transfer caused by violent expulsion would, for instance, be represented by the events occurring at the end of this 'chapter' of Mediterranean religious history; for the very year of the definitive Christian *reconquista* of the Iberian Peninsula was also that of achieving an 'intra-religious' homogenization—by expelling Spanish Jews from the country. In their enforced flight to places such as Antwerp, Amsterdam, Bordeaux, or Hamburg, they took with them the entire cultural material available on the Iberian Peninsula—including the material the Muslim conquerors had brought with them several centuries before.

Accordingly, one might ask, whether cultural circulation is always a 'good thing'. The experience of 21st century intellectuals—as being always 'on the move'—may very well lead to such an assumption. Yet (formerly) colonized communities might have a very different view of such processes. At the same time, it may indeed be the case that—after many generations—the descendants of the colonized ultimately deem positive the processes of cultural transfer accompanying even events as violent as war and subjugation: that is, as an evolution, which brought the achievements of 'modernity' to their communities. Basically, the above question cannot be answered, at least not within a scholarly framework. It may be that a world populated by small, self-sufficient, isolated communities—a Rousseauist world, a world without a comprehensive cultural net—would be experienced as an idyll. At the same time, it may very well be that

(in terms of citizenship) seems to be less 'deeply rooted' than it had been during the period from the emancipation to the middle of the 20th century; at the same time, their commitment to the faith of their ancestors may have become somewhat less intense, as is the case with regard to (nominally) Christian Westerners. These two parameters provide for a framework of intellectual mobility that may very well be higher than in the case of people with other cultural backgrounds. As a (necessary) supplement to this observation, one should highlight that Israel, the nation state established by the survivor generation, may be considered a sort of laboratory of highly intense cultural exchange—as an (approximate) miniature version of the global cultural net.

such a world (if in fact established) would be considered a consummate prison, or even an earthly variant of hell. Perhaps one need not shy away from at least posing the question, whether the circulation of Greco-Roman and Christian culture from the Mediterranean to Northern Europe (a circulation propelled and mediated by war and conquest) was a catastrophe—or actually a blessing; nor from the complementary query, whether present-day Europeans and North Americans would have a more blissful life, had they preserved their identity and continued to pray to Woden and Thor, and to live in the woods; or indeed, whether 'happiness' may be a viable measure for such inquiries at all. Be that as it may: the net is a fact, the same as progress.[28] The theories and hypotheses at hand aim at being descriptive; their evaluation is left to the respective reader.

Trade, Merchants, and Incidental Transfer

At this point, it is also necessary to mention agencies factually facilitating or enacting a systematic cultural transfer and circulation of the respective material, while this very process was an inadvertent, accompanying, accidental, even unexpected side effect of other ventures and endeavors. Undoubtedly, the British East India Company will be one of the most prominent examples in this respect. Its activities consisted in economic exploitation based on previous physical conquest and political subjugation.

Another example for such an agency of incidental cultural transfer—which, in contrast to the East India Company, was relatively free from the more violent forms of hegemonic endeavors—was the *Deutsche Hanse*. The organization known by this name was a league of German cities, whose economic activities mainly consisted in trading—the largest one being Hamburg, which continues to refer to itself as *Freie und Hanse-Stadt Hamburg*. Like the latter, almost all of the respective towns were harbor cities: Bremen, Lübeck, Greifswald, Rostock, to only name the most important ones. The 'commercial net(work)' these cities were beginning to set up, and to continually expand, from the 12th century onward is important for the aspects and phenomena here discussed, insofar as it expressly intended to go beyond the temporary or transitory contacts typically accompanying commercial exchange. All over Northern and Eastern Europe, including places such as Nizhny Novgorod, the *Hanse* established small outposts of German merchants; the latter ascertained the manufactured goods that might

28 For a more detailed discussion of this intricate question, see Küpper ("Some Remarks on World Literature" passim).

be needed in the hosting cities, informed their partners residing in the towns of the *Hanse* league, later welcomed the incoming ships, accommodated their crews, and sold the goods to the locals, whose language and habits they had learnt. Economically, the *Hanse* was so successful that it established the basis for the fact that the largest member of its league, Hamburg, is still the wealthiest community in continental Europe.

The specificity of the 'colonies' mentioned is that they were governed by a legal status that became obsolete in Europe with the era of the democratic revolutions, but which we can trace back to Ancient Greece. It was widespread during the European Middle Ages, as well as in Early Modern times. It is still used in many Islamic countries until today, there referred to as '*dhimma*'. The Greek term is 'metic'—in its original spelling: '*métoikos*', a person who moved ('*met-*') his household ('*oikos*'). The concept's implication is the archaic notion that one's home should typically be located in one's place of birth. Metics were the exception to this rule; they were permitted to reside in cities where they had not been born—such as Spartans in Athens. While permitted to engage in craftsmanship and trade, they were not given citizenship, not even as second- or third-generation residents. They had no 'rights', only 'privileges'—that is, guarantees, unilaterally conceded, which could be revoked at any time. They were obliged to pay a considerable surtax. When committing crimes, they were severely punished; if citizens proper perpetrated crimes against them, the consequences were not all that grave. In a nutshell: their situation was far from comfortable. Having no other choice, or incited with a view to an economic advantage to be gained, it seems as though they accepted this state of affairs; as did the diasporic Jews in Europe, prior to the era of emancipation: for they lived under the exact same legal status—as Christians and Jews residing in territories conquered by Islamic powers did, and sometimes still do. In this context, the important point is that the status of metic implied that there was no pressure, not even an invitation or expectation, to assimilate to the respective autochthonous culture. In terms of cultural patterns, Spartan *métoikoi* remained Spartans, as German *Hanse* merchants remained Germans, or pre-emancipation Jews remained Jews, etc. At the same time, the (typically economic) necessity to interact with the locals caused metics to develop the corresponding skills—including those pertaining to the locally customary semiotic systems. As a consequence, they were able to communicate in two different cultural frameworks, whereby they turned into prototypical agents of cultural transfer incidentally, and usually inadvertently. The men of the *Hanse* paved the way for a phenomenon of on-going virulence: the high receptivity of Eastern Europe concerning all kinds of cultural items of German origin. This applies even today.

The atrocities committed during the Nazi era notwithstanding, the German language, culture, and, along with them, manufactured goods, have a greater importance and standing in post-Soviet Eastern Europe than in any other territory of the world—including Germany's Western partners within the European Union.

Applicability Beyond Europe

It remains an open question, transcending both the geographical and the historical boundaries of this essay, whether or not there are comparable transnational agencies in other parts of the world and at other times. Some selected remarks will have to do, in this regard.

As already mentioned, universalistic ideologies—whether religious or secular—seem to be powerful agents with regard to promoting the floating of cultural material. In addition to the Roman Church, one would have to consider the role of the *umma*—that is, the community of those who pray to Allah. In countries far removed from its territory of emergence—such as Indonesia, or (sub-Saharan) West-Africa—one may observe its activities as an agency of cultural transfer. For reasons of disciplinary competence, I shall leave it at the following speculations concerning a consideration of the cultural impact of Christian and Muslim religions in a comparative perspective. One relevant point that indeed requires being discussed is the virtually complete rejection of staged performances in traditional Islam. The type of drama qua mass media, which emerged in Western Europe during the age under scrutiny here, simply does not exist in (traditional) Islamic societies. In that sense, one might hypothesize that Islam as an agency of cultural transfer is primarily dedicated to its faith and related religious practices, while its contribution to a spreading of more secular cultural practices and items is comparatively limited, at least in this specific era. By contrast, it might be noted that the Roman Church exported the religious drama created in Spain (the *auto sacramental*), as well as its Jesuit analogs, to the 'exotic' places mentioned above. Seeing that, in terms of form and structure, these post-Renaissance didactic plays were heavily influenced both by the system of rhetoric, and by Humanistic (Aristotelian) principles of composition, this process may also have paved the way for the subsequent reception of secular European drama in the respective regions.

On the other hand, one should not discard the fact that, after Antiquity, the philosophical basis of the West was laid by the reception of an *œuvre*, which probably would have remained unknown in the Christian Occident (at least until the fall of Constantinople) had not the highly cultivated Muslim conquerors of Northern Africa and the Iberian Peninsula carried it with them, along with their

weapons, and then established it in the conquered territories—quite the same as their faith, their mosques, their medical practice, etc. Military conquests driven by nothing but material greed might encompass a certain cultural transfer, as well (one might adduce the case of the Mongol tribes, who, from the 13th century on and under their leader Genghis Khan, had begun to expand their areas of influence from central Asia to the entire region later known as the Ottoman Empire). Typically, however, such does not go along with a systematic *translatio studii*, in contrast to cases of military conquests fueled by universalistic ideologies. Yet with respect to the question of Islam as an agency of secular cultural transfer, the transmission of the Aristotelian corpus might be a singular case.[29]

Outlook: Early Modern Times and the 21st Century

With regard to secular universalism as a catalyst of floating processes in the cultural net, one would have to take into consideration the concept of 'human rights', and the pretension of the political model of democracy to universal applicability and expediency. It might be superfluous to comment on the cultural side effects of modern universalistic ideologies, since they are potentially open to everyone's view each day, when watching the news. There is literally no Western military endeavor that is not immediately followed by massive attempts at implementing—in the respective conquered or 'freed' territories—structures, rules, and narratives, whose main or even sole task is to facilitate and then propel the unrestricted floating of cultural material from the Western metropolises to the regions thus 'integrated' (or 're-integrated') into the 'universal' net, a process decidedly aided by the respective rhetorical techniques in public relations and global(ized) corporate 'mission statements'.

One might inquire as to what may have changed over the course of the centuries separating our day from the Early Modern age. The role of the Christian Churches for contemporary circulating processes concerning cultural material has diminished drastically, which is in line with their general loss of influence.

29 This point raises many questions difficult to answer in a non-speculative way; even if it were true that the leading Arabic Aristotelians had been converted Jews, there still remains the question of why the religious authorities tolerated their activities. A tenable suggestion or observation in this respect might be the following: Islam does not need a concept such as Original Sin; consequently, an unrestrictedly positive evaluation of abstract reason is possible, at least in principle; the case is different, the more the level of abstraction is lowered.

As a transnational ruling class, the higher aristocracy has vanished.[30] For the abovementioned reasons, the importance of people of Jewish origin as agents of ensuring a floatation of the material in the net may have increased even. The transnational community of scholars and artists is still of great importance. At the same time, it must remain an open question (at least for now), whether or not the community of scholars will manage to recover from the blow to its transnationality inflicted by the age of 'national cultures'.

Certain agencies of transculturation did not emerge until Modernity proper. Of course, the most important one is the (visual) media industry (radio, film, television, the internet), which did not begin to deploy its revolutionary activities until the 20th century. Global capitalism is said to have reached its state of maturity during the last decades. This economic model is a relevant factor, also in the sphere of culture and cultural goods or commodities—and not only since the age of Imperialism (the second half of the 19th century); for its early stages may be traced back to Antiquity. When taking the epithet 'global' literally, it is, of course, a phenomenon that emerges with the beginning of the 20th century. It may very well be the case that the evaporation of a shared concept(ion) of rhetoric—which occurred during the age of Nationalism, and along with the respective consolidation of (apparently) 'national cultures'—has already been superseded in our time by a transnational (and trans-European) 'semiotico-rhetorical' system, whose main mediating basis will no longer be language, but visually encoded patterns.[31]

Within the framework of the essay at hand, these more recent agencies cannot be discussed in detail. As far as cultural transfer is concerned, one might

30 Present-day heirs to the throne typically marry women (or men) from their own country; in order to avoid frictions with their peers, they sidestep the members of their country's aristocracy. The concept of 'dynastic bonds' beyond particular borders, and utilized as a political tool, has evaporated along with the complete loss of effective power on the part of the 'Royals'. Their status is that of common 'high-profile individuals'. In order to preserve this status, they are obliged to fulfill the needs of the readers of the yellow press. For a girl or a young man working as a hairdresser, it is easier to fantasize about being a journalist or a fitness instructor of their own country, than to be some snobbish aristocrat from abroad.

31 This observation is not meant in a strictly dichotomic way; the actual performance of the speech on the rhetorician's part—that is, a form of visual encoding—has always been a component of rhetoric. Present-day global mass media rely not only on visual codes, but also make use of language, of course (albeit in a way that is rather reduced, at least from the standpoint of a person educated before the 'iconic turn'). Still, the relative weight of linguistic and visual mediation seems to have been inverted. This said, the formal standardization ('rhetoricization') of visual encoding in today's globally distributed motion pictures seems to be no less strict than the standardization of verbal patterns had been during the age(s) of rhetoric.

say that their activities do not differ from the pursuits of their predecessors in terms of quality (for instance: printing companies, Medieval *scriptoria* copying manuscripts; traders, associations of traders, trading companies). The difference is (evidently) in quantity, and the future will tell whether or not the exponential increase of cultural material distributed via the internet will bring about qualitative change as well—meaning, a change, to which the above description (concerning the processes of cultural floatation in the past) might no longer apply.

Bibliography

Burckhardt, Jacob. *Weltgeschichtliche Betrachtungen*. Ed. Rudolf Marx. Stuttgart: Kröner, 1978. Print.

Bung, Stephanie. "Playful Institutions. Social and Textual Practices in Early Spanish Academies". *Poetics and Politics. Net Structures and Agencies in Early Modern Drama*. Eds. Toni Bernhart, Jaša Drnovšek, Sven Thorsten Kilian, Joachim Küpper, and Jan Mosch. Berlin: de Gruyter, forthcoming [2017]. Print.

Drnovšek, Jaša. "Frühneuzeitliche Passionsprozessionsspiele als Projekt der katholischen Erneuerung.". *Themes of Polemical Theology Across Early Modern Literary Genres*. Eds. Svorad Zavarský, Lucy R. Nicholas, and Andrea Riedl. Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2016. 321–333. Print.

Fothergill-Payne, Louise. "The Jesuits as Masters of Rhetoric and Drama". *Revista Canadiense de Estudios Hispánicos* 10.3 (Spring: 1986): 375–387. Print.

Gvozdeva, Katja. "Le monde ludique des académies italiennes: l'exemple des Intronati de Sienne". *Savoirs ludiques. Pratiques de divertissement et institutions savantes, littéraires et politiques dans l'Europe moderne*. Eds. Katja Gvozdeva, Alexandre Stroev, and Louise Millon. Paris: Champion, 2014. 49–88. Print.

Knox, Dilwyn. "Order, Reason and Oratory: Rhetoric in Protestant Latin Schools". *Renaissance Rhetoric*. Ed. Peter Mack. New York, NY: St. Martin's P, 1994. 63–80. Print.

Küpper, Joachim. "Christentum, Judentum, Islam – Säkulare Welt und Geschichtlichkeit". *Heilige Texte. Religion und Rationalität*. Eds. Andreas Kablitz and Christoph Markschies. *Geisteswissenschaftliches Colloquium*. 1. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013. 141–166. Print.

—. *Diskurs-Renovatio bei Lope de Vega und Calderón. Untersuchungen zum spanischen Barockdrama. Mit einer Skizze zur Evolution der Diskurse in Mittelalter, Renaissance und Manierismus. Romanica Monacensia*. 32. Tübingen: Narr, 1990. Print.

—. "Jesuitismus und Manierismus in Graciáns *Oráculo manual*". *Romanistisches Jahrbuch* 58 (2007): 412–442. Print.

—. "Some Remarks on World Literature". *Approaches to World Literature*. Ed. Joachim Küpper. *WeltLiteraturen / World Literatures*. 1. Eds. Irmela Hijiya-Kirschnereit, Stefan Keppler-Tasaki, and Joachim Küpper. Berlin: Akademie, 2013. 167–176. Print.

Ruderman, David B. *Early Modern Jewry: A New Cultural History*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2010. Print.

Appendix

Bernhard Asmuth

Drama

Drama (Greek ‘δρᾶμα’, ‘drama’; Latin ‘fabula (scaenica)’, less often ‘drama’; English ‘drama’, French ‘drame’, Italian ‘dramma’)

A. I. *Definition*. – **II.** *Word History*. – **III.** *Rhetoric and Drama*. **B. I.** *Antiquity*. – **II.** *The Middle Ages*. – **III.** *Renaissance, Baroque*. – **IV.** *The Enlightenment and After*.

A. I. *Definition*. ‘Drama’ is taken to signify a literary work intended for performance, [and] typically in dialogic form, which used to be called ‘Wechselrede’ [sc. ‘to speak in turns’]. In this sense, ‘drama’ serves as the designation for one of the three literary genres (along with epic and lyric poetry). In the narrower sense, ‘drama’ (the same as ‘Schauspiel’ [sc. ‘play, theatrical performance’]) was a form of stage play situated between tragedy and comedy in

Asmuth, Bernhard. “Drama”. *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik. Band 2: Bie–Eul*. Ed. Gert Ueding. *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*. 2. Ed. Gert Ueding. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1994. 905–921. Print.

Translator’s note: the present chapter translates the 1994 entry “Drama” in the *Historical Dictionary of Rhetoric* verbatim and without changes, with these exceptions: abbreviations customary in a lexicon are spelled out in this English version; particular lexemes are given in inverted commas (e.g. ‘drama’); n-dashes are replaced by m-dashes in the text proper (apart from the outline); other insertions are given in brackets (with the exception of punctuation marks as a result of English syntax, here mainly adverbial commas); unless indicated, all emphases (italics, bold type) are retained exactly as in the original, and none are added (unless indicated); the initial outline has been reformatted to correspond to the formatting in the text proper; all endnotes in the original are converted into footnotes in the translation, and numbered sequentially; the ‘further reading’ segment is transferred into a footnote concluding the respective section; the citational style of the *Historical Dictionary of Rhetoric* has been retained for this version, and only for this chapter in the volume *Rhetoric and Drama*; abbreviated cross-references within the individual footnotes are replaced by repeating the respective title; customary English abbreviations (cf., ch., Vol.) are used in the footnotes; (Ancient) historical proper names and works (e.g. Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*) are Anglicized throughout; for reasons of internal coherence with regard to Asmuth’s argument, citations from German versions of Classical (or later) texts are exactly translated from their German version, rather than replaced by standard English equivalents; where pertinent, original German quotes are adduced in the respective footnotes; all translations are by DS Mayfield, FU Berlin, 2016.

Bernhard Asmuth, Universität Bochum (Author)
DS Mayfield, Freie Universität Berlin (Translator)

the late 18th and during the 19th century. While the term 'drama' is not customary in these cases, the [ensuing are] numbered among dramatic forms in a wider sense[:] 'music drama' (opera, operetta, Singspiel [sc. light musical, operatic comedy], musical), which had attained to an autonomous existence apart from spoken drama since the 17th century[;] moreover, puppet shows and the dramatic forms [pertaining to the] media of the 20th century (radio drama, sound film, television play)[; and], to some extent, also staged theatrical forms without language (pantomime, ballet, silent movies).

To this day, the conception of 'drama' is guided by the six qualitative elements, which ARISTOTLE[1] deemed essential for *tragedy*: μύθος, mýthos (action); ἤθη, ēthē (characters, singular: ἦθος, ēthos); λέξις, léxis (speech, language); διάνοια, diánoia (thought, 'sententia',[2] 'intention',[3] 'cognitive faculty'[4]); ὄψις, ópsis (view, setting); μελοποιία, melopoiía (song, music). Considering that ēthē and diánoia may be seen as pertaining to the action, and that, with the exception of Ancient tragedy, music may be absent, the remaining fundamental elements are[:] action, dialog or (when including monolog and monodrama) individual [(in)direct] speech acts, and—as partial elements of ópsis—visual performance, as well as role-playing, which Aristotle does not treat separately. With these [elements], 'drama' may be defined as an 'acted, spoken, staged play'.[5]

II. *Word History*. In Greece, the term 'drama' is attested since the 5th century BCE, in the rare sense of 'deed' already in AESCHYLUS,[6] in the predominant meaning of 'stage play' first in HERODOTUS.[7] It is in this sense that the records concerning dramatic performances use it [sc. the term 'drama'] from the outset,[8] the same as, later, the *Hypotheseis* originating with ARISTOPHANES OF BYZANTIUM around 220 BCE, [which are] abstracts, initially primarily of the texts by tragedians.[9] Lists indicating personae appear "wherever recorded, with the caption τὰ τοῦ

1 Aristotle: Poetics 6.

2 J. C. Scaliger: Poetices libri septem (Lyon 1561; reprint 1964, 1987) 18.

3 O. Gigon, in: Aristoteles: Poetik (1961) 31.

4 M. Fuhrmann: Nachwort zu: Aristoteles: Poetik (1982) 21. 110f.

5 'Handlungs-sprech-schau-spiel'; cf. B. Asmuth: Einführung in die Dramenanalyse (1980, [3]1990, [[8]2016]) 3–14.

6 Aeschylus: Agamemnon 533.

7 Cf. B. Snell: Aischylos und das Handeln im Drama (1928) 4f.; H. Schreckenberg: ΔΡΑΜΑ (Drama). Vom Werden der griechischen Tragödie aus dem Tanz (1960) 89.

8 Der Kleine Pauly, Vol. 2 (1975, reprint 1979) 160.

9 Der Kleine Pauly, Vol. 2 (1975, reprint 1979) 160f.; Paulys Realenzyklopädie, Vol. 9, 414ff.

δράματος πρόσωπα [tà toũ drámatos prósōpa]'[10], Latin 'dramatis personae'. In terms of conceptual history, the most important instance is chapter 3 of Aristotle's 'Poetics'[,] where he remarks that both SOPHOCLES (in tragedies) and ARISTOPHANES (in comedies) represent individuals in action. "For this reason, as some believe, their works are called 'dramas': for they indeed represent [persons] engaging in activities ('*drōntes*', from '*drān*')".[11] From this perspective, 'drama' initially means action. Moreover, Aristotle acknowledges HOMER's "dramatic" quality, insisting even that epic poetry should generally be "dramatic".[12] "The 'dramatic' [as such] results from the unity of action", as Fuhrmann explains.[13]

There are indications for a more primal understanding of 'drama', already submerged in Aristotle. As Schreckenberg shows, the verb 'δρᾶν' originally denoted a manual, and then a physical activity in general, that is, a [form of] 'handling' [something].[14] (Consequently, '*Handeln*' [sc. 'to act', 'action'] is a felicitous translation). At first, the noun 'drama' had not denoted the action represented on a stage, but—quite like *mimesis*, initially[15]—the histrionic activity [as such], more precisely, the pantomimic representation of a role as part of the masked dance pertaining to the cult of Dionysus. Song and spoken text were added later, whereby 'drama' took on the meaning conveyed by Aristotle.[16]

For a long time, the further development of dramatic theory bypassed the noun 'drama'. HORACE speaks of "scaena",[17] "fabula",[18] "actus".[19] Following the Latin grammarian DIOMEDES GRAMMATICUS (4th century CE), one referred to the "genus dramaticum",[20] to dramatic literature or [dramatic] poesy, to the dramatic art of poetry (also in the sense of a poetics of drama), [and] termed the individual work a "dramatic poem". LESSING still subtitled his 'Nathan' thus, [the same as] SCHILLER the 'Don Carlos'. Sporadically, [the term] 'drama' with Latin inflection

10 Der Kleine Pauly, Vol. 2 (1975, reprint 1979) 161.

11 Aristotle: Poetics (trans. by M. Fuhrmann 1982) 3.

12 Aristotle: Poetics (trans. by M. Fuhrmann 1982) chs. 4 and 23.

13 Aristotle: Poetics (trans. by M. Fuhrmann 1982) 132.

14 Schreckenberg: ΔPAMA (Drama). Vom Werden der griechischen Tragödie aus dem Tanz (1960) 1–12.

15 H. Koller: Die Mimesis in der Antike (Bern 1954) 119–121.

16 Schreckenberg: ΔPAMA (Drama). Vom Werden der griechischen Tragödie aus dem Tanz (1960) 89ff.

17 Horace: Ars poetica 125. 179. 183.

18 Horace: Ars poetica 190.

19 Horace: Ars poetica 130. 189.

20 Cf. E. R. Curtius: Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter. (^{3}1961) 438f.; K. R. Scherpe: Gattungspoetik im 18. Jahrhundert (1968) 11f.

may already be encountered in the 17th century, as in ROTTH, who follows MASEN.[21] Yet it was not until BATTEUX established the generic system of lyric, epic, and dramatic poetry,[22] which Goethe later called "natural forms of poesy",[23] that 'drama'—the same as the new words '*Lyrik*' [sc. 'lyric poetry'] ([1773 and] 1776 in G. A. BÜRGER)[24] and '*Epik*' [sc. 'epic poetry']—developed into a leading concept. In contrast to '*Schauspiel*' [sc. (stage) play], which had been adopted previously ([in the] 16th century), and '*Theater*' or '*(Theater-)Stück*' ([during the] early 18th century), 'drama' primarily denotes the literary text in its written form, not so much the theatrical performance. SULZER distinguishes [a] 'drama' from "the stage play ['Schauspiel'], for which it serves".[25] For [the year] 1763, the word 'drama' is recorded in ABBT,[26] in GERSTENBERG [for the year] 1766/67 ("away with the classification of drama!").[27] In 1773, HERDER employs it with the same genitive, as well as with the plural "Drama's".[28] SULZER notes: "One is already accustomed to refer to a poem crafted for a factual [and effectual: 'würkliche'] representation of an action by [way of] the Greek word ['drama['] ([sc.] an action)".[29] The catalyst seems to have been Lessing, [who was] influenced by DIDEROT. For the latter's treatise 'De la Poésie dramatique' (1758), he [sc. Lessing] published a translation in 1760,[30] in which the word 'drama' appears frequently, several times also in chapter headings. In Lessing's own writings, it is encountered from 1759 on.[31]

III. *Rhetoric and Drama*. As to the relationship of rhetoric and drama, there are individual, historical studies. A general rhetoric of drama is wanting, although

21 A. C. Rotth: Vollständige Deutsche Poesie (1688) 134, 139f., partial reprint in: M. Szyrocki (Ed.): Poetik des Barock (1977) 184, 187f.

22 Cf. Scherpe Gattungspoetik im 18. Jahrhundert (1968) 64ff.

23 "Naturformen der Poesie"; Goethe: Noten und Abhandlungen zu besserem Verständnis des west-östlichen Divans (1819). Hamburger Ausgabe, Vol. 2, 187.

24 [Thereto, see also Asmuth: Lyrik, in: Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik. Vol. 5: L–Musi. Ed. G. Ueding (2001) 693f.].

25 J. G. Sulzer: Allgemeine Theorie der Schönen Künste, part 1 (1773) 369.

26 F. Kluge: Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache ([18]1960) 141.

27 H. W. Gerstenberg: Briefe über Merkwürdigkeiten der Litteratur, 14. Brief. Partial reprint in H. Blinn: Shakespeare-Rezeption I (1982) 77f.

28 J. G. Herder: Shakespear. Sämtliche Werke, ed. by B. Suphan, Vol. 5 (1891) 208ff.; Blinn: Shakespeare-Rezeption I (1982) 105ff.

29 Sulzer: Allgemeine Theorie der Schönen Künste, part 1 (1773) 365.

30 D. Diderot, G. E. Lessing: Das Theater des Herrn Diderot, trans. by G. E. Lessing, ed. by K.-D. Müller (1986) 283ff.

31 Lessing: Werke, ed. by H. G. Göpfert, Vol. 5 (1973) 184 (= 51. Literaturbrief). 376 (= Abhandlung über die Fabel I).

drama depends on speech to a greater degree than other [forms of] literature. In drama, rhetoric presents itself differently than in other cases. Features of the standard art of speaking (long monologs, targeted at an aim of persuasion, [tendered in an] effectual verbal form) forego their prevalence and [particular] nexus, [while being] distributed to several persons (characters, actors, author) and interests.

In particular, the following *specific features* emerge: 1) typically, a drama's action is not limited to a continuous situation, as is the case in an oration. It extends over a longer period of time, with changing characters and settings. 2) Accordingly, it is not [just] one [person], who speaks for a long time. Several characters make utterances, frequently, and mostly briefly. 3) It is not excluded that one interested party would aim at persuading the other, or both each other, but [this is] not characteristic throughout. Apart from targeted 'rhetorical' speech, there are light conversations, which do not [immediately] pursue purposive effects. 4) The personae do not act in their own right, but as characters [devised] by the author. A typically indirect communication between author and audience superposes their dialog. Ultimately, the author's aims with a view to the audience are more important than the intentions of the characters. 5) Supplementing the rhetoric established in the dialogic text, the actor's rhetoric—in terms of articulation, facial and gestural expressions—comes into play.

The following will chiefly consider textual rhetoric, [seeing that] the rhetoric of performance is less well documented. Along therewith, a focus will be on theoretical connections between dramatic poetics and rhetoric.

B. 1. *Antiquity*. Speech in drama is as old as tragedy. Supplementing the choral song customary until that point in time, it emerged in Athens around 534 BCE, during the feast of Dionysus, when THESPIS, "as an individual speaker, faced the chorus during the prolog and rhesis".[32] AESCHYLUS added a second actor, SOPHOCLES a third, whereby the chorus gradually receded into the background. [One] remarkable [aspect] is "a constant increase of the proportion, as well as the length and quantity of rheseis [sc. 'speaking parts']: Aeschylus has the fewest and shortest, Euripides the most and longest rheseis",[33] with up to 110 verses.[34] Yet

32 Der Kleine Pauly, Vol. 5 (1975, reprint 1979) 755.

33 B. Mannsperger: Die Rhesis, in: W. Jens (Ed.): Die Bauformen der griechischen Tragödie (1971) 180.

34 Euripides: Phoinissen 1090ff.; Bakchen 1043ff.

also the "*number and extent* of the stichomythias increases constantly",[35] [and] "the decisive action is increasingly transferred from rhesis into stichomythia".[36]

Among Greek tragedies, those by EURIPIDES, with their extended speech contests, are the ones most influenced by rhetoric. This may have inspired ARISTOPHANES to have Euripides compete with Aeschylus in a contest of words in his comedy 'The Frogs'. With its sequence "prolog—speech of reflection—report of a messenger—epilog", Euripidean tragedy comes very close to the disposition of an oration.[37] As regards the education of prospective orators, QUINTILIAN deems Euripides more suitable than Sophocles[,] adducing [the factors of] style, sententiae, and emotive effect in his [sc. Euripides'] plays.[38] MENANDER's comedies he praises even more effusively, and specifically with regard to the court scenes, the "meditationes", and especially the enacted declamations, which permit the prospective orator's rehearsing his [proficiency] in various roles.[39] In general, Quintilian esteems Greek comedy: "I do not know, whether any form of literature—apart from Homer, however, who [...] is always in a league of his own—comes closer to the art of speaking, or is better suited for rendering someone an orator".[40]

SENECA's Latin tragedies represent a further stage of "rhetoricization".[41] Here, where "a quarter of the whole consists of monologs",[42] it is not so much about persuasion, but about conveying the expression of the characters' turmoiled psyche. Such monological segments are up to 158 verses long.[43] As in his philosophical prose, Seneca has a proclivity for mannerist effects in terms of style—which Quintilian criticizes.[44] His penchant for staging stichomythic verbal duels in the form of terse *sententiae* ("minutissimae sententiae")[45] is notorious.

---

35 B. Seidensticker: Die Stichomythie, in: W. Jens (Ed.): Die Bauformen der griechischen Tragödie (1971) 220.

36 Mannsperger: Die Rhesis, in: W. Jens (Ed.): Die Bauformen der griechischen Tragödie (1971) 181.

37 Mannsperger: Die Rhesis, in: W. Jens (Ed.): Die Bauformen der griechischen Tragödie (1971) 179.

38 Quintilian: [institutio oratoria] X, 1, 67f.

39 Quintilian: [institutio oratoria] X, 1, 69–71.

40 Quintilian: [institutio oratoria] X, 1, 65.

41 Der Kleine Pauly, Vol. 5 (1975, reprint 1979) 916.

42 H. Schauer/F. W. Wodtke: Monolog, in: Reallexikon der deutschen Literaturgeschichte, 2nd ed., Vol. 2 (1965) 419.

43 Seneca: Agamemnon 421ff.

44 Quintilian: [institutio oratoria] X, 1, 130.

45 Quintilian: [institutio oratoria] X, 1, 130.

No less important than the traces of the art of speaking in drama are the interrelations between the poetics of drama and rhetorical *theory*. Above all, this pertains to the conceptions of action, characters, and affective effect in tragedy, which ARISTOTLE presents in his 'Poetics'. Regarding the action, he demands *probability* (εἰκός, eikós).[46] This is a concept of value that relates to rhetoric, more precisely, to forensic circumstantial evidence. Attributed already to the Sicilian proto-rhetoric,[47] probability was one of three stylistic qualities (along with clarity and brevity) in the school of ISOCRATES, which were recommended for the rhetorical *narratio*.[48] Aristotle transferred the concept to drama. In so doing, he no longer means the probability of oratorical argument, but logical consistency in the context of the plot. This corresponds to his call for a *unity of action*.[49]

The ties between the poetics of drama and rhetoric are even closer with regard to the *characters* and their style of speaking. When Aristotle introduces *appropriateness* (πρέπον, prépon, ἁρμόττον, harmótton) as a stylistic principle in his 'Rhetoric', he is thinking of diction as adequate to the situation and case at hand, but especially to the speaker's social status.[50] Accordingly, the conceptions of his 'Poetics' concerning characters (Greek ḗthē, singular: ḗthos) in drama entirely adhere to the principle of appropriateness: the character of a dramatic persona is to be in accord with its social role, with the historical tradition, and with itself.[51] Horace concurs.[52] As Quintilian explains,[53] it was the difficulty in translating the word ḗthos that conduced to a synthesis of style and character: on the one hand, it denotes the balanced, enduring degree of affect and style, in contrast to the agitated, short-lived páthos[; and], on the other hand, specifically the constant disposition of a human being, that is, his character, the latter not in terms of a natural individual temper, but of a social role determined by age, gender, and profession. The probability of the plot and the appropriateness of the characters and their way of speaking are variants of *plausibility* (πιθανόν,

46 Aristotle: Poetics 9.
47 Plato: Phaedrus 272d–273c; Aristotle: Rhetoric II, 24 to the end; M. Fuhrmann: Die antike Rhetorik (1984) 16.
48 Quintilian: [institutio oratoria] IV, 2, 31.
49 Aristotle: Poetics 8.
50 Aristotle: Rhetoric III, 7, 1.
51 Aristotle: Poetics 15.
52 Horace: Ars poetica 112–127.
53 Quintilian: [institutio oratoria] VI, 2, 8.

pithanón, [sc. the potentially persuasive or convincing]), which Aristotle emphasizes both in his 'Poetics' and in his 'Rhetoric'.[54]

The affective *effect* of drama is tied to rhetoric to an even greater degree than the action and the characters. In his famous and disputed definition, Aristotle attributes to tragedy that it "produces woe ['Jammer'] and affright ['Schaudern'] and thus effects a purification of [or: from] such states of arousal".[55] (Rather than as 'Jammer' and 'Schaudern', LESSING translated ἔλεος (éleos) and φόβος (phóbos) as "Mitleid" [sc. "pity"] and "Furcht" [sc. "fear"]).[56] In the 17th century, DONATUS, MASEN and BIRKEN added joy (gaudium) and hope (spes) as the analogous affects in comedy.[57] Allusive precursors of this conception of tragedy, including the conceptual pair 'phóbos' and 'éleos', are encountered in GORGIAS' 'Encomium of Helen'.[58] The effects ascribed both to tragedy and, by Gorgias, to the art of rhetoric, are rooted in orgiastico-religious conceptions.[59]

Knowledge about the *performances* of drama are also preserved in rhetorical literature. The orator's comportment is often differentiated from that of the actor.[60] QUINTILIAN tenders a cohesive portrayal of the art of delivery (actio) on the part of the orator, as well as, on occasion and by way of comparison, also of the actor.[61] For the orator's education, he recommends consulting with comic actors, albeit only to the extent that their repertoire may be expedient for the orator, that is, not for studying female roles or confused conduct (drunkenness, anxiety, infatuation), for instance.[62]

II. *The Middle Ages*. As to Medieval drama, there is little to be said from the perspective of rhetoric. There is no historical connection with either Ancient or Modern drama.[63] Due to a misinterpretation of Classical sources, it was believed

54 Aristotle: Poetics 9; Rhetoric II, 18; cf. H.-J. Neuschäfer: D'Aubignacs 'Pratique du théâtre' und der Zusammenhang von 'imitatio', 'vraisemblance' und 'bienséance', in: F. Hédelin d'Aubignac: La pratique du théâtre (Amsterdam 1715; reprint 1971) XIII–XXV.

55 Aristotle: Poetics 6 (trans. by M. Fuhrmann 1982).

56 Lessing: Hamburgische Dramaturgie 75, Werke, ed. by H. G. Göpfert, Vol. 4 (1973) 578.

57 R. J. Alexander: Das deutsche Barockdrama (1984) 64; as to Masen, cf. D. E. R. George: Deutsche Tragödien vom Mittelalter bis zu Lessing (1972) 120. 124.

58 Gorgias of Leontini: Reden, Fragmente und Testimonien, ed. by T. Buchheim (1989) XXIV; 9 (= Lobpreis der Helena 8f.); cf. H. Koller: Die Mimesis in der Antike (Bern 1954) 157–162.

59 Cf. M. Fuhrmann: Einführung in die antike Dichtungstheorie (1973) 90–98.

60 Cf. e.g. Aristotle: Rhetoric III, 12, 2; Cicero: Orator 74; De oratore I, 18; III, 214. 220.

61 Quintilian: [institutio oratoria] I, 11; XI, 3.

62 Quintilian: [institutio oratoria] I, 11, 1f.

63 R. Bergmann: Mittelalterliche geistliche Spiele, in: Reallexikon der deutschen Literaturgeschichte, 2nd ed., Vol. 4 (1984) 65.

(and ERASMUS OF ROTTERDAM still reiterates this in his 'Adagia' of 1500) that, "in Ancient times, one person read out all roles, while the actual joculatores, wearing half masks, were engaging in pantomime".[64] [Dramatic] concepts were equally understood in a peculiar way. One hardly knew any *tragedies* in the Ancient and current sense. During this time, the word did not denote theatrical plays, but narratives with a woeful ending, for instance by VIRGIL, LUCAN, and OVID.[65] It was not until towards the end of the Middle Ages that, in Humanist circles, a revival of the Classical notion of tragedy was setting in, [and] new tragedies were being written here and there (the first by MUSSATO [1261–1329]: 'Ecerinis', first printing [in] 1636). With [the term] 'dramatic', one referred to "a certain type of speaking [...] between someone who asks, and another, who answers", without the author's intervention.[66] Incidentally, the Christian Middle Ages suspected stage play of being immoral, following TERTULLIAN's [view] ([in] 'De spectaculis'). It was charged with shamelessness ("impudicitia theatri").[67] '*Theatrum*' also signified 'bordello'.[68] Initially, a culture of performance could only develop under the aegis of the clergy.

Since the end of the 10th century, a *liturgical drama* was beginning to develop from Easter liturgy[:] initially presented by clerics inside the church [and] in the form of Latin hymns, [it] was later also performed outside the church, included laymen, and was supplemented by vernacular scenes with peddlers and the like. Liturgical drama (miracle or mystery plays: nativity, passion, [and] Corpus Christi plays, [variants of] the Pietà) constitutes the larger part of Medieval dramatic art. Here, "the word does not take center stage, [is] rather the accompanying text for the play's spectacle ['Schau-Spiel'] and the vivid images".[69] Influences of school rhetoric are less manifest in the words of the acting characters, when compared to those by the speaker of the prolog, the so-called *praecursor*.[70] Since the 14th century, there were also secular plays (Neidhart's [and] Carnival plays, moralities) entirely in the vernacular (with tetrametric rhyming verses, in Germany)[;] these were organized by the trade and craft guilds of a town, and

64 H. A. Frenzel: Geschichte des Theaters (1979) 11.

65 D. E. R. George: Deutsche Tragödientheorien vom Mittelalter bis zu Lessing (1972) 33. 322.

66 Johannes Balbi (13th century), trans. by George: Deutsche Tragödientheorien vom Mittelalter bis zu Lessing (1972) 320.

67 Isidore of Seville: Etymologiae XVIII, 59; thereto, cf. George: Deutsche Tragödientheorien vom Mittelalter bis zu Lessing (1972) 22.

68 George: Deutsche Tragödientheorien vom Mittelalter bis zu Lessing (1972) 321.

69 H. Rupprich: Die deutsche Literatur vom späten Mittelalter bis zum Barock, part 1 (1970) 238.

70 Bergmann: Mittelalterliche geistliche Spiele, in: Reallexikon der deutschen Literaturgeschichte, 2nd ed., Vol. 4 (1984) 103.

staged as *simultaneous settings*, with multiple sceneries—distributed across a marketplace, for instance. In this fashion, male residents, who also enacted the female roles, were able to practice [public] speaking. For the [case of the] Netherlands, this is evidenced by the "Kamers van Rhetorica" [sc. 'Chambers of Rhetoric'], established by the *Rederijkers* (from the French [term] 'rhétoriqueur') in the 15th century[;] for the most part, they distinguished themselves by performing plays. More detailed findings as to the[ir] practice of speaking are wanting, apart from indications in the texts themselves, for instance in the scenes of loutishness and verbal dispute [forming part] of certain plays. For Medieval times, an independent theory of drama has not been transmitted.[71]

III. *Renaissance, Baroque*. As far as the nexus of rhetoric and drama is concerned, the Early Modern Age is the most important epoch. Tying in with CICERO's view of comedy as a "speculum vitae", as well as with the Medieval mirror [e.g. for princes] literature,[72] one saw the *world as a theater*,[73] the stage as a sort of orator's podium,[74] or as a preacher's pulpit for moral and denominational appeals,[75] [and] "school theater as pertaining to the pursuit of 'eloquentia'",[76] in which the "actors" serve "as pedagogical objects".[77] At the same time, "rhetoric" was considered "a histrionic form of conduct".[78] The leading Jesuit dramatists (BIDERMANN, MASEN, AVANCINI) were professors of rhetoric. In the Renaissance's hermetico-cabalistic tradition (G. C. DELMINIO, R. FLUDD), the memory—of import

71 Further Reading: E. Catholy: Das Fastnachtsspiel des Spätmittelalters (1961) 70–86. H. H. Borcherdt: Das europäische Theater im Mittelalter und in der Renaissance (1969). H.-J. Diller: Redeformen des englischen Mysterienspiels (1973). H. J. Hentschel: Die Gestalt des Vice und seine Redekonventionen im Wandel und Niedergang der Moralität (1974).

72 Cicero: De republica IV, 11, 13; cf. W. Kühlmann: Gelehrtenrepublik und Fürstenstaat (1982) 402, note 84; H. Rupprich: Die deutsche Literatur vom späten Mittelalter bis zum Barock, part 1 (1970) 296–302; part 2 (1973) 331f.

73 Cf. E. R. Curtius: Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter (^{3}1961) 148–154; W. Barner: Barockrhetorik (1970) 86–131.

74 Barner: Barockrhetorik (1970) 302; cf. 289–318. 344–352. 364f.

75 Cf. D. E. R. George: Deutsche Tragödientheorien vom Mittelalter bis zu Lessing (1972) 54. 57; Rupprich: Die deutsche Literatur vom späten Mittelalter bis zum Barock, part 2 (1973) 320; H. Krause: Die Dramen des Hans Sachs (1979) 45; R. J. Alexander: Das deutsche Barockdrama (1984) 78.

76 Barner: Barockrhetorik (1970) 302–321; cf. K. Zeller: Pädagogik und Drama. Untersuchungen zur Schulcomödie Christian Weises (1980) 16–35. 76f.

77 H. Haxel: Studien zu den Lustspielen Christian Weises (1932) 1.

78 Barner: Barockrhetorik (1970) 89.

rhetorically [cf. memoria]—was conceived of as a theater, perhaps even like SHAKESPEARE's Globe Theatre.[79]

Now available in printed format, Ancient comedies and tragedies, especially by the Romans (TERENCE, SENECA), inspired [various] imitations. ARISTOTLE's 'Poetics', virtually without effect previously,[80] became the epitome of poetic theory, along with Horace's 'Ars poetica'. Italian commentators of the 16th (CASTELVETRO), as well as French theoreticians (CHAPELAIN, HÉDELIN D'AUBIGNAC) and dramatists (CORNEILLE) of the 17th century augmented the Ancient legacy into a system of formal rules (three unities, five acts), which remained valid until the 19th century, and whose [formal] appearance is now labeled '*closed form*', following Wölfflin.[81] ROBORTELLO, a commentator of Aristotle, compared the dispositio of tragedy to that of an oration. As regards a drama's 'protasis' or 'prolog', other theoreticians of his time employed the terms denoting the beginning of a speech ('*prooemium*', '*exordium*'). Appearing in dramatic theory during the 16th century, the word 'expositio', originally a term customary in rhetoric, generally came to replace 'protasis' during the 18th century. The brevity, clarity, and probability demanded of an exposition had previously applied to the rhetorical *narratio*.[82]

Courtly culture provided the new drama with a contemporary color. Poetic theorists (LA MESNARDIÈRE, STIELER) were interested in safeguarding social *appropriateness* in the linguistic design of characters.[83] Tragedy and comedy were kept apart by means of a '*Ständeklausel*' [sc. a clause separating the estates]. Much like SCALIGER had before, OPITZ ascribed "maiestet" [sc. 'majesty'] to tragedy, to comedy "persons and unsophisticated issues of the lower classes".[84] "This being why one represents them as speaking naïvely and without sophistication, which is appropriate in their case: [...] Yet in important matters, concerning gods, heroes, kings, princes, cities, and suchlike, one must present

79 Cf. F. A. Yates: Gedächtnis und Erinnern (1990) 123ff. 294ff. 356ff.

80 Cf. M. Fuhrmann: Einführung in die antike Dichtungstheorie (1973) 193. 197f.

81 "*geschlossene Form*", H. Wölfflin: Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe (1915); V. Klotz: Geschlossene und offene Form im Drama (1960).

82 F. Robortello: In librum Aristotelis de arte poetica explicationes (Florence 1548) 117; H. G. Bickert: Studien zum Problem der Exposition im Drama der tektonischen Bauform (1969) 23, 36, 88; cf. H. Lausberg: Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik (^{3}1990) §346.

83 Cf. R. Bray: La Formation de la Doctrine Classique en France (Paris 1927; reprint Paris 1963) 215ff.; K. Stieler: Die Dichtkunst des Spaten (1685), ed. by H. Zeman (Vienna 1975) 837–1883.

84 "geringen standes personen vnd schlechte [= schlichte] sachen"; M. Opitz: Buch von der Deutschen Poeterey (1624; reprint 1963), ch. 5, 20; J. C. Scaliger: Poetices libri septem (Lyon 1561; reprint 1987) 11. 144.

impressive [implying: respectable], copious, and vehement [implying: affective] speeches, and not simply [and] only name a thing, but elaborate on [implying: ornament] it with splendid [and] sublime words".[85] Tragedy was unanimously assigned to the nobility and the lofty style. Comedy, however, not only laid claim to the humble, but also to the middle style, since it was credited with [yielding] *delectatio* (PONTANUS, STIELER).[86] As an exception, HARSDÖRFFER permits kings to appear on stage, when the matter is "fröliche Händel" [sc. "cheerful actions"].[87] Such theoretical vacillation gave comic poets a thematic and stylistic leeway. Often, the effect of Baroque 'Lustspiele' [sc. 'delightful plays'] is precisely in the *contrast* of aristocratic and crudely comic characters (in GRYPHIUS' 'Horribilicribrifax', for instance). This is still echoed in LESSING's conception of the "true comedy".[88]

The division between the two dramatic genres in accordance with the social status of the characters had been prepared long beforehand: by way of the moral [and], during the 16th and 17th century, estatist interpretation of ARISTOTLE's distinction between personae being worthier in tragedy and worse in comedy[;][89] by way of the opinion of Aristotle's student THEOPHRASTUS, recorded by DIOMEDES (4th century CE), as per which tragedies represented heroic fates, comedies harmless private deeds[;][90] by way of the opposition between the tragic 'cothurnus' [sc. 'buskin'] and the comic "soccus" ([sc.] 'low show'), as mentioned by HORACE;[91] by way of QUINTILIAN's assigning tragedy to *pathos*, comedy to *ethos*[;][92] [and], during the Middle Ages, by way of the "estatist reinterpretation" of the three genera dicendi and their respectively targeted effects.[93] Yet it was only the conception of new tragedies and comedies under the aegis of Humanism that

85 [The above translation is modernized semantically, as well as in orthography and punctuation:] "Darumb tichtet man jhnen auch einfaltige vnnd schlechte reden an / die jhnen gemässe sein: [...] Hergegen in wichtigen sachen / da von Göttern / Helden / Königen / Fürsten / Städten vnd dergleichen gehandelt wird / muß man ansehliche / volle vnd hefftige reden vorbringen / vnd ein ding nicht bloß nennen / sondern mit prächtigen hohen worten vmbschreiben"; Opitz: Buch von der Deutschen Poeterey (1624; reprint 1963) ch. 6, 30. 32.

86 Cf. L. Fischer: Gebundene Rede (1968) 143, 159.

87 G. P. Harsdörffer: Poetischer Trichter (1648–53; reprint 1969), part 2, 97.

88 G. E. Lessing: Abhandlung von dem weinerlichen oder rührenden Lustspiele (1754). Werke, ed. by H. G. Göpfert, Vol. 4 (1973) 55f.

89 Aristotle: Poetics 2.

90 Cf. Fischer: Gebundene Rede (1968) 141f. 148.

91 Horace: Ars poetica 89f.; cf. 227–231; Quintilian: [institutio oratoria] X, 2, 22.

92 Quintilian: [institutio oratoria] VI, 2, 20; cf. I, 8, 8.

93 [Cf. the German technical term:] "*Dreistillehre*"; H. Brinkmann: Zu Wesen und Form mittelalterlicher Dichtung (1928; reprint 1979) 68.

rendered factually effectual the estatist criterion in drama. This was accompanied by a paradigm shift in stylistic theory. While VIRGIL's works had served as poetic exempla of the three *genera dicendi* until the end of Medieval times, tragedy and comedy were assuming this function after SCALIGER's poetics.[94]

Influenced by a courtly environment, [the art of] rhetoric manifests itself in manifold forms, functions, and assessments. To demonstrate power, reigning princes gave splendid speeches, [and] tyrants rather pompous ones.[95] Likewise magnificent is the courtship of princes, embellished with Petrarchist ornament.[96] Above all, [the ensuing maxim] is in effect: "orating we reign!".[97] This signifies less the ostentation of a sovereign's splendor than the shrewd protection of one's interests. *Dissimulation*, which theoreticians in the wake of MACHIAVELLI recommended for the statesman, was commonly deemed permissible, at least in cases of emergency. The motto of LOUIS XI of France is[:] "Qui nescit dissimulare, nescit regnare" ('he who is unable to dissimulate, does not know how to govern'). LOHENSTEIN takes it up: "He who is unable to playact / is unfit for ruling".[98] PLATO's charge against GORGIAS' rhetoric, namely that it did not serve the truth, but for make-believe,[99] now became a concept in the political struggle for survival. On occasion, the equation of rhetoric and dissimulation leads to a conflict between *tongue and heart* ("discidium [...] linguae atque cordis").[100] This is an important theme in Shakespeare,[101] the same as elsewhere.[102] Typically, it is less the princes themselves, and rather their scheming advisors, who attend to "dissimulation's weighty art".[103] *Sententiae*, "the mainstays ['load-bearing columns'] of tragedy",[104] serve as auxiliary devices, the same as *exempla*, which substantiate one's own stance vis-à-vis other views.

---

94 Fischer: Gebundene Rede (1968) 141f. 148.

95 Cf. e.g. Lohenstein: Agrippina I, 1ff.

96 Lohenstein: Agrippina II, 1ff.

97 ['by speaking/speeches/oration we reign/rule':] "durch reden herrschen wir!"; Gryphius: Leo Armenius I, 512.

98 "Wer sich nicht anstelln kan / der taug zum Herrschen nicht"; Lohenstein: Cleopatra (1680) IV, 84.

99 Plato: Gorgias 454c–455a; Phaedrus 272d.

100 Cicero: De oratore III, 61.

101 Shakespeare: Coriolanus III, 2.

102 Gryphius: Horribilicribrifax Teutsch, ed. by G. Dünnhaupt (1976) II, 3, p. 39; cf. Gryphius: Leo Armenius I, 509ff.

103 "der Verstellung schwere Kunst"; Schiller: Maria Stuart I, 6, 545.

104 Harsdörffer: Poetischer Trichter (1648–53; reprint 1969), part 2, 81; cf. Scaliger: Poetices libri septem (Lyon 1561; reprint 1987) 145 ["sunt enim quasi columnae, aut pilae vniversae fabricae illius"].

In addition to scenes displaying splendor, the Baroque phenotype of dramatic rhetoric also includes appearances on stage, in which rulers or other high-ranking persons, all of them male, lose their composure, and are beside themselves with fear. SENECA's tragedies, with their scenes of witchcraft, specters, and atrocities, and [with] their extended portrayals of affect, served as models. Shakespeare, VONDEL, GRYPHIUS, and others took their cue therefrom, thematically and stylistically, as well as with regard to the structure of their plays.

More characteristic for Baroque drama than the impotent despair, with which Senecan characters endure grief and pain,[105] is a verbose overcoming of moral tribulations, at least in the case of the more appealing personae. This holds true for the *martyrs* of the Christian 'Trauerspiel' [sc. 'mourning play'] (GRYPHIUS' 'Catharina von Georgien', for instance), who, in terms of nobility, are in no way, or hardly, inferior to the potentates. Their immunity vis-à-vis the agony of torture and death, which produces *admiration* rather than compassion, not only corresponds to the Baroque's Neo-Stoic ideals of indifference [sc. 'apátheia'] and constancy ['constantia'],[106] but also to the aristocratic ideal of affectual control.[107] One example of such heroic rhetoric is the dying speech of the philosopher Seneca in LOHENSTEIN's 'Epicharis'.[108]

The *rhetoric of comedy* also took its cue from the rhetorical culture of the nobility. The portraits of artisanal uprightness, soldierly vainglory, and rustico-schoolmasterly sciolism, such as GRYPHIUS tenders in his comic plays, demonstrate not so much the idiosyncrasies of "persons of low estate" [see Opitz above], but rather the ridiculousness of their aspiring to higher things. These comic characters embody the "ineptus orator".[109] Their "vices" are variants of maladroit speaking. The effect attains to its consummation, when two speakers of comic futility are competing with each other.[110]

A treatise by the Jesuit LANG describes the *extralinguistic* forms of expression [employed] by Baroque actors, as well as their meaning.[111]

---

105 Cf. O. Regenbogen: Schmerz und Tod in den Tragödien Senecas, in: Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg 7 (1927/28). Separate reprint 1963.

106 Cf. H.-J. Schings: Consolatio Tragoediae, in: R. Grimm (ed.): Deutsche Dramentheorien, Vol. 1 (1973) 1–44.

107 Cf. N. Elias: Die höfische Gesellschaft (1983) 168f.

108 Lohenstein: Epicharis V, 141ff.

109 Cf. J. B. Schupp: Ineptus orator (1638).

110 Cf. e.g. Gryphius: Horribilicribrifax Teutsch, ed. by G. Dünnhaupt (1976) III, 6, 63–71.

111 F. Lang: Abhandlung über die Schauspielkunst (Dissertatio de actione scenica, 1727), ed. by A. Rudin (Bern 1975). Further reading: P. Stachel: Seneca und das deutsche Renaissancedrama (1907). E. Lefèvre (ed.): Der Einfluß Senecas auf das europäische Drama

IV. *The Enlightenment and After*. The transition from Baroque aristocratic culture to the *Enlightenment* was linked to a profound change with regard to structures and values. The princely court, hitherto the cultural center, did not find favor with the now predominant, bourgeois literati, seeing that "falsity and intrigue dwell" there.[112] With the emergence of *bourgeois tragedy*, the estatist distinction between tragedy and comedy lost its validity. Between tragic and comic plays, an intermediate form developed, which, during the 18th and 19th century [and] following DIDEROT, was deemed a drama (or play) in the narrower sense.[113]

Given a general embourgeoisement, [the art of] rhetoric, being associated with courtly life, lost its standing. This also had repercussions in drama. Enlightenment critics stigmatized Baroque rhetorical ornament as Phoebus and Galimatias or as "fustian" ["Schwulst", 'bombast']. LOHENSTEIN's mourning plays, which represent this style, were charged with "hieroglyphic and enigmatic obscurity" in terms of their parables.[114] Studied sophistries [are said to] asphyxiate the passions[;][115] instead of the characters, one [is said to] always hear the poeta doctus speaking.[116] BODMER and BREITINGER, as well as the manuals in their wake, drew on the criticism, which, in Antiquity, QUINTILIAN had leveled against SENECA:[117] by default, they denied the Breslavian dramatist any sense of taste (*iudicium*) whatsoever, while still acknowledging his genius, talent, fancy, or similar hyponyms of *ingenium*.

Likewise, the authority of the stylistic and conduct-related principle of *appropriateness* (aptum, decorum) suffered a decline, at least in terms of its previously prevalent meaning of "Standesgemäßheit" [sc. 'acting as befits one's social status'] ("Anständigkeit" ['social propriety']). It was replaced by *naturalness*, which had previously only been a concomitant ideal—in the context of the old opposition between nature and art.[118] LESSING desired that even queens,

---

(1978). W. G. Müller: Die politische Rede bei Shakespeare (1979). H. F. Plett: Theatrum Rhetoricum, in: Plett: Renaissance-Rhetorik (1993) 328–368.

112 Schiller: Wilhelm Tell, III, 2, verse 1669.

113 Das Theater des Herrn Diderot, aus dem Französischen übersetzt von G. E. Lessing, ed. by K.-D. Müller (1986) 140f. 153. 293. 434.

114 J. J. Breitinger: Critische Abhandlung von der Natur, den Absichten und dem Gebrauche der Gleichnisse (1740, reprint 1967) 224.

115 J. J. Bodmer: Critische Betrachtungen über die Poetischen Gemählde Der Dichter (1741, reprint 1971) 360.

116 Bodmer: Critische Betrachtungen über die Poetischen Gemählde Der Dichter (1741, reprint 1971) 425

117 Quintilian: [institutio oratoria] X, 1, 130; cf. VIII, 3, 56.

118 Cf. Aristotle: Rhetoric III, 2, 4; Quintilian: [institutio oratoria] XII, 10, 40–44; B. Wehrli: Kommunikative Wahrheitsfindung. Zur Funktion der Sprache in Lessings Dramen (1983) 40f.; B.

at least on the stage, would "speak naturally".[119] He held "that the court is precisely not the place, where a poet may study nature".[120] He distinguished bourgeois drama from Ancient tragedy, which had been set in a public sphere: "we modern [dramatists], we who have abolished the chorus, we who, for the most part, leave our characters within their own four walls: what reasons could we possibly have to nevertheless always have them produce such decorous, such studied, such rhetorical utterances?".[121]

Yet Lessing is here not reprimanding the rhetorical [modus operandi] in the wider, Classical sense, but only its one-sided, courtly-pathetic version. Seen from this angle, one might also speak of an attempt at "subordinating rhetorical diction to the law of naturalness",[122] or even of a "consensus between naturalness and rhetoric".[123] One even held that, during the 18th century, drama had turned "into the new sphere of activity of a publicly practiced eloquence", which, at that time, had not been possible in the political realm.[124] This new way of thinking not only influenced the style, but also the duration of speeches. In Lessing, utterances of more than 20 lines only rarely occur.

Even so, the fact that Classical rhetoric remained anchored in higher education until the end of the 19th century also ensured its reverberations in drama, [at least] for a time. LESSING's Nathan not only convinces as a person of integrity. By means of his capacity for disposing his words well, and for delivering them to the delight of his audience, which is acknowledged on several occasions,[125] he also appears as "the ideal orator".[126] SCHILLER, who represents a

---

Asmuth: Stilprinzipien, alte und neue. Zur Entwicklung der Stilistik aus der Rhetorik, in: E. Neuland, H. Bleckwenn (ed.): Stil, Stilistik, Stilisierung (1991) 23–38.

119 Lessing: Hamburgische Dramaturgie, 59. Stück. Werke, ed. by. H. G. Göpfert, Vol. 4 (1973) 505.

120 "daß der Hof der Ort eben nicht ist, wo ein Dichter die Natur studieren kann"; Lessing: Hamburgische Dramaturgie, 59. Stück. Werke, ed. by. H. G. Göpfert, Vol. 4 (1973) 505.

121 "wir Neuern, die wir den Chor abgeschafft, die wir unsere Personen größtenteils zwischen ihren vier Wänden lassen: was können wir für Ursache haben, sie dem ohngeachtet immer eine so geziemende, so ausgesuchte, so rhetorische Sprache führen zu lassen?"; Lessing: Hamburgische Dramaturgie, 59. Stück. Werke, ed. by. H. G. Göpfert, Vol. 4 (1973) 504. Similarly already C. Weise: Freymüthiger und höfflicher Redner / das ist ausführliche Gedancken von der Pronunciation und Action (1693) ch. 41; cf. K.-H. Göttert: Einführung in die Rhetorik (1991) 168.

122 W. Jens: Von deutscher Rede (1969) 58.

123 Jens: Von deutscher Rede (1969) 64.

124 H.-J. Gabler: Geschmack und Gesellschaft (1982) 31.

125 Lessing: Nathan der Weise II, 5; III, 4.

126 Wehrli: Kommunikative Wahrheitsfindung. Zur Funktion der Sprache in Lessings Dramen (1983) 147; cf. 147–171.

brief "phase of 're-patheticization'",[127] grants rhetoric ample space. While partly dubious, as in the case of the brigand and "Meisterredner" [sc. "master rhetorician"] Spiegelberg,[128] it seems positive in the main. Don Carlos' love for his royal stepmother triggers a hardly unappealing "audacious eloquence" on his part.[129] When, "like a dreamer", he beseeches his father to entrust the Netherlands to his, and not the Duke of Alba's, care,[130] this [is said to] simultaneously serve "humankind". Even more so, it applies to the silver-tongued wish for "freedom of thought", which his friend, Marquis Posa, directs to King Philipp.[131] Having matured into a classic author, and apropos of his work on 'Wallenstein', Schiller indeed speaks of "a certain dread as to [re]lapsing into his former, rhetorical manner"[;] in the interest of poetic purity, he wishes to steer clear of "both aberrations, the *prosaic* and the *rhetorical*".[132]

Likewise during the 19th century, rhetoric still served for reputable purposes in drama, for instance in BÜCHNER, who, in 'Dantons Tod', refashions historical orations pertaining to the revolution. Frequent paronomasiae in KLEIST, Büchner, and NESTROY demonstrate rhetorical schooling (and SHAKESPEARE's influence), rather than a critique of rhetoric. When Kleist's village judge Adam aims to win over his clerk [by the name of] Licht with the assertion that Licht is "a friend of well-worded speech" indeed,[133] conversant with his CICERO and DEMOSTHENES, it is the partners in communication that seem comical, not their topic. On occasion, even BRECHT still devises long speeches. In so doing, he has his personae proclaim programmatic [viewpoints], for instance [when] Galilei sets apart the new age of doubt from the old one of faith.[134]

For the most part, however, the rhetorical [mode] became a mockery after SCHILLER's death. In other words, LESSING's critique was intensified. Nevertheless, it now addressed, not so much a courtly mien, as the dubious urge for higher things in [certain] bourgeois circles. Grand words [are said] not to suit ordinary people. NESTROY's redheaded protagonist Titus Feuerfuchs [literally: 'Firefox']

---

127 I. Strohschneider-Kohrs: 'Unterschriften' als szenisch-dramatische Aktion, in: Aratro corona messoria. Festschrift G. Pflug (1988) 224.

128 Schiller: Die Räuber I, 2.

129 "Verwegene Beredsamkeit"; Schiller: Don Carlos I, 5, 708.

130 "wie ein Träumender"; Schiller: Don Carlos II, 2, 1176.

131 "Gedankenfreiheit"; Schiller: Don Carlos III, 10, 3215f.

132 "einer gewissen Furcht, in meine ehemalige rhetorische Manier zu fallen"; "beide Abwege, das *Prosaische* und das *Rhetorische*"; Der Briefwechsel zwischen Schiller und Goethe, ed. by E. Staiger (1977) 479, Brief vom 2. 10. 1797.

133 "ein Freund von wohlgesetzter Rede"; Kleist: Der zerbrochne Krug, verse 135.

134 Brecht: Leben des Galilei, scene 1.

knows how to accommodate the pathetic talk of an "authoress", rendering it ridiculous as a result.[135] In his dramatic works, STERNHEIM caricatures the petty bourgeoisie's mindset and mode of speaking during the Wilhelmine Era. In 'Mutter Courage', Brecht's sanctimonious army chaplain boasts that God had "bestowed upon" him "the gift of powerful speech"[:] "I preach 'em senseless".[136] His 'Arturo Ui' parodies the eloquent violence of Nazi executives. One might also recall CHAPLIN's parody of Hitler in the film 'The Great Dictator'. A rejection of the rhetorical [mode] is particularly conspicuous in HAUPTMANN's tragicomedy 'Die Ratten': the impresario Hassenreuter, defending "the art of speaking" with dramatic verses of the later Schiller, is faced with this objection on the part of his disinclined student Spitta—[which is] entirely in line with Hauptmann's [view]: "I am not partial to anything stilted, anything rhetorical. [...] I have no love for all that sonorous bombast in 'The Bride of Messina'".[137] Spitta invokes the young Schiller, GOETHE's 'Götz', and, above all, Lessing.

Even more characteristic for *the drama of the 19th and 20th century* than the mockery of particular habits of speaking is that the capacity for oratory, and even for communication altogether, is generally called into question. It was particularly HOFMANNSTHAL, who dealt with this topic, for instance in his famous 'Lord Chandos-Brief'. His peculiar earl Hans Karl Bühl recoils from performing as an orator, "since it is impossible to open [one's] mouth without causing utter confusion". *Appropriateness*, that venerable ideal of conduct and discourse, now poses an obstacle to speaking. Earl Bühl asserts: "Everything one utters is indecent".[138]

Rather than the art of rhetoric, the interest of dramatists now turned to *deficits in speaking*, especially in *Naturalism*, which staged the milieu of socially underprivileged individuals, including their everyday language. As features of the "realistic drama", A. KERR diagnosed [the following:] *dialect*, waiving of grammatical correctness, discontinuation of poetico-pathetic and ingenious discourse.[139] A valorization of extralinguistic elements corresponds to such a

135 Nestroy: Der Talisman II, 17.

136 [Literally: 'so that/until they lose hearing and sight', a German idiom; the closest equivalent might be: 'they don't know what hit them']. "die Gabe der Sprachgewalt verliehen. Ich predig, daß Ihnen Hören und Sehen vergeht"; Brecht: Mutter Courage, scene 6.

137 Hauptmann: Die Ratten, Act 3. Centenar-Ausgabe, ed. by H.-E. Hass, Vol. 2 (1965) 777f.

138 "weil es unmöglich ist, den Mund aufzumachen, ohne die heillosesten Konfusionen anzurichten"; "Alles, was man ausspricht, ist indezent"; Hofmannsthal: Der Schwierige III, 13. Gesammelte Werke in 10 Einzelbänden, ed. by B. Schöller, Vol. 4: Lustspiele (1979) 437.

139 A. Kerr: Technik des realistischen Dramas, in: Das neue Drama (1905). Reprint in: K. Hammer (ed.): Dramaturgische Schriften des 19. Jahrhunderts, Vol. 2 (1987) 982–993, spec. 989f.

problematization of rhetoric and, ultimately, of speech as such. The increase of *stage directions* during the 18th century, and especially in Naturalism, is distinctive.

In 1955, DÜRRENMATT deplored [this fact]: "Many have forfeited the appreciation of the rhetorical, since, as Hilpert reports, an actor unable to remember his lines invented Naturalism. This is a pity. Like no other device of art, oratory is capable of getting across the forestage [sc. of reaching the audience, and not only acoustically]. Yet even the critics have little use for it. The author, who dares [to employ] oratory in this day and age, will fare like the farmer Dikaiopolis, he will have to lay his head on the executioner's block; only that, in contrast to the Acharnians of Aristophanes, most critics will [actually] strike [sc. take his head]".[140] To date, not much has changed in this respect.

Rhetoric's lingering loss of significance is not only reflected in drama, but also in its *theory*. The more recent aesthetic theorists, such as SULZER, JEAN PAUL, and also HEGEL, who deems drama "the highest stage of poesy, and of art in general",[141] typically consider neither the rhetorical quality of a dramatic text, nor its theatrical performance, unlike DUBOS, who still reflected on declamation, as well.[142] In cases where the mise-en-scène is indeed part of the discussion, for instance in LESSING's observations on the actor EKHOF,[143] the concern is the "demand for a reduction of the rhetorical function of gestures",[144] and of the declamatory style in general.

Rhetoric had no part in the *most important changes*, which took place in the theory and outward form of drama since the Enlightenment. This concerns the departure from *Aristotle*'s Poetics (J. M. R. LENZ, BRECHT), from the closed [form of] drama and its rules, which began during the 18th century and became manifest by the end of the 19th century. In SHAKESPEARE's wake, more open structures

140 "Viele haben den Sinn für das Rhetorische verloren, seit, wie Hilpert berichtet, ein textunsicherer Schauspieler den Naturalismus erfunden hat. Das ist schade. Die Rede vermag wie kein anderes Kunstmittel über die Rampe zu dringen. Doch können auch die Kritiker nicht mehr viel mit ihr anfangen. Dem Autor, der heute die Rede wagt, wird es wie dem Bauern Dikaiopolis gehen, er wird seinen Kopf auf den Richtblock legen müssen; nur daß im Gegensatz zu den Acharnern des Aristophanes die meisten Kritiker zuschlagen"; F. Dürrenmatt: Theaterprobleme. Gesammelte Werke, Vol. 7 (Zürich 1988) 49.

141 "die höchste Stufe der Poesie und der Kunst überhaupt"; G. F. W. Hegel: Vorlesungen über die Ästhetik, part 3: Die Poesie, ed. by R. Bubner (1971) 259.

142 J. B. Dubos: Réflexions critiques sur la Poésie et sur la Peinture (Paris 1755 [first printing 1719]) Vol. 1–3.

143 Lessing: Hamburgische Dramaturgie, 2. 4. Stück Werke, ed. by. H. G. Göpfert, Vol. 4 (1973) 241–251; cf. H. Frenzel: Geschichte des Theaters (1979) 228–231. 252–256.

144 Frenzel: Geschichte des Theaters (1979) 253.

proliferated.[145] Hardly of import rhetorically is the aforementioned blurring of the generic boundaries between tragedy and comedy[; or] the shift in emphasis—most pronounced in Naturalism—from the action to the personae (which, following La Bruyère, are typically called *characters* since the 18th century)[;][146] [or] the change in focus, from miracles and divine direction to human 'motivations'.

Even so, there are also two remarkable [and] significant *innovations* from a rhetorical perspective. On the one hand, rhetorico-poetic theorems, and specifically less of the Ciceronian than of the Longinian tradition (sublimity; movere, translated as 'rühren' [sc. 'to stir (up) emotionally'] in the 18th century), together with dramatically targeted effects (compassion!), played a distinctive role in the formation of a bourgeois aesthetics of affect (Shaftesbury, Dubos, Baumgarten).[147] On the other hand[:] in their refunctionalized form, originally rhetorical conceptions decisively influenced precisely this aesthetics of the more recent theory of drama, specifically Brecht's epic theater.

Drama developed into the model of poetic sensibility and vividness in the light of *Aesthetics* [qua discipline], which its philosophical founder Baumgarten tied to the so-called lower powers of cognition, that is, to sensory perception and sentiment, and thus detached from rational thinking.[148] Like others after him, Dubos believed that it was only in the state of performance that drama, specifically tragedy, attained to its distinctive emotive effects.[149] The affective homogeneity of speaker and audience [had been] invoked in Antiquity as the effectual basis of the art of oratory and poetry[;][150] later, in the Enlightenment's program of sensibility, [it was] compared to the resonance of stringed instruments, [and] revived as "sympathy" in terms of a comprehensive philanthropy[;][151] [it] found its most prominent concretization in the dramaturgy

145 Cf. V. Klotz: Geschlossene und offene Form im Drama (1960).

146 Cf. U. Schneider: Der moralische Charakter. Ein Mittel aufklärerischer Menschendarstellung in den frühen deutschen Wochenschriften (1976); J. W. Smeed: The Theophrastan 'Character'. The history of a literary genre (Oxford/New York 1985).

147 As regards the significance of rhetoric for modern aesthetics, cf. K. Dockhorn: Macht und Wirkung der Rhetorik (1968).

148 As to the emotionalism in drama, cf. A. Martino: Geschichte der dramatischen Theorien in Deutschland im 18. Jahrhundert, Vol. 1 (1972).

149 Dubos: Réflexions critiques sur la Poésie et sur la Peinture (Paris 1755 [first printing 1719]) Vol. 1, ch. 44, 460 ; cf. Schiller: Über die tragische Kunst. Nationalausgabe, Vol. 20 (1962) 159f.

150 Aristotle: Poetics 17; Horace: Ars poetica 101–111; Cicero: De oratore II 189–191; Quintilian: [institutio oratoria] VI, 2, 25–28.

151 Cf. J. J. Breitinger: Critische Dichtkunst (Zürich 1740) Vol. 2, 356ff.

of compassion pertaining to bourgeois tragedy.[152] (A lyrical atmosphere, that is, a typically lonely self in harmony with Nature, the "sympathy between a human being and the elements",[153] is a later, Romanticist variant of this originally social consonance).

Universally praised during the 18th and early 19th century, dramatic vividness became the criterion for *epic*, as well. In view of an even more immediate *repraesentatio* in drama, diegetic visualization (hypotyposis, evidentia, repraesentatio), which Ancient rhetoric had recommended as particularly effectual in emotive terms,[154] was now readily regarded as 'dramatic'.[155] The contrast of staged [and] 'performative' with descriptive and narrative forms of literature, which, around 1780, J. J. ENGEL suggested to distinguish between drama and epic,[156] was also applied to the internal differentiation of epic poetry, and these designations have here persisted to this day.[157]

All in all, philanthropy and the aesthetics of affect pertaining to the epoch of sensibility provided the rhetorical and dramatico-theoretical body of thought with such a fundamentally new character that its Ancient roots are now hardly discernible, and were long overlooked. One example is SCHILLER's distinction, tying in with KANT, between the *sublime* and the *beautiful*, which is a variation on the Ancient opposition of *pathos* and *ethos*.[158]

Given rhetoric's loss of prestige, and given the counter project of a disinterested delight in art, now conceived of as non-purposive, as advocated by Kant and GOETHE, the conceptual core of rhetoric, the synthesis of persuasive purpose and affective devices, also lost its authority. Formerly means of impression, the emotions were refunctionalized into vehicles of expression, into

152 Cf. Martino: Geschichte der dramatischen Theorien in Deutschland im 18. Jahrhundert, Vol. 1 (1972) 188ff.

153 "Sympathie zwischen dem Menschen und den Elementen"; A. G. de Staël: Über Deutschland (1814; reprint 1985) 214.

154 Quintilian: [institutio oratoria] VI, 2, 29–32; Pseudo-Longinus: De sublimitate 15; cf. H. Lausberg: Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik (^{2}1973) §§810–819.

155 Cf. already J. Chapelain: Discours de la poésie représentative (around 1635), in: Chapelain: Opuscules critiques (Paris 1936) 127–131.

156 J. J. Engel: Über Handlung, Gespräch und Erzählung (1964) 146–149; cf. Plato: Republic 392–394.

157 Cf E. Lämmert: Bauformen des Erzählens (^{2}1967) 87; F. K. Stanzel: Typische Formen des Romans (^{5}1970) 11f.

158 Cf. Dockhorn: Macht und Wirkung der Rhetorik (1968) 57. 63. 68; G. Ueding: Schillers Rhetorik (1971) 66.

signs of an initially social "sympathy",[159] [and] then only of an *Einfühlung* [sc. 'an em-pathetic process'] appreciative of art, or blissfully sentimental in Nature. "The doctrine of Einfühlung, founded by F. T. VISCHER, ties in with HERDER and Romanticism".[160] In the 20th century, it shaped the literary studies approach of intra-textual interpretation—as advocated, above all, by E. Staiger.[161] When BRECHT's socio-critical "plays" and his theory of *epic* or *dialectic theater* revitalized the prestige of tendentious literature, which had long been ostracized, he expressly rejected such 'Einfühlung', which he deemed "a mainstay of the prevalent aesthetics".[162] He conceived thereof as a suggestively intoxicating, bourgeois attribute, conducive to political illusions and obstructive of social change, [and], in this sense, he also construed the tragic emotions mentioned by ARISTOTLE. In contrast to STANISLAVSKI's recommended method of *physical actions*, by means of which the actor, starting from extralinguistic activities of the dramatic character, is to empathize with his role and experience it as real,[163] Brecht demanded that also the actor abstain from 'Einfühlung'. Even so, his polemic against 'Einfühlung' retains its ontological premise: the separation of tendency (purposiveness, persuasion) and feeling. He simply reverses the bourgeois assessment, [and] valorizes tendency, his own at any rate, while more or less devaluing emotion. He conceives his "poetics of drama as a poetics of effect"[;][164] to this extent, he is comparable to the didactic stage rhetoric of the Early Modern Age, with which, in part, he agrees also in terms of form, for instance as regards his addresses to the audience. Committed to the Neue Sachlichkeit of the twenties, [which was] skeptical of emotions,[165] and even more so to the Marxism he discovered for himself during that time, he [sc. Brecht], rather than appealing to the emotions, wishes to move the audience, by way of critical reflection, in the direction of social change. While he does speak in favor

159 Cf. Martino: Geschichte der dramatischen Theorien in Deutschland im 18. Jahrhundert, Vol. 1 (1972) 469 (entry 'Sympathie').

160 Brockhaus Enzyklopädie in 20 Bänden, Vol. 1 (1966) 811 (article 'Ästhetik').

161 For a critical assessment thereof, cf. J. Schulte-Sasse, R. Werner: Einführung in die Literaturwissenschaft (1977) 28–30.

162 "ein Grundpfeiler der herrschenden Ästhetik"; B. Brecht: Über experimentelles Theater. Gesammelte Werke, Vol. 15 (1967) 298.

163 Cf. K. Stanislavski: Theater, Regie und Schauspieler (1958) 37.

164 "Dramenpoetik als Wirkungspoetik"; W. Hinck: Das moderne Drama in Deutschland (1973) 122.

165 [The very name of the movement known as '*Neue Sachlichkeit*' implies: a 'sober, dispassionate, matter-of-fact, descriptive approach'—with the prefix 'new' also implying a 'reaction to', a countermovement].

of a "pleasurable [form of] learning",[166] [and while] he does not reject emotions out of hand, he requires that they be controlled by a critical consciousness[;] at any rate, [he] demands that "Einfühlung be relinquished".[167] He adopts as his "principle [...] to produce Verfremdung [sc. 'defamiliarization'] in place of Einfühlung [sc. 'an em-pathizing process']".[168]

Accordingly, his [sc. Brecht's] epic theater is indebted to rhetoric via the detour of the bourgeois aesthetics of 'Einfühlung'—in the form of a double negation, which suggests a partial affirmation: as the aesthetics of sentiment opposes rhetoric, Brecht opposes that aesthetics. With rhetoric, he shares the tendentious character, and thus the primary approach. He foregoes the arsenal of devices relating to the emotions, which he saw in the de-rhetoricized and obfuscatory form of the aesthetics of 'Einfühlung'. Even so, he himself did not recognize the partial identity of his concept, targeted at effect, with rhetoric. He felt negative about "eloquence", being the opposite of his partiality for "arguments",[169] [and] summarily lumped it together with its historical counterforce, the aesthetics of sentiment. Much like LESSING had before, he proceeded from a foreshortened understanding of rhetoric.[170]

166 "lustvolles Lernen"; Brecht: Vergnügungstheater oder Lehrtheater? Gesammelte Werke, Vol. 15 (1967) 267.

167 "das Aufgeben der Einfühlung"; Brecht: Über experimentelles Theater. Gesammelte Werke, Vol. 15 (1967) 300; cf. 293f. 298–303.

168 "Prinzip [...] anstelle der Einfühlung die Verfremdung herbeizuführen"; Brecht: Über experimentelles Theater. Gesammelte Werke, Vol. 15 (1967) 301.

169 Brecht: Über experimentelles Theater. Gesammelte Werke, Vol. 15 (1967) 298: "Anstelle der Argumente tritt die Beredsamkeit" ["Eloquence takes the place of arguments"].

170 Further Reading: G. Zeißig: Die Überwindung der Rede im Drama. Vergleichende Untersuchung des dramatischen Sprachstils in der Tragödie Gottscheds, Lessings und der Stürmer und Dränger (1930). J. Schröder: Gotthold Ephraim Lessing. Sprache und Drama (1972). H. Seidler: Prunkreden in Grillparzers Dramen, in: Seidler: Studien zu Grillparzer und Stifter (Vienna 1970) 85–134. D. Borchmeyer: Tragödie und Öffentlichkeit. Schillers Dramaturgie [...] (1973). G. Schaub: Georg Büchner: Poeta rhetor, in: Georg Büchner Jahrbuch 2 [1982] 170–195. W. Neuber: Nestroys Rhetorik (1987). W. Wülfing: "Ich werde, du wirst, er wird". Zu Georg Büchners witziger Rhetorik im Kontext der Vormärzliteratur, in: B. Dedner, G. Oesterle (ed.): Zweites Internationales Georg Büchner Symposion 1987 (1990) 455–475. R. Campe: Affekt und Ausdruck. Zur Umwandlung der literarischen Rede im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert (1990). P. von Matt: "The tongues of dying men ..." Zur Dramaturgie der Todesszene, in: G. Buhr, F. A. Kittler, H. Turk (ed.): Das Subjekt der Dichtung. Festschrift G. Kaiser (1990) 567–578.

DS Mayfield (ed.)

Proceedings

"Rhetoric and Drama", International Conference, FU Berlin, February 11–12, 2016

Rhetoric being processual, the ensuing proceedings are tendered by the present editor to provide the reader with a substantive description of the academic dynamics during the conference: its *actio*, energetic discussions, positions taken—both challenging and accommodating other views. In conducing to *memoria*, these synopses might serve as a heuristic *locus* for *inventio*.

Synopses of Papers Given (Feb 11—12, 2016)

Kathy Eden (Columbia U, New York City) "From the Refutation of Drama to the Drama of Refutation" (Feb 11, 2016 · 4.30 – 5.30 p.m.)

Précis

Eden's presentation linked dramatic practice to legal procedure, specifically to that of refutation. She stressed that, from the earliest school days onward (sc. already in the *progymnasmata*), students would be (and were forced to be) familiar with this forensic basis. Referring to Quintilian, Eden accentuated that "it takes an artist to refute"—the *télos* being victory in court; moreover, Quintilian stresses that 'it is easier to dismantle than to construct, easier to accuse than to

These proceedings were prepared by the present editor on the basis of immediate handwritten notes, which were checked against the summary minutes taken by the conference team: Andrea Dueñas Paredes, Lena Maria Hein, Anna Lena Schächinger (two assigned to each talk, all three to the final discussion). In addition to those by the speakers, the selected contributions to the discussions referred to below are by: Gasan Gusejnov, Natalia Sarana (HSE Moscow); Igor Candido (FU Berlin); Marie-Christin Wilm (Friedrich Schlegel Graduate School, FU Berlin); Gaia Gubbini, Tatiana Korneeva, Toni Bernhart, Gautam Chakrabarti, Sven Thorsten Kilian (all DramaNet, FU Berlin).

DS Mayfield, Freie Universität Berlin (Editor)

defend'. In contrast to Plato (the Platonic 'Socrates'), Aristotle's pragmatics had emphasized that refuting is more important than being refuted.

Eden discerned a homology between forensic rhetoric and theater from the earliest beginnings of either. Euripides, for instance, is "most rhetorical". Moreover, various playwrights would "pit themselves against each other in a contest of words". While also adducing the *modus operandi* pertaining to proving or disproving a given event or action—for instance by eyewitnesses or hearsay, by signs (tokens)—Eden accentuated that, usually, there is a "dramatic back and forth", dynamic instances of defending (oneself), refuting and being refuted. In (partly very) long speeches of alternation (a sort of 'Q&A'), the aim was to highlight (the opponent's) inconsistencies. At times (as, for instance, in *Richard III*), there are moments of self-refutation, and also self-incrimination. Eden stressed that "Shakespeare is full of refutations and self-refutations", which are performed with equal artfulness.

Building on the fact that Greek rhetoricians draw from dramatists (and also vice versa), Eden highlighted "a deep structural homology between refutation in drama and in the forum"; formally, "alternation is a central feature in court and in drama". With reference to Plato's *Gorgias* (glossed as Plato's most dramatic and rhetorical, hence dynamic dialog), in which Socrates comically plays both parts in a dialog, Eden stated that (sophistic) rhetoricians "cater to the *óchlos*", which they seek to gratify. The character Socrates, however, states that 'he will be just as glad to refute as being refuted'—with the latter valued higher than the former (by the philosopher). The Platonic 'Socrates' therefore acknowledges rhetoric as agonal, contentious. Starting from the aspect of 'refuting the refutation', Eden highlighted the fact that refutation takes, and can take, several forms. The "rhetorical refutation of the law courts is worthless to Socrates", since it "depends on a large crowd (of witnesses)", the quantity of the audience is the distinctive quality; what matters in this form of (sophistic) refutation is the mass—while Socrates is in for singularity. He therefore wishes to reduce the (quantity of the) audience; ultimately, to "become our own most ardent refuters" (for personal benefit, insight). From this antagonism, Eden outlined the lovers of the *demos* on the one hand (Gorgias), and the lovers of philosophy on the other—with the latter aiming both at refuting and at being refuted (Socrates).

In the concluding part of her presentation, Eden stressed the fact that "Early Modern theater is full of refutations, both of self and others"—hence the metaphor of the "internal forum of the mind". Already Petrarch's confessions (the *Secretum*) might be read "as one long refutation, an elenchic dialog". Montaigne is "repeatedly refuting himself" in the *Essais*, placing a "higher premium on being refuted than refuting"—while Eden also acknowledged the fact that there

is a certain amount of "self-commendation in self-refutation" in Montaigne (the same as in Socrates).

Questions and Answers

- Most referred to the semantic range of the word *élenchos*, affirming that it not only signifies refutation (which tends to have a "negative" connotation), but also a "putting to the test", which is more open in meaning (that is, 'whether something be true', here with reference to Sextus Empiricus, to Ancient Skepticism). The latter is particularly of import with regard to Montaigne ("essaying").
- Eden, referring to Aristotle in particular (while not to Sextus), stated that there had been an "appropriation of legal terms", which "carry a residue from the earlier meaning"; "the primary meaning is legal"; she stressed that this would not deny a (possible) change of meaning. Eden emphasized multiple cross-references between Aristotle's *Poetics* and his *Rhetoric*, for instance with regard to *mímesis*, *praxis*, *páthos*—the latter being crucial qua experience; tragedy marks a real experience of suffering "done to us"; drama is both a "doing", and a "having something done to us". Eden stated that, generally, 'drama became increasingly more rhetorical', from Aeschylus to Euripides.

- Küpper agreed that "the device of refutation" is crucial during Early Modern times, but suggested a "secondary influence" for the "dialog with the self", and one of high emotionality, namely Prudentius' *Psychomachia*—hence a Christian background to the praxis and tradition of self-refutation. Montaigne tied in with the Classical model. In addition, Küpper asked about the absence of refutation as a device in the *Poetics*: "why does he avoid its explanation" there; and "to which elements, parts of tragedy" in the Aristotelian sense had Eden referred.
- As to *psychomachia*, Eden agreed that this would merit further scrutiny. With regard to Shakespeare's Richard: "it is not his conscience talking to him", hence this is "not a dialog, but more intensive". She explained that Aristotle does not mention refutation specifically and explicitly in the *Poetics*, because he refers to it in his other works. On the whole, "drama has become increasingly more rhetorical". With regard to the effect of refutation, Eden asserted that "it comes out of both kinds of experiences: doing the refuting, being refuted", that is, 'active and passive', while the latter "seems more important" to Socrates, since it 'leads to self-knowledge'.

Glenn W. Most (U of Pisa/U of Chicago) "Sad Stories of the Death of Kings: Sovereignty and Monarchy in Tragedy" (Feb 11, 2016 · 5.45 – 6.45 p.m.)

Précis

By way of introduction, Most stressed that it is impossible not to notice connections between drama and rhetoric: first, there are public speeches, and (references to) actions, and often violent ones; secondly, persuasion is a key aspect of either; thirdly, both are (performed) competitive(ly). In rhetoric as in drama, there is a tension between 'accommodating' tendencies and 'dominating' ones, while something that seems to accommodate may in fact tend toward domination, as well (sc. accommodation as a form of domination).

Most's talk focused on the "exchange of stories" concerning "the sad death of kings" (referring to Shakespeare's *Richard II*), where "the empty place of the king is occupied by Death"; in this context, he remarked that "the generic distinction between histories and tragedies is notoriously fluid".

Most contrasted the Aristotelian *Poetics*' implicit or tacit insistence on not once referring to *basiléos* or *týrannos* ("Aristotle's stubborn silence") with the "stubborn insistence" of Ancient tragedians on kings—there being "a king in every tragedy". Yet a preference for emphasizing ethical aspects is discernible in Aristotle. The tragedians' predilection is for the depiction of the "heroic age", and in this sense one might say that "Greek tragedies are anachronous"—wherefore "historicization is not necessary" in this case. The last tyrant overthrown in Athens having been Hippias, kings were known to Athens either as Spartans or as Barbarians, respectively Persians.

Most proceeded to relate the chorus to the figure of the king: there is "no play without either chorus or king", the chorus being "as essential as the king". The latter prefers to interact via 'intermediaries or directly'. The chorus' distinctive features in terms of form and function are: it 'sings, dances, moves, is plural, anonymous, and of a much lower status than a king'. In contrast to the king, "the chorus is always alive", "cannot be killed", but, "like the audience, remains alive".

While "cooperative values", "self-restraint", "solidarity" are represented or imagined in the chorus, plays often represent the ambitious sons of kings, a king's "individualism", "arrogance, infatuation with power, disregard of the gods", with the latter all coming to "one form or other of grief"—represented in a form of alternation. Generally (and with reference to Nietzsche), tragedy might

be said to explore the tensions between democracy (chorus) and monarchy (king).

Most stated that his emphasis was thus anthropological and political, with Greek tragedies 'speaking to more than just 5th century BCE' Athens. The "king's freedom to pursue his ends is what makes him what he is"—there being "no one above him apart from the gods". By contrast, "the chorus is bound up in all kinds of negotiations"; and, similarly to the chorus, the "spectators are transformed into a group"—the question being "with whom they identify". Most stressed the fact that "every audience identifies with both the king and the chorus", as well as with their actions—the latter being "presented in the extreme", seeing that the emphasis of tragedy is on a "single moment of decision" (as per Aristotle). Moreover, in tragedy "human decision is never autonomous", since there is always an 'influence of the past'.

By way of conclusion, Most once more referred to the fact that, "at the end of a play, the king is often dead". In Shakespeare's *Richard II*, even this fact of being a king is cast into question, all sovereignty being (to some extent) fictional. Most stressed that this realization is often delegated to the chorus in Greek tragedy, since kings therein "all too often die before they can do so".

Questions and Answers

- Küpper considered plausible the suggestion that tragedy functions as "democratic propaganda" in 5th century BCE Athens. In Early Modern times, there is no chorus, hence "no dichotomy between cooperative and competitive values", 'no discussion of democracy'. As regards Aristotle, Küpper agreed that the *Poetics* "depoliticizes drama", and tragedy in particular (focusing on *kátharsis*, *hedoné* in terms of function)—the question being, whether this be conscious on Aristotle's part.
- In response, Most accentuated that there is almost no space given to the chorus in Aristotle, "and none to the gods", while he "sees tragedy primarily in ethical and rhetorical terms", which are taken "from his other works almost wholesale". Accordingly, Most's "guess is, that it is really just Aristotle" himself, who valued tragedy rather positively in the *Poetics*. Plato had "attacked tragedy", particularly since he feared that "emotions would get worse and worse, get out of hand". Historically, tragedy had the function of "state regulation" in politics; but "Aristotle in his *Poetics* pays no attention to the political or religious aspect". Most therefore emphasized that Aristotle's 'de-politicization of tragedy' is in reaction to "Plato's political and religious view".

- Eden inquired further into the aspects of "political and autonomous sovereignty" in Plato in contrast to Aristotle, and their 'varying responses to Greek tragedy'.
- Most replied that Plato is intensely focused on "sovereignty in ways Aristotle just is not". "Plato is sensitive to sovereignty", but reacted to "tragedy with intensity"—thinking "that everybody else reacted in the same way". Aristotle "did understand tragedy", while not being as sensitive to "sovereignty".

- Kilian asked whether the distinction between history (play) and tragedy is not an "artificial genre distinction".
- Most replied that the use of the term "historical" in Shakespeare is a "publishing issue"; the generic boundaries are relatively "fluid".

- Wesche commented that Schiller thought the "chorus is not democratic", that it was to 'protect drama from reality', and that Scaliger "avoided speech of the people"; hence Wesche inquired: "what is the rhetoric of the chorus".
- Most said that he was *de re* "dissatisfied with Schiller's account", seeing that "no chorus is needed to protect tragedy from reality"; he again emphasized that "Aristotle hardly mentions the chorus"; to the question, Most answered that "the chorus has no rhetoric, except for the figural language, which is rhetorical".

- With reference to the relation of rhetoric to (plot) logic, Gusejnov asked whether "pathos in Aristotle is not just an attribute"; for, in (plot) logical terms, the "king must be killed because of pathos".
- Most stressed the aspect of "suffering" in this respect, not simply that of "experience". The "subject of suffering is not the same" as that of "learning".

Martha Feldman (U of Chicago) "The Castrato as a Rhetorical Figure" (Feb 12, 2016 · 09.00 – 10.00 a.m.)

Précis

By way of introduction, Feldman stressed the performative, social (qua event) and rhetorical aspects of the castrato phenomenon and the opera—'opera being fundamentally rhetorical', and "the aria a dynamic oratory", 'with an ear (at)tuned to the audience' (and vice versa). Unlike Burmeister, she would not

transform Quintilian into music—her emphasis being a Ciceronian one, where a "performative stage star still retains *decorum*"; with regard to the "musical *téchne*", the "most important one is the voice".

Castrati were able to "produce a high pitched" tone with a "far reach of tremendous range and nuance", and with the "highest level of intensity and self-assurance". They had to "practice daily" to achieve range and scale, and a "very well-wrought" *elocutio*, "perfect diction", as a "key device for punctuating language"; they were forced to 'constantly rework, hone, rewrite'—in terms of the *ornatus* of their voice. They were "singing masters", whose skills were described (and criticized) by means of rhetorical terms, such as *invenzione*, *variazione*, *decoro*. The castrato singer might be termed "the ideal orator"; his libretti combine "singing and writing". As all students at the time, castrati were schooled in rhetoric, and were told to "cultivate rhetoric" and grammar (sc. "where the periods should be put") also in their singing. Feldman emphasized that "rhetorical precepts continued to be present and were not wiped out altogether" (also not later). Moreover, the "orator and the dramatic actor had the same performance training".

Farinelli, in 'leaping between registers', "carves out a space for brilliance": that is, for vocal or musical *ornatus*, in terms of a "reprise with ornaments" (variations)—'creating beauty from variety. Some pieces were "excessively ornamented" (the "*bravura* arias") and reduced later, with regard to *decorum*. In terms of function, "*ornatus* was a relief or balance"; but, as Feldman added, "*ornatus* only works so long". Generally, this also pertains to shifting vogues, for instance that "from theatricality to rhetorical *virtù*". During the Enlightenment, castrati went out of fashion, not least due to a "reconceptualization of music as truth and contemplation"—in line with judging singing as a 'work of autonomous art true to nature'.

Questions and Answers

- Bloemendal asked how trustworthy the accounts of the singing of castrati might be; and whether one were dealing with "descriptions, ideas, or fictions".
- Feldman accentuated that these accounts are "very much to the point", and "described in very precise terms", while 'not being too idealized'.

- Most highlighted the "application of rhetorical theory" to opera, "the work of castrati"—rhetoric being "prestigious", having a "long history"; thus, a time-honored, "long tradition" is applied to a "new institution" (for

"legitimization"). With regard to the traditionally emphasized "masculinity in the *orator*" qua "*vir* (*bonus*)", Most stressed those tropes that "made fun of effeminate" speakers, asking how this might relate to the castrato phenomenon.

- Feldman answered that "castrati were considered the ideal stand-in for the sovereign", which might seem "almost inexplicable". The only critique thereof came from France and the theologians (opposing castrati). Feldman stressed that the "theatrical illusion", the theatrical "register", was foregrounded (and "accepted"); moreover, "only castrati were capable of doing" what they did in terms of music, of "voice", therein having their "own reserves of power". Rhetorically, Feldman ventriloquized the question pertinent to the time as follows: "does it really matter what they are in real life". She stressed, however, that this complex "starts to be thematized later in the 18th century"—particularly via a "satirical register".

- Eden, replying to Most's comment, accentuated that the "*orator* in Cicero" is distinguished from the "military man" and his "force": "a double value is already built into rhetoric", and "rhetoric has already taken a step back from the manly"—visible, not least, in the fact that the root of "*persuasio* is sweetness".
- Most, conceding the "ambivalence of rhetoric", again pointed to the fact that the 'rhetorical tradition is being used to explain what is being done', while 'the detractors might then use other parts of rhetoric': "the defenders of castrati use the rhetorical tradition as do the accusers".

- Küpper commented that, with regard to "tragedy and rhetoric", it is about "convincing someone" (the forensic, for instance, has a "pragmatic" function, "for real life", and drama a political or ethical function), while "opera is not about convincing", but about "*stupore*, *admiratio*" (particularly, as a result of the *ornatus*); one is dealing with "a device of aestheticization", while there is no ethicization, no ethics.
- Feldman replied that, especially at this time in Italy, "it is about admiration" indeed; even so, "there is some attention to being convincing"—for otherwise "you lose the audience". Moreover, "the job of a singer is to collectivize", as in drama; for the "space of theater is fragmented"—hence the 'need (while it is hard) to collectivize': "*persuasio*" is crucial.

- Korneeva remarked how close to power, to the sovereign, the court, the castrati were, asking whether the nexus "rhetoric–drama–politics is reflected on the textual level".
- Feldman responded that "Farinelli is not a typical, but an exceptional castrato" in being 'close to power'. The sovereign might 'give (some) castrati a stage and platform', as a result of which they are "seen as that figure" of power with "influence"; this affects the libretti in content and form.

- Sarana inquired into a "religious rhetoric" with regard to the opera.
- Feldman agreed that these were "very much parallel phenomena" (a church setting and opera, also in social terms, at the time). There were "many oratories"; and 'operas with a religious theme were enjoyed'.

Maria Galli Stampino (U of Miami)
"Family, City, State, and Theater: Carlo Gozzi and the Rhetoric of Conservatism"
(Feb 12, 2016 · 10.15 – 11.15 a.m.)

Précis

By way of introduction, Stampino emphasized that "anyone schooled in Italy is still (to this day) influenced by the rhetorical, specifically via Jesuit influence". She highlighted that the play under scrutiny pertains particularly to the "epideictic genre", the setting being Venice in the carnival season. Moreover, one is not dealing with a "court setting", but with a decidedly "commercial, economic function and value"; the "private gain" of merchant families is in the forefront, hence the aspect of "mass appeal", the rhetorical function of *delectare*, so as to "make more money".

In the specific case, this mass appeal was furthered by Goldoni's proclamation in a "*prologo* printed and distributed at the end of the previous season" to be producing "one new play a week"—the result being in fact "16 new plays, 2 per week", which were immediately "sold out". Rather than writing "not fully written-out plays in the *commedia dell'arte*" tradition (causing 'a fluidity of texts and authors'), Goldoni "wants to be the author", wishes his 'text to be fixed', and "also for economic reasons (not just originality)".

Stampino analyzed a play by Gozzi "rediscovered in 2003, published in 2011, unperformed", which "features his real-life antagonists". In terms of style, she judged it to be "very wordy"; and, 'if performed, a little overlong'. It is a comedy,

hence the nexus to "epideictic rhetoric" is pronounced; it is 'built on dualities, alternations', also "refutation". The setting is "remote" (Mississippi, although it looks like Venice), while the time is contemporaneous, featuring Goldoni and Chiari as characters, who are supported by their factions; in this sense, it is an "agonistic" play (concerning the "tension between authors"), with a "face-to-face confrontation"—hence "the back and forth in comic terms". The "*carnevale*" setting also features a "latent violence"—people being so "close to each other"; a 'challenge to a *guerra alla veneziana*' ensues in terms of content.

Accordingly, the 'particular performance of the mass scenes in the play is important': "the whole play is a critique of excess", although "some theater is necessary for the communal welfare", as Stampino explained along Gozzi's lines—this being the "epideictic moment". Gozzi thus issues "a caveat about the excesses of theater", although the "Venetians are too enamored with theater to drop it". Historically and in terms of genre, this play marks a 'moment of change in theater traditions', which is accompanied by a change of the rhetorical technique when contrasted with the previous tradition.

Questions and Answers

- Most, commenting on the fact that "the main characters are playwrights", stated that this does appear in Greek drama, "but hardly later"; he moreover inquired into the "legal implications" (at the time) of staging "two living authors"; and whether this is connected to the fact that there was "no circulation" of the play.
- Stampino replied that referring to real-life persons is "one of the tools Gozzi uses" with a view to "timeliness"; she affirmed that there were "laws against slander", and that this was a "big accusation to make"; ultimately, the play is "very polemical in intent" (while "pointing to a moral responsibility"). Even so, Stampino hypothesized that "he wanted it performed": Gozzi had "first written it in prose", and had provided "versification for some scenes".
- Korneeva added that Goldoni and Chiari also did something to this effect.
- Stampino emphasized that Goldoni put out his plays immediately. With regard to the "laws of the *Commedia dell'arte*", she stated that they have "become archeological texts", since "one can only imagine how they would have been staged"; for "the actor families did not want their tricks to be written down".

- Wesche asked whether there is "a didactic impetus in Gozzi", and whether this is "linked to gender".

- Stampino replied that there are "many women present", as well as "a lot of characters, and many strata", a "citywide" representation, "for the whole society"; they also voice opinions concerning the theater. Gozzi is indeed interested in the "citywide impact of theater". The audience might "vicariously live the tension of other people dealing with the *agón* of the playwrights"—seeing that the play stages performances, a sort of meta-drama. It being "1750", servants "need to express the likes and dislikes of their masters vicariously".

- Küpper noted that Gozzi is "the most rhetorical of all writers today and yesterday" (sc. mentioned during the conference), his "basic device" being "allegory" ("the apogee of rhetoricity" as per Quintilian's '*aliud . . . aliud*'). There is also a pronounced "emphasis on pleasure", the *delectare* (it "provides fun"), while the "message import is reduced". Küpper referred to 'Aristotle's emphasis on *hedoné*', 'with which Gozzi is in line', here.
- Stampino argued that "even the fact that he [sc. Gozzi] says 'innocent *divertimento*' implies that he points to the excesses"—meaning, that *docere* is also implied: "a teaching occurs there", a "warning". She judges that "he kind of has it both ways", while Gozzi does in fact "talk about *divertimento*". Yet Stampino also stressed that "there seems to be a message always in all plays" (particularly as regards Italy during this time).

- Sarana referred to the fact of "speaking like a commoner", according to the "social strata" in the play, and inquired as to the "register", and whether there was a theoretical discussion thereon (or a "polemical" intent).
- Stampino replied that, intratextually, there seems to be no special problem with this matter, Goldoni having "written in Venetian dialect" (historically); nor is Venice a "monolingual community". Gozzi, however, does "go toward the *lingua franca* Italian, which no one uses in Venice".

- Eden referred to the *triás* of "teach, delight, move" (in terms of intent), and questioned how one might 'get from one to the other'. She also requested that the "epideictic agenda" here be clarified, seeing that it "comes in two flavors: praise and blame"—asking whether it is not mostly "the vituperative part, blaming rather than praising".
- Stampino agreed with the assessment as "vituperation", there being "no *docere* in the play" itself; "playwrights were not morally (socially) equipped for '*docere*'". By contrast, there are "other plays that are more allegorizing".

Jan Bloemendal (Huygens Institute, The Hague/Amsterdam) "Rhetoric and Neo-Latin Drama: The Two Tragedies by the 'Polish Pindar' Simon Simonides/Szymon Szymonowic (1558–1629): *Castus Ioseph* and *Penthesilea*" (Feb 12, 2016 · 11.30 a.m. – 12.30 p.m.)

Précis

By way of introduction, Bloemendal stressed that his emphasis is on his dealing with "Early Modern Latin drama", and that "every piece of literature is rhetorical in Antiquity and Early Modern drama"—seeing that "everyone" was taught rhetoric "in school", using the respective "stylistic devices" (including "prosopopoeia, impersonation", which was "part of the schooling"). As a consequence, there were "many rhetorical handbooks in Early Modern times" ("more than 1000"), which were also used for "letter writing", for instance—the result being that "rhetoric invaded everyone's minds, and was ubiquitous". It was also part of what "preachers had to learn—Erasmus wrote a theoretical and practical manual for preachers"; likewise, the "Jesuits were very productive" (referring to the "*ratio studiorum*"). Hence "both in practice and in theory—rhetoric was everywhere".

In terms of drama, "Seneca the Younger was omnipresent", and "Senecan tragedies are (still) considered to be very rhetorical" (in having a "short, pointed style", using "stichomythia"). The use of the "*varietas verborum*, the *copia verborum*", including the "use of *sententiae*", was 'the kernel of a good Senecan drama'. The "display of learning", the "Asianic style"—"all this is present in Neo-Latin drama also", Bloemendal accentuated. Even so, a "'rhetoric of drama' is difficult to find", due to rhetoric's (and the rhetorician's) "Protean character".

With regard to the author under scrutiny—Simon Simonides, appointed poet Laureate by the Pope in 1590—Bloemendal stressed the 'inter- or supra-national scene of Humanists', into which he was embedded (he knew Justus Lipsius, for instance). The play itself, *Castus Ioseph*, is judged an "extraordinary play", seeing that—contrary to audience expectation, "used to seeing Joseph as a comedy"—the spectators are not given "a comedy, as was typical for *fabulae* from the *Old Testament*" performed "in Terentian fashion". Instead, "Simonides wrote a Senecan tragedy", which "focuses heavily on the emotions of Potiphar's wife".

In terms of form, Bloemendal accentuated the use and value of "standard elements, set pieces in all of Neo-Latin drama", a 'structure always present'. These "dramatic conventions", as well as the *lingua franca* "Latin" (present "all over, also in the colonies"), and the "omnipresence" of the system of "rhetoric",

decidedly "helped the movement of texts" (three factors very useful for the DramaNet context, as Bloemendal highlighted).

Bloemendal proceeded to a close reading of a passage, in which he identified a plethora of stylistic devices (such as synonymy, emphasis, *correctio*, *accumulatio*, *sententiae*, *anaphora*, *variatio*, *antithesis*, *chiasmus*), as well as 'persuasion via emotionality' (*movere*) in terms of the effect of the integration of form and content.

Building on the latter aspect, Bloemendal expounded that "school theater" depended particularly on "emotionality", was "very pathos-ridden", so that, "even if the audience did not understand", it would take the message from the "context". Comprehension was further facilitated by "stock characters", which were to produce the effect of "we know it from the *Bible*"—from "that general intertext" (at the time). Bloemendal repeated that it was "more about passion than about '*dran*' qua action" in the Senecan tradition. 'Rhetoric (emphatic of *páthos*, here) is thus also used to define the *ethos* of a character—to identify and characterize them'.

Tying in with previous talks during the conference, Bloemendal stressed that "there is no king, but Ioseph is a prince to be" (see Most's presentation); and he highlighted the "Senecan feature" of "addressing one's mind" (see Eden's presentation).

In conclusion, Bloemendal laid particular weight on the fact that "from Poland to Spain, from Holland to the Black Sea, from the Baltic to Italy, they did have a common rhetorical tool kit, and a common language (Latin)", which enabled and accelerated the "mobility of certain phrases", set pieces. He suggested the metaphor of rhetoric as at once "the dressing and the salad bar": one might "choose which ingredients" one desires; as an alternative image, Bloemendal proposed that of "rhetoric as the glue in a worldwide web".

Questions and Answers

- Gusejnov inquired whether the aspect of "inter-artiality" (in architecture, for instance, "the building of cities as rhetorical acts") mattered in the "context of creation" (emphasizing *actio*).
- Bloemendal replied that rhetoric "functions in so many contexts", also in 'the social, the linguistic (Latin), the political', etc. ('of a city, locality').

- Gubbini suggested the lives of Saints (in Latin, in the vernacular) as a possible formal, generic intertext for the *Ioseph*.

- Bloemendal, referring to the author's background, said his was an "Armenian-Jewish context", and that "Christ is not mentioned"; but that, "yes, it is possible", seeing that there is often a "typological interpretation in Neo-Latin drama", specifically in "martyr drama"—only that "Joseph is not killed".
- Eden suggested that one might explore a connection between Most's and Bloemendal's papers via the nexus of kings (including Joseph qua prince) and Christ—that is, between the political and the religious (the typological).
- Bloemendal agreed that Christ is a "presence in absence".

- Küpper referred to the "*koiné* Latin" and the "*téchne* of rhetoric" as very fruitful perspectives, while highlighting also the fact that "Neo-Latin drama" was highly "standardized", facilitating a "floating of cultural" material—its "mobility" ("traveling through Europe"). He inquired into the "context of rhetoric" for Neo-Latin "Protestant authors" in particular, seeing that the *New Testament*'s style is considered "*humilis*", and "exterior decoration" would thus be "refuted" by Protestants.
- Bloemendal mentioned Protestants who were Humanists (such as Grotius, Heinsius) and wrote Senecan drama: "the Humanist wish prevailed—they wanted to write tragedies". With regard to the comment, Bloemendal again emphasized the 'traveling of books', of "traders, ecclesiastical" men etc. ("texts, companies, merchants, rulers", among others), and that it was a "very dynamic" time, with agents "traveling a lot"—"Early Modern Europe" not having been "as static" as perhaps hitherto believed.
- Kilian added that the German type of Protestant rhetoric at the time was mainly that of "Protestant propaganda".

- Most referred to the "substitution of Biblical characters for Greek heroes" performed by the Church Fathers, and inquired into the use of Ancient drama in schools: "were they performed" or typically "*Lesedramen*".
- Bloemendal agreed that "Early Christianity had to find its space", but that such "substitution was no longer necessary" once Christianity had consolidated. With regard to drama, Bloemendal stated that "Seneca's dramas were used as *Lesedramen*", but also "for declamation", and sometimes for performance. Neo-Latin plays, often written by the headmasters themselves, were "performed by school boys". The "scripts were often quite loose"; so "the Latin and the vernacular versions are very different", at times ('accommodated to the respective needs').

- With regard to the adoption, transformation, and substitution processes on the part of Early Christianity, Eden highlighted that "differences were erased in the process".
- Küpper adduced the use of the "priority thesis" by the Church Fathers (Ancient pagan materials were thought of as 'disfigured, distorted' from their supposedly 'original' Jewish qua proto-Christian source, the *Old Testament*).

- Bernhart asked about a nexus between the *Volksschauspiel* and Neo-Latin drama being translated into the vernacular, and about the "influence of Neo-Latin drama on European literature in general".
- Bloemendal stated that this is being looked into, with further study in this respect being a desideratum. He particularly mentioned the *Everyman* in its various stages of reception: there were many "translations, imitations" into Latin, Dutch, English. The "extent of the influence" deserved further attention, he noted. 'Vernacular plays were often first translated into Latin' qua mediating language, 'and then into other vernaculars'.

Jörg Wesche (U Duisburg–Essen) "Verse Games in German Baroque Plays" (Feb 12, 2016 · 2.45 – 3.45 p.m.)

Précis

By way of introduction, Wesche stated that he wished to refute the notion of the "frozen artificiality of German Baroque drama"—his endeavor being the analysis of "stylistic devices", of "linguistic aspects" from an interdisciplinary perspective, with the aim of demonstrating, first, "the rhetorical power of meter", its 'persuasiveness'; and, secondly, its "interactional, acoustic" effect.

In terms of the interrelation of discourse and form, Wesche accentuated the aspects of "self-contained verse", "metrical repetition" and "repetition mirrored metrically" as elements of a 'verbally composed Baroque Neo-Stoicism'—a 'persistent steadiness and steadfastness' (*Beharrlichkeit*) against "the temporal progress of time".

As to the acoustic effect, Wesche stressed "the might of rhythm, overpowering the audience", with "spoken language as the basis of meter": "talking in verse is talking, and verbal art", it is 'interactionally useful', reflecting a "vitality in verse" (as the "effect of stage play in language"). Gryphius particularly "uses the oral technique". In the "dialogical, interactional use of

meter", the "use of ellipsis" is crucial; it facilitates "speedy changes", rendering dialogs 'dynamic': there can be "a lot of interactions in a single line—an intensity via meter", producing "an *in situ* effect". With regard to 'metrically interrelated' "question and answer constellations" in Gryphius, Wesche stressed the "persuasive use of verse in the speech duel of Love and Death"—including the occasional rhetorical question qua appeal, *apostrophé* to the audience.

Moreover, Wesche accentuated the 'persuasiveness of rhymes', the use of 'antithetic and alternating structures to distribute between roles', the use of stichomythia—and, generally, "the high degree of metrical stylization". He concluded that, consequently, "meter" is particularly "adapted to drama"—its "utility" being its exceptionally 'persuasive' function.

Questions and Answers

- Feldman inquired into a possible connection to Petrarchan poetics, particularly the sonnet, in this context.
- Wesche concurred, stating that the link is via Opitz and Opitzian writers, respectively the translations of Petrarch.

- Küpper stressed that one is dealing with *Lesedramen* in the case of Gryphius: "these dramas are no longer staged" and "no longer (actively) received in the German context" (in contrast to the Spanish plays from the same period); moreover, "rhetoricized drama" has gone "out of fashion", except for the case of Shakespeare, who is still "most popular in the German" language. Consequently, Küpper suggested that there are "different degrees of rhetoricalness" (in general, and specifically in Baroque drama), and that "certain variants are considered obsolete"—the reason being the "end of rhetoric, Romanticism".
- Wesche replied that, indeed, "German poetics cut off the 17th century tradition"; Shakespeare remains "popular and survives, because he was de-rhetoricized"; as to *Lesedramen*, he emphasized that there was "school theater" also, and that "Gryphius' plays were staged, in schools, for instance"—with a "focus on aspects of interactional, declamatory speech".

- Eden (also replying to Küpper's remark concerning 'degrees of rhetoricalness') commented on the "development of verse", the connections between "poetics and rhetoric" in terms of 'meter' in the former, and 'the power of rhythm (*numerus*)' in the latter (as emphasized by Cicero). Even so, "Shakespeare gave up rhyming couplets, on the whole, at the end", while

"verse meter is a different matter, specifically in drama". She confirmed that there is a "spectrum of rhetoricity".
- In general, Wesche pointed to "doggerel, satire", and various "mixtures of traditions" (Aristotle, Scaliger); to "mixtures of Latin and Roman traditions in all of German poetry of the 17th century". He also stated that, despite its "rhymes", "Goethe's *Faust* is not so boring".

- Most confirmed that "Shakespeare survives the end of rhetoric by being de-rhetoricized"; rhetoric also survives by being ironized as a result of a "skepticism about rhetoric" ("when people are consciously rhetorical, they are always ironic about being rhetorical"), stating: "You don't have to hammer if there's no resistance". Ultimately, Romanticism 'geniusified' Shakespeare. With regard to meter, Most commented that it is "not just self-persuasion, but also the practice of expressing (something) well".
- Wesche agreed as to Shakespeare. With regard to rhyming, he referred to Opitz stating that one 'is free in organizing the sequence of rhymes'.

- Bernhart asked for clarification about the particular persuasiveness of meter.
- Wesche replied that poetics was conceived of as the "sister art" of rhetoric (and vice versa)—"*oratio ligata* is *oratio*" ("a special form of *oratio*"), hence aims at (is "linked" to) "persuasion".

- Eden returned to the aspect of 'Shakespeare having been de-rhetoricized'; referring to Samuel Johnson, she said that the latter changed the perception of Shakespeare as "a poet of *téchne*, art" into the "natural poet Shakespeare"—this, however, were still "an appropriation of a rhetorical category", regarding the "*phýsis*/*téchne*" dichotomy. She asserted that Shakespeare is "no less rhetorical than (the) other authors (of the period)", but that the "audience does not have the sense that he is using it". So the question would have to be: "how is it that Shakespeare uses the rhetorical devices so that the audience does not notice, and accepts them". She asked: "if there is a rhetoric of drama, how does Shakespeare have a longer shelf life?"—and suggested that "literary theory de-rhetoricized him", while he does sport a "highly artificial language".
- Küpper rejoined that this would not yet clarify the "structural difference (of Shakespeare) to German Baroque drama" (particularly Gryphius, here) in terms of (rhetorical) form.

Joachim Küpper (FU Berlin)
"Towards a Network Theory of Cultural Production"
(Feb 12, 2016 · 4.00 – 5.00 p.m.)

Précis

Küpper formulated his decidedly 'function-oriented' theory of culture qua "networks"—enabling "processes of reception", and "specifically in drama"—in opposition to the "national culture theory", to the cult of "ingenuity and genius on the part of Romanticism".

Outlining other metaphors—for instance the 'structuralist tree', or the 'post-structuralist rhizome'—he considered them to be still 'too naturalistic, too structuralist'. Moreover, Greenblatt's notion of "cultural circulation" leaves unanswered the problems of "contingency or dependency", of "agency", of 'differences in circulation'; at the same time, it is problematic in its being 'recipient-focused' as regards 'material forms'—for there is also a 'transportation' in the non-literal sense, and "other things are dragged along also". Latour's conception is said to have some utile features, while Küpper opposed the notion of an "agency of objects on their own". The 'network' is able to map an "a-teleological" dynamics, representing "the specificity of cultural dynamics" qua contingent: it "holds on to the (human) agent", considers how 'materials are affected', includes "literary phenomena".

The notion of the network in Küpper's acceptation has the following characteristics: it is "non-hierarchical", "without center", "created with a view to" (sc. 'purposive'), "may be destroyed", is "never complete"; "networks tend to be refunctionalized, they do not cease"; they "enable the transfer of material, anywhere and everywhere", and "potentially endlessly"; they have a tendency to "extend and ramify", and are "not necessarily stable, and usually virtual", flexible; the "cultural network" comprises also the "books, paintings" etc. themselves—it "needs a physical substratum", including human agents, such as "spouses, courtiers, armies" for "traveling, transfer processes"; it includes "stories, narratives migrating" (with the 'original' intent typically not being retained or remaining 'the same'); the network has a "transport capacity", may be "interrupted temporarily" (for instance by censorship); it features a "control logic: power, money, prestige, etc."; there is always "material floating in a net" ("based on existing material, also from other environments"); it is "inconsumable", retained "while humankind persists"; materials are "then shaped" via "recombination" (for instance in the novel), to different degrees of

"formal shaping" and "reshaping", followed by a 'reinsertion' into the net; the material's functions include "didactics, entertainment, reflection".

Applied to Early Modern times in particular, the "virtual network also propelled a 'Renaissance' in the literal sense". At the same time, "visual culture as a mass medium" defined much of the materials in the net, while "redefining what literature is meant to be" (in terms of function); for instance, Senecan and Terentian drama "differ significantly" from one another. Early Modern drama was thus geared towards "mass appeal" (and "no longer bound to ritual"); "drama" was "first", in this respect, while "narrative" followed "much later". The network approach is to "free the texts from being considered only in national" terms, so as to 'account for the reception' throughout Europe, to explain the traveling of the "fundamental level of formal structures and shapes", of "discursive constellations" present (all but) simultaneously throughout Europe—the "importation of cultural practices" based on a "local demand". Thus 'differences in the manner of extraction of material at different places, but at the same time', might be investigated and described by this approach. Finally, the "standard two-text comparison" is to be surmounted by the approach of seeing "items floating in a virtual net".

Questions and Answers

- Most voiced "an objection" to the network theory in that "it does not explain production", while it does "make it possible"; he invoked "an archive with many different stages of actualization".
- Küpper replied that an "archive is not flexible enough" in his view, while also not able to explain "how to travel between archives"; moreover, the term 'archive' may suggest the notion of "national literatures" as conceived of by "Romanticism", while Küpper wished to distance himself from this mindset—it being a "fact that cultural products travel from one culture to another". As to the objection, Küpper agreed that "the network does not explain the individual works, but their condition of possibility" (*Bedingung der Möglichkeit*). The model suggests ways of theorizing, conceptualizing 'exchanges', and of accounting for the fact that 'culture (cultural material) travels'. The concept of the network provides the basis and background for a process of "assembling", but "the respectively factual production cannot be explained by this model"—its emphasis is on the aspect of "cultural exchange". In terms of the relation between "social processes and cultural production", there is "much more cultural exchange than *ad hoc* creation".

- Most conceded that this network theory is "not a poetics", but provides "indications for the conditions of possibility". He still maintained that a, or the respectively particular, poetics "is what we are really interested in".
- Eden commented on the fact that, in Küpper's view, the "rhizome and tree are still naturally conditioned", while Küpper wished to place "emphasis on humans"; and to "maintain (human) agency in productivity", as "conditioned by time and place". She expounded that "the agent, artist produces by going to the net", where he "selects and assembles"; this would reflect a 'technical understanding of agency, of *ars*'.
- Küpper clarified that he "used the term 'assembling'" (and "'re-assembling', perceived as new"), but "avoided 'creation'"; his emphasis was on the fact that authors, agents "take all these bits and pieces, pieces that preexisted the assembling" process. He expressed doubts whether one might "explain creativity" (*per se*). Moreover, he accentuated the role of "contingency": for instance, the year 1492, the discoveries, changed the "conditions of cultural production" (as had the printing press).

Concluding Discussion (Feb 12, 2016 · 5.30 – 7.30 p.m.)

Guiding Questions · DS Mayfield

To provide the conference with a potential conceptual framework and initiate the discussion, the following guiding questions and hypotheses were pre-circulated to the speakers, and presented to the general public in the present editor's introductory remarks during the conference; the concluding statements and plenary discussion addressed certain aspects thereof.

1) In which ways may rhetoric apply—or be conducive—to a specific (literary) genre; in other words: is there a (particular) rhetoric of drama; and, in a diachronic view: have there been commonalities and differences in the application of rhetoric to (or in) drama since Ancient times, and specifically again during the Early Modern Age.

2) In terms of the long histories both of the art of rhetoric and the genre of drama, a mutual or bilateral influence seems plausible; in which ways has drama (and dramatic practice) influenced the rhetorical tradition generally conceived.

3) As to the development of drama and the history of rhetoric, might there be a particular relation regarding the factors of orality and textuality.

4) Approaching drama in terms of rhetoric, and by recourse to rhetorical *termini technici*, may shed additional light on an Aristotelian, plot-emphatic approach; moreover, Aristotelian(izing), pragmatic 'poetics of effect' might be seen as downright rhetorical.

5) Both rhetoric and drama are (at least usually) geared toward (re)presentation, *mise-en-scène*, *actio* (*pronuntiatio*): does the (partial) application of the rhetorical system in (a given) drama also provide a frame of reference for the (specific) production on stage.

Concluding Statement · Kathy Eden

First, Eden referred to the question whether there is "a rhetoric of drama", replying that there is no distinctive rhetoric particularly of drama: "there is rhetoric, drama is deeply rhetorical, but no rhetoric is exclusively dramatic". The common rhetorical ground is produced by a "fairly stable common schooling", a "rhetorical education".

Secondly, Eden tackled the question of the different tendencies, or "impulses", of the rhetorical tradition: on the one hand, rhetoric seeks to "accommodate"; on the other, it "is deeply adversarial". She highlighted the fact that "rhetoric has movable parts", which "can be put to other uses", under "differing circumstances". She renewed her claim that "public, forensic rhetoric can be accommodated to the private" (the *essai*, for instance); this "accommodation" would also take place in the "*ornatus*", specifically with regard to "voice, delivery (facial expressions, in terms of gesture)", as well (with reference to Feldman's talk). Rhetoric is "adversarial" in terms of ideology (such as "democracy, monarchy", with reference to Most's talk); in terms of form or structure, "stichomythia is very adversarial" (with reference to Wesche's talk). She concluded that rhetoric is "both adversarial and deeply accommodating".

Concluding Statement · Glenn W. Most

Most highlighted four points in his concluding statement. First, "rhetoric came back from the dead" (he suggested that "no one would have come to this conference 30 years ago", and he himself "had no idea it [sc. rhetoric] would come back, 32 years ago")—but really, "rhetoric was always there (except during Romanticism, where it died a painful death)"; "the return of rhetoric" corresponds to "the end of Romanticism".

Secondly, Most discerned a "nostalgia in literary studies for a foundational system, theory, or science"—also for purposes of "communicability"; and this "basis can be imagined as having been there". Thirdly, and connected thereto, he accentuated that rhetoric is "not only a system, but also a terminology", which is used for effect (also to display or feign erudition: a form of "pseudo-scientificity"), not least of all.

Finally, he stated: rhetoric "is a real grab bag—despite the claims to systematicity"; it "can be used to show anything"; the wish for "anchoring in some aspect" remains strong (likewise in metaphysics or theology).

Concluding Statement · Martha Feldman

Feldman affirmed the value of rhetorical "accommodation", of "accommodation as embodied"; in this context, she referred to Castiglione's *Courtier*, its 'ideal courtier *persona*' as a "rhetorical figure" that would require further attention in this context, and, more generally, in terms of the nexus of "court and rhetoric".

Secondly, she indicated that a move "away from the purely textual, or intertextual, towards the oral" would be necessary, particularly in favor of a focus "also on voice, presence, figure". Likewise, she encouraged "to think more about the audiences, differing audiences to whom rhetoric was directed, the cultural reception and translation"; in this line, she suggested to be speaking of a "rhetoric of exchange, agonism, of the audience". At the same time, Feldman conceded that "to move outside the text is hard to do: for what we have are texts, archives"; it is "a great big iceberg", with the 'tip being the text', and the remainder pertaining (mostly) to an "oral tradition".

Concluding Statement · Maria Galli Stampino

Stampino emphasized drama as "agonistic", and as a "lab for testing, trying out different solutions without consequences" (in comedy, for instance)—in contrast to the "forensic" setting. With regard to the "de-rhetoricization of Shakespeare", she suggested one inquire as to "how he retains the appeal"; in the same vein, she urged that one think about the questions: "what Shakespeare are we talking about, which Shakespeare are we reading"; for he was "rhetoricized in a different way in nineteenth century Italian translations"—with a view to "nineteenth century Italian audiences"—when compared to other contexts of reception. In line therewith, she stressed that, "in the network, the receiving context, the linguistic context, is important". Finally, she encouraged that one should be "thinking of rhetoric in the concrete application", and to "de-absolutize" it: "the rhetoric manifested in the text" is only one aspect.

Concluding Statement · Gasan Gusejnov (Guest)

Gusejnov (standing in for Bloemendal during the concluding discussion) took up the question of "why rhetoric came back", and confirmed "some similarity between Early Modern times and today", primarily "in analogy to the book culture". His emphasis was on the fourth part of rhetoric, *memoria*. As "is the case now", the "collective memory was weakening" in the Early Modern Age, due to a

"shift from *mnéme* to the visual", and partly to "the acoustic". He accentuated "the salvational aspect of rhetoric": "memory is under threat—that is why rhetoric is back"; and he urged: "we have to look back, some recuperation has to take place". As a prospect, he also considered it a desideratum to be looking at the *actio*, specifically with regard to the modern virtual world, which is "active without effects, and only produces emotions", while agents "do not remember what was yesterday"—thereby tying in with his initial emphasis on memory.

Concluding Statement · Jörg Wesche

Wesche treated four points pertaining to the "limits of rhetoric and drama". First, he highlighted the "correlation between poetics, rhetorical handbooks, and the praxis of drama"; in Early Modern handbooks of poetics, rhetorical *dispositio*, tropes, techniques provide a "universal tool kit" for purposes of "accommodation". In this vein, it would be necessary to reflect on "the medial conditions of rhetoric in dramatic performance", and to investigate to what extent such a reflection took place in the respective handbooks. Secondly, he considered whether there is a "hiatus between rhetoric and drama", despite the fact that there are (significant) overlaps in "*memoria*, *actio*". Thirdly, Wesche addressed the "latitudes of *parrhesía*, the *licentia poetica*", asking: "what is specific to drama". Moreover, he questioned "how the chorus fits into drama"; and whether there are "certain licenses" there, as well.

Lastly, Wesche tackled the general limits: with regard to rhetoric, "what does not fit in with drama". He expressed doubts whether, for instance, 'self-interrogation, *revocatio*, *refutatio* were fit for being put on stage', asking: "can a revocation be put on stage in public"—or is it "not adjustable to drama for material limits". In concluding, he referred to "rhetoric as *materia*" (it being "everywhere", at "schools, universities"), while asking: "where is rhetoric itself put on stage", in terms of a "meta-reflection on rhetoric". Wesche accentuated that these two aspects ought to be differentiated.

Concluding Statement · Joachim Küpper

Küpper singled out three aspects. First, he called for a differentiation and an accentuation: "to what extent should we level the differences between forensic (political) rhetoric (and discourses) and drama"; for "it is about convincing someone" indeed—but, in the former, this 'is a different form of convincing (at times pertaining to questions of life and death)', while, "theoretical, ethical

questions are at stake in drama"; this makes for a "difference in function".

Secondly, Küpper returned to the aspect of "degrees of rhetoricity", questioning whether there is "a generic aspect" to it; "in opera and poetry", for instance, a higher degree is taken to be "acceptable", a "higher tolerance" for rhetoricity—the basic pattern of both music and rhetoric being "recurrence with repetition". He stressed that there are conventional(ized), "preconceived notions of what is acceptable" in this respect (which are contingent, hence changeable). At the same time, and in terms of form, music is sequential, based on "time", while drama (as per Aristotle) focuses on "action".

In conclusion, Küpper asked: "what about rhetoric in drama after the age of rhetoric" (that is, in the 19th and 20th century); he stated that "Beckett and Brecht are full of rhetoric", also "allegory", and are "extremely stylized"—although "perhaps not according to the Ancient theory". He wondered whether there is not "a certain intrinsic affinity of drama to rhetoric", which is relatively "higher than in narrative"; if this be so, the question would be: "why is drama more rhetorical (than other genres)".

Concluding Plenary Discussion (Selected Contributions)

- Generally, Gusejnov submitted that "rhetoric is a representation of knowledge, while music is a representation of emotion".

- Chakrabarti emphasized that "cultural production is flexible, fluid, and does not need an archetype". He highlighted a need for the recourse to examples "other than European, of the Asian world", for instance. With regard to India, he stated the importance of the "oral manner" (sc. in terms of *elocutio*), "oral transfer" (sc. in terms of *memoria*).

- Concerning the discussion of (cultural) memory, Küpper stressed its 'high degree of selectivity'; one is 'free to recombine, reassemble, without being aware of the (or any) limits to one's creativity'.

- Candido remarked: "rhetoric keeps coming back"; and that "only rhetoric destroys rhetoric (and not logic, dialectics)"—highlighting the fact that 'rhetoric is built on language' (with emphasis on the 'importance of *elocutio*'); referring also to Küpper, Candido confirmed that "memory also restricts what you can say or choose".

- Eden accentuated that "Romanticism was using rhetoric, was using words, to counter or destroy rhetoric". The claim that Romanticism was not rhetorical, the "absence of rhetoric", is 'an idea that would never have been accepted by the Ancients—it would have made no sense to them, since they (the Romantics) are using words'.
- Most rejoined that the Romantics "only thought they were" destroying rhetoric without using rhetoric.

- Kilian inquired into the aspect of a "second degree rhetoricity" qua "message to the audience": 'drama not being traditionally linked to one voice, but more voices, *delectare* and *movere* take place on more levels'; and there may be "*movere*, *delectare*, even if there is no *docere*".

- With regard to the network theory, and replying to a question from the student audience concerning "how the selecting process goes by", Küpper stressed that "access increased with certain cultural techniques, technologies"; at present, there is "access to all kinds of things", which are "heterogeneous", while the interaction with them, "the working through", is "not as intense" as it used to be in Early Modern networks. Moreover, novel

"publishing techniques", with not only "manuscripts", but also "books" floating—that is, the "material conditions of access"—must be taken into account, as well. The quantity of "material accessible is much larger now", while the "level of formal shaping is much lower now". In previous days, there was a "limited number of texts"—leading primarily to "imitation with variation and refinement".

- Wilm tied in with the fact that 'the purpose of rhetorical speech is to convince others that your opinion is true'; this, however, is different in drama as per Wilm, seeing that it "demonstrates different" views and "possibilities", without necessarily showing "which is the wrong, which is the right position" (she referred to Schiller's *Maria Stuart*). The 'rhetorical material may be the same, but the result differs' (in terms of function, effect).
- With reference to historical plays (here: Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*), Küpper mentioned "possible speeches that could have taken place", which are geared towards "different attitudes of the audience, its disposition", its various (historical) circumstances of reception. Generally speaking, in a "political speech, the focus is on the message" (or its 'philosophy'), while in drama the focus is also on "the form of the message".

- Expounding on the "hiatus" he had mentioned, Wesche outlined different antagonistic tendencies between rhetoric and drama: "monolog vs. dialog", "convincing vs. intrigue", "*claritas*, *puritas* vs. ambiguity, ghosts" (sc. irrational occurrences), etc.—concluding that "this does not fit together". With regard to Aristotle's poetics and the desired effect of *kátharsis*, Wesche stated that one might read this as signifying: 'in drama, you have passion and pain to become free from it', while, before a judge (in the forum), one "is not allowed to provoke emotions" as might be detrimental to one's case.

Contributors

Kathy **Eden** is Chavkin Family Professor of English and Professor of Classics at Columbia University. Her books include *Poetic and Legal Fiction in the Aristotelian Tradition* (Princeton, 1986), *Hermeneutics and the Rhetorical Tradition: Chapters in the Ancient Legacy and Its Humanist Reception* (New Haven, 1997), *Friends Hold All Things in Common: Tradition, Intellectual Property and the "Adages" of Erasmus* (New Haven, 2001), and *The Renaissance Rediscovery of Intimacy* (Chicago, 2012).

Martha **Feldman**, the Mabel Greene Myers Professor of Music, is a music historian specializing in Early Modern Italy. Her books include *City Culture and the Madrigal at Venice* (Berkeley, 1995), *The Courtesan's Arts: Cross-Cultural Perspectives* (co-ed.; Oxford, 2006), *Opera and Sovereignty: Transforming Myths in Eighteenth-Century Italy* (Chicago, 2007), and *The Castrato: Reflections on Natures and Kinds* (Berkeley, 2015), which emerged from the Bloch Lectures at the University of California at Berkeley. She is a recipient of the Dent Medal of the Royal Musical Association and a member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Her current book projects involve the end and aftermath of the castrato phenomenon in modern Rome and the problem of voice across different disciplinary formations. She is President of the American Musicological Society.

Maria Galli **Stampino** holds a *laurea* in Modern Languages and Literatures from the Università cattolica "S. Cuore" of Milan, a Master's in American Studies from the University of Kansas, and a Master's and PhD in Italian and Comparative Literature from Stanford University. She is Professor in the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures in the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Miami, where she also serves as Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. She is the author of *Staging the Pastoral: Tasso's* Aminta *and the Emergence of Modern Western Theater* (Tempe, 2005); the editor and translator of Lucrezia Marinella's *L'Enrico, ovvero Bisanzio acquistato* (Chicago, 2009; and Modena, 2011); the co-editor (with Julie D. Campbell) of *In Dialogue with the Other Voice in Sixteenth-Century Italy: Literary and Social Contexts for Women's Writing* (Toronto, 2011) and (with Anne J. Cruz) of *Early Modern Habsburg Women: Transnational Contexts, Cultural Conflicts, Dynastic Continuities* (Burlington, 2013), which received the Honorable Mention for a Collective Work published in 2013 from the Society for the Study of Early Modern Women. She is currently completing the translation and edition of Lucrezia Marinella's *Amore innamorato et impazzato*

(with Janet Gomez), and she is at work on the tradition of *Commedia dell'arte* between the 17th and 18th centuries.

Jan **Bloemendal**, PhD (1997) in Classics, Utrecht University, is a Senior Researcher at the Huygens Institute of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, Amsterdam. From 2006 to 2012 he was a Professor by special appointment of Neo-Latin at the University of Amsterdam. He has published on Neo-Latin and Dutch drama, Classical reception, poetics, emblems, and Erasmus. In 2010, he published an edition of Gerardus Johannes Vossius, *Poeticarum institutionum libri tres* (Leiden/Boston, 2010). With Howard B. Norland, he recently co-edited *Neo-Latin Drama and Theatre in Early Modern Europe* (Leiden/Boston, 2013) and (with Philip J. Ford and Charles Fantazzi) *Brill's Encyclopaedia of the Neo-Latin World* (Leiden/Boston, 2014).

Jörg **Wesche**, Dr. phil., Professor of German Literature at Duisburg–Essen University, Germany. Main fields of interest: Early Modern literature; cultural studies; poetics and rhetoric; the literary reception of science. Selected book publications: *Texte zu modernen Mythentheorien* (ed., Stuttgart, 2003); *Literarische Diversität. Abweichungen, Lizenzen und Spielräume in der deutschen Poesie und Poetik der Barockzeit* (Tübingen, 2004); *Kulturelle Orientierung um 1700. Traditionen, Programme, konzeptionelle Vielfalt* (ed., Tübingen, 2004); *Fragen an die Sphinx. Kulturhermeneutik einer Chimäre zwischen Mythos und Wissenschaft* (ed., Heidelberg 2011); *Wiederholen/Wiederholung* (ed., Heidelberg 2015).

Joachim **Küpper** is professor of Comparative Literature and Romance Literatures at Freie Universität Berlin, Germany. Until 2016, he served as the director of the Dahlem Humanities Center, which he founded. He has published on a wide range of texts from Classical Antiquity to the 20th century. His research also focuses on literary theory and aesthetics. He is a member of the German National Academy of Sciences, as well as of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, a recipient of the Leibniz-Award, and holds an Advanced Grant from the European Research Council (ERC). His monographs include *Diskurs-Renovatio bei Lope de Vega und Calderón. Untersuchungen zum spanischen Barockdrama. Mit einer Skizze zur Evolution der Diskurse in Mittelalter, Renaissance und Manierismus* (Tübingen, 1990), *Petrarca. Das Schweigen der Veritas und die Worte des Dichters* (Berlin/New York, 2002). Among his recent articles in English are: "The Traditional Cosmos and the New World" (in: *MLN* 118, 2003); "*Hamlet*, by Shakespeare, and *La vida es sueño*, by Calderón, or the Problem of Scepticism" (in: *Germanisch-Romanische*

Monatsschrift, 2008); "Ei(aa)roneia: The Politics of Religion in the *Cantar de mío Cid*" (in: *MLN* 126, Supplement, 2011); "*Uti* and *frui* in Augustine and the Problem of Aesthetic Pleasure in the Western Tradition (Cervantes, Kant, Marx, Freud)" (in: *MLN* 127, Supplement, 2012); "Religious Horizon and Epic Effect: Considerations on the *Iliad*, the *Chanson de Roland*, and the *Nibelungenlied*" (in: Bloch et al. *Rethinking the New Medievalism*. Baltimore, 2014); "My Encounter with Peter Szondi. Remarks on *Theory of the Modern Drama* (1880–1950)" (in: Zepp. *Textual Understanding and Historical Experience. On Peter Szondi*. Paderborn/München, 2015).

Bernhard **Asmuth**, Dr. phil., was Professor of German Studies at Ruhr University Bochum, Germany, until 1997. After a dissertation on "Lohenstein and Tacitus", as well as other articles concerning German Baroque literature, he wrote introductions to lyrical poetry, stylistics, and the analysis of drama. Apart from the entry "Drama", he authored 14 other articles for the *Historical Dictionary of Rhetoric*. In several publications, he also dealt with the history of the German school essay qua rooted in rhetorical theory. His research focuses on guiding concepts of stylistics (the *aptum*, *evidentia*, image and imagery, *perspicuitas*, *Sachlichkeit*, suspense), and especially on their reconceptualization during the eighteenth century.

DS **Mayfield**, Dr. phil., studied American, English, and Spanish Literature at Würzburg University, as well as Comparative Literature in Berlin and Cambridge (UK). An alumnus of the Friedrich Schlegel Graduate School and the DramaNet project at Freie Universität, he is performing research on rhetoric and Early Modern drama (Rojas, Machiavelli, Shakespeare), with Blumenberg as a theoretical framework. In 2015, he was a Global Humanities Junior Research and Teaching Fellow at The Humanities Center of Johns Hopkins University. A monograph with the title *Artful Immorality – Variants of Cynicism. Machiavelli, Gracián, Diderot, Nietzsche* appeared with de Gruyter (Berlin, 2015).

Index