The Idea of the Holy, tr. J. Harvey (1923); A. B. Kieth, *A Hist. of Sanskrit Lit.* (1928); R. A. Nicholson, *Lit. Hist. of the Arabs,* 2d ed. (1930); T. S. Eliot, "R. and Lit.," *Essays Ancient and Mod.* (1936); H. N. Fairchild, *Religious Trends in Eng. Poetry,* 6 v. (1939–68); Auerbach; J. Campbell, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* (1949); Raby, *Christian* and *Secular;* Curtius, ch. 12; *The Indian Heritage,* ed. V. Raghavan (1956)—anthol.; L. Martz, *The Poetry of Meditation* (1954); Frye; M. Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane* (1959), *Shamanism: Archaic Techniques of Ecstasy* (1964); L. B. Campbell, *Divine Poetry and Drama* (1959); C. I. Glicksberg, *Lit. and R.: A Study in Conflict* (1960); R. May, *Symbolism in R. and Lit.* (1960); F. M. Cornford, *The Origin of Attic Comedy,* ed. T. H. Gaster (1961); R. Bultmann et al., *Kerygma and Myth,* tr. R. H. Fuller (1961); H. Frankfort et al., *Before Philosophy* (1963); *Penguin Book of Religious Verse,* ed. R. S. Thomas (1963); W. J. Reynolds, *A Survey of Christian Hymnody* (1963); C. M. Bowra, *Primitive Song* (1964); O. B. Hardison, Jr., *Christian Rite and Christian Drama in the Middle Ages* (1965); A. S. P. Woodhouse, *The Poet and his Faith* (1965); J. Mascaró, *The Upanishads* (1965); H. Hatzfeld, *Santa Teresa of Avila* (1969); G. Dumezil, *Mythe et épopée,* 2 v. (1968–73); T. Cave, *Devotional Poetry in France c. 1570–1613* (1969); M. Novak, *The Experience of Nothingness* (1970); M. H. Abrams, *Natural Supernaturalism* (1971); N. A. Scott, Jr., *The Wild Prayer of Longing* (1971), *The Poetics of Belief* (1985); D. B. Morris, *The Religious Sublime* (1972); P. Milward, *Shakespeare's Religious Background* (1973); J. A. Ramsaran, *Eng. and Hindi Religious Poetry* (1973); H. Frei, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative* (1974); E. S. Shaffer, *"Kubla Khan" and the Fall of Jerusalem: The Mythological School in Biblical Crit. and Secular Lit., 1770–1880* (1975); H. Schneidau, *Sacred Discontent: The Bible and Western Lit.* (1976); G. B. Green, *The Interp. of Otherness: Lit., R., and the Am. Imagination* (1979); *The Critical Study of Sacred Texts,* ed. W. D. O'Flaherty (1979); B. Jordan, *Servants of the Gods: A Study in the R., Hist., and Lit. of 5th-C. Athens* (1979); B. K. Lewalski, *Protestant Poetics and the 17th-C. Religious Lyric* (1979); R. Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (1981), *The Art of Biblical Poetry* (1985); G. Gunn, "Lit. and R.," *Interrelations of Lit.,* ed. J.-P. Barricelli and J. Gibaldi (1982); *New Oxford Book of Christian Verse,* ed. D. Davie (1982); N. Frye, *The Great Code* (1982); S. A. Handelman, *The Slayers of Moses: The Emergence of Rabbinic Interp. in Mod. Literary Theory* (1982); W. LaFleur, *The Karma of Words: Buddhism and the Literary Arts in Med. Japan* (1983); R. Strier, *Love Known: Theology and Experience in George Herbert's Poetry* (1983); G. Tennyson, *Victorian Devotional Poetry* (1983); D. Daiches, *God and the Poets* (1984); *Penguin Book of Eng. Christian Verse,* ed. P. Levi (1984); M. Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative* (1984); L. M. Poland, *Lit. Crit. and Biblical Hermeneutics* (1985); *The Bhagavad-Gita,* tr. B. S. Miller (1986); S. Prickett, *Words and the Word: Lang., Poetics, and Biblical Interp.* (1986); *Literary Guide to the Bible,* ed. R. Alter and F. Kermode (1987); A. C. Yu, "Lit. and R.," and J. R. Barth et al., "P.," *Encyc. of R.,* ed. M. Eliade, v. 8, 11 (1987)—covers Indian, Chinese, Japanese, Christian, and Islamic religious p.; *Contemp. Religious P.,* ed. P. Ramsey (1987); G. H. Tavard, *Poetry and Contemplation in St. John of the Cross* (1988); T. R. Wright, *Theology and Lit.* (1989); H. Bloom, *Ruin the Sacred Truths* (1989); T. G. Sherwood, *Herbert's Prayerful Art* (1989); F. B. Brown, *Religious Aesthetics* (1989); M. Lichtmann, *The Contemplative Poetry of G. M. Hopkins* (1989); E. J. McNees, *Eucharistic Poetry* (1992).

O.B.H.; T.V.F.B.

REMATE. A Sp. metric term denoting a short stanza placed at the end of a poem and serving as a conclusion to the poem. The r. generally repeats the last rhymes of the preceding full-length strophe. It is most commonly used at the end of the *canción* (q.v.). In it the poet addresses himself to the *canción,* giving it a special message to bear to a particular person, "recognizing some flaw in the *canción,* or making an excuse for it, or telling it what it must answer if it should be found wanting in some respect" (Rengifo). It has also been called *vuelta, commiato, despido, envio, ripressa, ritornelo* (*retornelo*), and *contera.*—Rengifo, *Arte poética española* (1592, ch. 86); E. Segura Covarsí, *La canción petrarquista en la lirica española del siglo de oro* (1949); Navarro.

D.C.C.

RENAISSANCE POETICS.

I. INTRODUCTION
II. THE DEFENSE OF POETRY
III. THE LANGUAGE OF POETRY
IV. THE GENRES OF POETRY
V. THE PRINCIPLE OF IMITATION
VI. RHETORIC AND POETIC
VII. CONCLUSION

I. INTRODUCTION. Lit. crit. was first recognized as an independent form of lit. and the critic first accepted as a new kind of writer in the Ren.; indeed, nearly all modern poetics (q.v.) derives directly from ideas advanced in this period. Ren. crit. began in the struggle to defend imaginative lit. against attacks of immorality and frivolity. In establishing a place for the writing and studying of poetry, the use of the vernacular was debated (and also vindicated); genres were distinguished, each with its own conventions; the humanist movement instituted as the basis of poetics the practice of imitating Cl. texts; and rhetoricians supplied a basic *techne* or set of rules on which poetic art could rely.

II. THE DEFENSE OF POETRY. Boccaccio in his *Genealogiae deorum gentilium* (1360) and in his life of Dante laid down the main lines for defending poetry against clerical and secular charges. He argues that religion and poetry (q.v.) are not opposed; on the contrary, the Bible is poetry and teaches, as all poetry does, by means of allegory

(q.v.), i.e. metaphors with fixed and continuing referents. In addition, the poets were the first theologians. Seemingly immoral pagan stories may thus be interpreted in wholly moral ways: "When the ancient poets feigned that Saturn had many children and devoured all but four of them, they wished to have understood from their picture nothing else than that Saturn is time, in which everything is produced, and as everything is produced in time, it likewise is the destroyer of all and reduces all to nothing." For Boccaccio even the story of Leda and the Swan could be viewed allegorically as anticipating (or shadowing) the Virgin and the Dove. Boccaccio also defended poetry against charges of frivolity, arguing that it had always been admired by the people, protected by their leaders and rulers, and supported by wealthy patrons. Moreover, the poet is a creator like God Himself; there is, Boccaccio says, no higher vocation possible for man.

Once these arguments were in place, they were copied, expanded, and developed in nearly all It., Fr., and Eng. defenses of poetry from the 14th through the 16th c. Meanwhile, much technical lore about Cl. poetry was spread abroad through elaborately annotated editions of Horace's *Ars poetica*, most esp. the popular edition by Badius Ascensius first pub. in Paris in 1500. The result was summed up in It. crit. by Marco Girolamo Vida's *De arte poetica* (The Art of Poetry, 1527; tr. R. G. Williams, 1976), a long verse treatise imitating Horace but also incorporating much humanist theory about the moral purpose and genres of poetry, the function of the critic, and the like. As for theory relating specifically to vernacular poetic theory, the most important work of the early 16th c. is Giangiorgio Trissino's *La poetica* (Books 1–4, 1529; Books 5–6, 1563) which is an elaborate analysis of It. versification and verse conventions.

A new factor was introduced into European lit. crit. in 1508 with the publication by Aldus of a reliable Gr. text of Aristotle's *Poetics* and a Lat. tr. by Pazzi in 1536. The *Poetics* was known in the Middle Ages only through a Lat. tr. of a paraphrase by the Arabian philosopher Averroes, and a badly flawed Lat. tr. by Lorenzo Valla that was pub. in the late 15th c. Pazzi's Lat. tr. was an immediate and powerful stimulus to critical thought. Detailed commentaries on the *Poetics* began to appear in the 1540s and continued to be produced in Italy throughout the rest of the century. In the earlier commentaries—e.g. those by Robortelli (1548) and Maggi and Lombardi (1549)—Aristotle mixes exotically with theories derived from rhet. and with didactic theories drawn from the humanist trad. and from Horace. In general, these treatises interpret catharsis (q.v.) as purgation of wicked impulses, and tragedy (q.v.) as a form providing examples of vices to avoid.

The most famous It. Ren. commentary on Aristotle is *Poetica d'Aristotele vulgarizzata e sposta* (The Poetics of Aristotle in the Vulgar Lang.) by Lodovico Castelvetro (1570, 1576; ed. W. Romani, 2 v., 1978; abridged tr. A. Bongiorno, *Castelvetro on the Art of Poetry*, 1984), which insists that tragedy is popular entertainment and that catharsis is insensitivity to suffering created by seeing it in plays. After 1540, most full-blown It. critical essays—e.g. Antonio Minturno's *De poeta* (1559), usually considered a source of Sir Philip Sidney's *Defense of Poesie* (1595)—draw heavily on Aristotle. These texts usually treat lit. as a source of moral instruction through examples of virtue and vice. They regularly combine Aristotelian ideas with the Horatian trad. that poetry should "profit" morally, even as it "delights." More narrowly focused treatises—e.g. Giraldi Cinthio's *Discorsi intorno al comporre dei romanzi, commedie, e tragedie* (Discourses on Composing Romances, Comedies, and Tragedies, 1554; tr. H. L. Snuggs, 1968)—mix Aristotelian ideas with ideas drawn from theories of vernacular versification and trads. about popular vernacular genres like romance.

Whatever the point of view, after 1540 few critical treatises were written in Italy that did not draw on the *Poetics*. That the Sp. followed the It. lead is illustrated by Alonso Pinciano's *Philosophía antigua poética* (1596), a commentary on the *Poetics* treating imitation, verisimilitude, and wonder, among other topics. In northern Europe, conversely, the influence of Aristotle is not felt until the last quarter of the 16th c. Indeed, in northern Europe the most influential critical work was, for many years, the massive but derivative *Poetices libri septem* (Seven Books of Poetics, 1561; ed. A. Bock, 1964) of Julius Caesar Scaliger. Although Aristotle is often cited by northern European critics in the last quarter of the 16th c., not until 1611, with the *De tragoediae constitutione* (On the Nature of Tragedy) of Daniel Heinsius was a study of the *Poetics* produced comparable in scope and sophistication to its It. predecessors. But with Heinsius we begin to move from Ren. to neoclassical poetics (q.v.).

Another critical position, deriving from Aristotle's *Rhet.*, appears in, for example, Baltasar Gracián's *Agudeza y arte de ingenio* (Cleverness and the Art of Wit, 1642) in Spain and Immanuele Tesauro's *Il cannocchiale aristotelico* (Aristotelian Telescope, 1654) in Italy. "Concettismo" (see CULTERANISMO), as it is called, is concerned neither with plot and character nor with moral uplift. Instead, it is concerned with the effect of brilliant imagery, understood for the most part as pleasure and awe.

III. THE LANGUAGE OF POETRY. It. theories about poetic lang. were much influenced by the revival of interest in Cl. poetry that occurred in the 14th c. The humanist movement thus generated spent much of its early years interpreting—and in some cases recovering and perfecting—Gr. and Lat. mss., even though some of the best poets—Dante, Petrarch, Boccaccio—were writing in the vernacular. Humanists assumed that the great texts of the past, in all genres, were best in the Cl.

langs., esp. Lat. The support of vernacular writing was further complicated in Italy because of the many dialects in the separate city-states: the country as yet had no national unification and no national lang. Hence those interested in a vernacular body of work had first to defend a particular dialect for it (see ITALIAN POETRY).

Dante's *De vulgari eloquentia* (Of Eloquence in the Vernacular, ca. 1305; ed. A. Marigo, 1957) is the first and still the best argument for vernacular lit.; it has no worthy successor until Leone Battista Alberti's *Trattato del governo della famiglia* (1438), which contends that the vulgar (or common) tongue would become as polished as Lat. if patriotic writers gave it their attention. In *Prose della volgar lingua* (1524), Pietro Bembo claims the Florentine dialect is as good as Lat., and even superior to it as a lang. for modern subjects. Since Florentine was the one dialect with a strong literary trad., most Italians who wrote in the vernacular used it, yet some opposed it in favor of a truly national literary lang. they termed "Italian" or even "Courtier's Tongue." Il Calmeta and Castiglione (esp. in his *Il cortegiano* [Book of the Courtier]) were foremost among these proponents, although they took most of their arguments from Dante's earlier essay.

Nationalism also aided the cause of vernacular lit. in France. Joachim Du Bellay's *La Deffence et illustration de la langue françoyse* (1549; ed. H. Chamard, 1948) is firmly nationalistic. Du Bellay took many of his arguments from the *Dialogo delle lingue* of Sperone Speroni (1542; ed. and tr. H. Harth, 1975); he claims that the Fr. are as good as the Romans, so that it follows that their lang. is equally good. It is therefore the patriotic duty of all Fr. scholars and poets to write in Fr. and enrich the lang.; translators can also participate by enlarging the Fr. vocabulary with words "captured" from other langs. (see FRENCH POETRY).

The Eng. were, if possible, even more nationalistic than the Fr., yet the widespread taste for Lat. produced by grammar-school education made the battle more difficult than it might otherwise have been. Roger Ascham writes in *Toxophilus* (1545), his defense of the use of the ancient long bow in battle, that "to have written this book either in Lat. or Gr. . . . had been more easier." Indeed, in the 17th c. Bacon had some of his more important scientific works published in Lat. because he feared that "these modern langs. will at one time or other play bankrupt with books." On the other hand, Richard Mulcaster, a prominent educator, thought of Eng. as "the joyful title of our liberty and freedom, the Lat. tongue remembering us of our thraldom and bondage." In this, he undoubtedly spoke for the majority of Englishmen. It should be added that both in England and in northern Europe the cause of national langs. and lits. was enhanced by the growing Reformist and Protestant movements, which insisted that the Scriptures be translated and available for all believers to read for themselves.

But once the cause of vernacular poetry was established, the practice raised problems of its own. The initial problem was meter: how could a vernacular lang. (lacking quantity) imitate the (quantitative) meter natural to the Cl. langs., Gr. and Lat.? Claudio Tolomei in his *Versi et regole de la nuova poesia toscana* (1539) tried to show how It. poetry could be written so as to imitate the prosody of Lat. verse. He was followed in France by Jacques de la Taille, who writes in the preface to his *La Manière de faire des vers en françois, comme en grec et en latin* (1573) that the real issue is the yearnings of "ultraclassicists" to rival Virgil or Homer, and argues for a new Fr. spelling and pronunciation that will permit the lang. to fit Cl. meter. The Eng. were more tolerant still, and many Eng. poets in the later 16th c. came to write an Eng. quantitative verse in imitation of the Gr. and Lat. because the Eng. lang. seemed closer to the Cl. langs., esp. Lat., than it did to It., with its greater percentage of rhyming words, or to Fr., with its more musical accent. For the Eng., meter superseded rhyme, and in *The Scholemaster* (1570) Ascham, associating rhyme with medieval scholastic verse, even calls rhyme "barbarian." See CLASSICAL METERS IN MODERN LANGUAGES.

Later treatises by William Webbe (1586) and (putatively) George Puttenham (1589) provide an additional, Protestant argument by declaring that the past age, when rhyme was employed, was not only "gothic" but papist. Webbe recalls "this tinkerly verse which we call rime" and condemns monks for having invented "brutish Poetry." Puttenham speaks of rhyme (q.v.) as "the idle invention of Monastical men," supporting the superiority of Protestant classicists. Even Edmund Spenser briefly became part of the quantitative movement, and as late as 1602, Thomas Campion in his *Observations* questions "the childish titillation of riming." The positive outcomes of such complaints in Eng. were a notable increase in poetic experimentation and the devel. of a flexible and powerful medium for dramatic poetry (q.v.), namely blank verse (q.v.).

IV. THE GENRES OF POETRY. Ren. concern with Cl. verseforms was matched by interest in Cl. distinctions of genre (q.v.), distinctions first worked out by the commentators on Horace and Aristotle and later codified by such critics as Minturno, Scaliger, and Sidney. In general, the commentators associated each of the major genres with a particular social stratum, with the nobility at the top and peasants and artisans at the bottom.

Epic (q.v.) or "heroic verse" (q.v.) was usually considered the most important and noble of all genres, since its heroes were rulers and military leaders and were meant to represent a nation's best values. In Italy, Ariosto, Trissino, and Tasso attempted major national epics. Their efforts were paralleled by those of Camoẽs in Portugal, Ronsard in Fr., and Spenser and Milton in Eng. But

whether such modern poetic narratives as *Orlando furioso* and *The Faerie Queene* could actually be considered epics was the cause of argument. Ariosto's *Orlando furioso* and Tasso's *Gerusalemme liberata* are popular romances, unlike the more classically oriented *L'Italia liberata dai Goti* of Trissino. Minturno attacks romances for lacking Cl. unity and for appealing to lower tastes, while Cinthio argues for the right of a new age to develop its own forms and to depart from the universal Ren. poetic principle of imitation (q.v.) of the ancients.

Tragedy (q.v.) ranks highest among dramatic genres both because its heroes are rulers and because Aristotle himself ranked tragedy highest in the *Poetics*. Scaliger notes that tragic plots are based on the activities of kings—the affairs of state, fortress, and camp. Cinthio adds that we call the actions of tragedy illustrious not because they are virtuous but because the characters who enact them are of the highest rank. Tragedy calls for elevated style and, in Italy, for magnificent scenery in presentation as well.

Comedy (q.v.) is complementary to tragedy. It treats middle- and lower-class characters, and it concentrates on situations that are amusing or ridiculous rather than pitiable and fearful. In *L'arte poetica* (1563), Minturno suggests that while noble ladies appear in public, middle-class women do not do so until after marriage, and the poet will violate comic decorum if he counters this practice. Castelvetro says that while members of the strong-willed aristocracy constitute a law unto themselves, the middle class will run to magistrates with their difficulties and live under the law. Consequently, the comic plot must not involve vendettas or other inappropriate behavior but instead treat the commonplaces of bourgeois life in which characters speak an everyday lang. Farce (q.v.) concentrates on lower-class characters and situations; here the chief responsibility of the poet is keeping decorum (q.v.), since the action is broad and the speech colloquial.

Most Fr. and Eng. critics followed this threefold generic division, giving almost exactly the same definitions as the It. critics. Pierre de Laudun, for instance, in *L'art poëtique françois* (1597), contends that "The characters of tragedy are grave people of great rank and those of comedy are low and of small position. . . . The words of Tragedy are grave and those of Comedy are light. . . . The characters in Tragedy are sumptuously dressed and those of Comedy garbed in an ordinary way." Most Ren. dramatists, incl. Shakespeare, followed these principles or, as in the Prologue to *Henry V*, announce it conspicuously when they do not. In Spain, Lope de Vega explained in *El arte nuevo de hacer comedias* (*The New Art of Making Comedies*, 1609) that while he admires Aristotle's theories, along with those of his Ren. interpreters, he has to make a living, and pleasing the crowd requires violating most of the Cl. rules, incl. those relating to the three unities.

Shakespeare's prologue speaks to the problem of unity—specifically, unity of place—as much as to social decorum, while Ben Jonson in *Sejanus* apologizes for not keeping to a unity of time (one 24-hour period). The unities of place and time were added by Ren. critics to the single unity of action (or plot, q.v.), which Aristotle argues in the *Poetics* is the basis for drama. The three unities were introduced for the first time in England through Sidney's *Defence* (written ca. 1580; pub. 1595). They were never observed rigorously, however, by the Eng. popular dramatists. It was in France that they became critical dogma, and it was principally from France that they were reintroduced into Eng. criticism in the later 17th c.

The theory of genres was complicated by two developing dramatic and narrative forms in the Ren.—tragicomedy and romance (qq.v.). For conservative critics, tragicomedy was by name and definition a "mongrel" form because it mingled kings and clowns, as Sidney puts it. However, Giambattista Guarini, the author of *Il pastor fido* (1590), argued that since the great and the lowly exist side by side in actual life, it is perfectly natural and correct to have both in a single drama. The response came from Jason DeNores (*Apologia*, 1590) when he remarked that comedy instructs citizens how to act, but a mixed genre, since it cannot instruct this way, is without any useful end; moreover, it gives no certain direction to the playwright as to appropriate behavior or lang. Guarini later published an extended reply, *Compendio della poesia tragicomica* (1601), in which he hinted that he writes to please rather than to follow "rules" or to instruct; and he adds that some of his shepherds are noble and some are not, hence his use of both tragedy and comedy. The best playwrights agreed, as we see in Shakespeare's late plays, *Cymbeline, Pericles, The Winter's Tale*, and *The Tempest*, and in Fletcher's prologue to *The Faithful Shepherdess* (1610?): "a God is as lawful in this as in a tragedy, and mean people as in a comedy."

V. THE PRINCIPLE OF IMITATION. The various strands of Ren. *imitatio* began with Plato, who notes in *The Sophist* (219a–c) two kinds of art he calls icastic and fantastic. Icastic or "likeness-making art" occurs "whenever anyone produces the imitation by following the proportions of the original in length, breadth, and depth, and giving, besides, the appropriate colors to each part" (235d)—when the artist records what he sees without any imaginative changes. Icastic art thus copies the original precisely. Fantastic art, on the other hand, either creates that which does not exist—Sidney will suggest the Cyclops as an example—or else gives a disproportioned, inexact representation of the object being imitated—fantastic art thus "produces appearance," according to Plato, "but not likeness" (236c). While both kinds of art share the identical end, representation, their means are opposed: one teaches by exact copying, the other persuades by asking us to ac-

cept what seems to be for what is. Since Plato uses sculpture and painting as his examples, his distinction is a distinction in poetics.

Beginning in the 14th c. with Petrarch, another kind of imitation—stylistic imitation of the ancients, esp. Cicero and Virgil—became popular. This theory of imitation persisted throughout the Ren. and overlaps other, more philosophical theories. It was closely associated with Ren. education, since much of the grammar school curriculum involved translating, paraphrasing, and imitating Lat. authors. Questions associated with it incl. whether one should imitate a single author or the best features of many; whether one should use Cl. forms directly or seek vernacular equivalents of them; and how originality (q.v.) and imitation can co-exist. Two treatises that nicely illustrate Ren. understanding of imitation in this sense are the *Ciceronianus* of Erasmus (1528) and the second book of Roger Ascham's *Scholemaster.*

The rediscovery of Aristotle's *Poetics* introduced yet another kind of imitation. Whatever Aristotle may have understood by *mimesis* (see IMITATION; REPRESENTATION AND MIMESIS), most Ren. writers understood it to mean either (a) the direct representation in lang. and dramatic action of the real world, or (b) the representation of typical (or "probable") aspects of the real world. The argument that the *mimesis* should focus on the typical or probable rather than on the specific or topical justified departures in plots from strict historical fact (see CLASSICAL POETICS). A very prominent thrust of the theory was the justification for reshaping history so that it conformed to the requirements of moral instruction. When interpreted in this way the *Poetics* seemed entirely consistent with the traditional theory inherited from Horace that poetry mixes the morally useful with the aesthetically delightful.

Thus in *La poetica* (1536) Bernardino Daniello argues that the poet, unlike the historian, can mingle fiction with fact because he is held not to what is or was but rather to what ought to be. Francisco Robortelli in his commentary on the *Poetics* (1548) likewise argues that the poet can add invented material in imitating reality, citing as exemplars Xenophon's ideal portrait of Cyrus and Cicero's ideal portrait of the orator; moreover, he adds, poets can invent matters which transcend nature so long as they can be logically inferred from what we know in nature: there is even room in the epic, he admits, for the marvelous. Girolamo Fracastoro similarly argues that the poet, in depicting the simple and essential truth of things, should not simply reproduce it but clothe it in beauty—beauty which is formal, ethical, and aesthetic, keeping only to decorum, which is for him suggested by the idea the poet wishes to portray.

Torquato Tasso further complicates the question of imitation in his *Discorsi dell'arte poetica* (Discourses on the Heroic Poem, 1567–70; tr. I. Samuel and M. Cavalchini, 1973) when he attempts to seek some balance between the claims of Christian and allegorical truth and poetic license and adornment: the naked truth, he claims, should be enhanced by novelty and surprise that will increase the sense of wonder. To some critics the requirement that certain kinds of poetry present wonderful and marvelous events and arouse admiration (*admiratio*) as well as teach moral lessons seemed to be compatible with the *Poetics*, but to others it contravened the dictum that the poet should represent the real world (or "nature"). The latter position is taken in the *Della poetica la deca disputata* (1586) of Francesco Patrizi, popularly known as the *Deca ammirabile.* For Patrizi there are two forms of the marvelous: one is a quality of the poem itself, which springs from the divine inspiration or enthusiasm of the poet and suitably combines the credible and incredible, making the work admirable (*mirabile*); the other is the effect produced in the audience, the extrinsic end of poetry (*la maraviglia*).

While the theory of imitation was considerably more advanced in Italy than elsewhere in the 16th c., there was great interest in France, Spain, and England as well. Du Bellay's *Déffence* argues that Fr. poetry can only hope to attain perfection by imitating the classics, and while the true poet is born, only education in the classics will protect his talent from being useless. But Du Bellay does not distinguish one kind of imitation from another; he left that to Jacques Peletier du Mans, who says (not unlike Tasso) in his *L'Art poétique* (1555) that the poet's responsibility is to imitate old things by adding to them something new, something beautiful. Ronsard invokes the fundamental principle of *imitatio* both in his *Abrégé de l'art poëtique françois* (1565) and in the 1572 preface to his incomplete epic. While he urges the use of images that are inspiring (since he sees the end of poetry as moral edification), he rules out images which are fantastic, unnatural, or marvelous. But the sense of morality is strongest in the work of Jean Vauquelin de la Fresnaye, who prefers scriptural themes for poetry. Indeed, he notes in his *Art poétique* (1605) that if the Greeks had been Christian they too would have sung of the life and death of Christ.

VI. RHETORIC AND POETIC. References to ornament and to memory suggest that, for many of the major Ren. critics, Ren. p. also grew directly out of Ren. rhet. Vida's *De arte poetica*, for example, combines a Horatian discussion of the training of the poet and a defense of poetry (in Book I) with rhetorical treatises on invention and disposition (in Book II) and elocution (in Book III). Daniello's *La poetica* expands Horace around the same three rhetorical concerns; and even Minturno's *L'arte poetica* combines Horace and Aristotle's *Poetics* with the rhetorical writings of Cicero and Quintilian. In the 14th c., Salutati had urged in *De nobilitate legum et medicinae* the practice of disputations, or *controversiae*, as a practical means to sharpen the mind, inspire further learning, and

engender practical results in the life of early humanist students; in the 15th c., Fracastoro, in the *Naugerius* (1555), argues that the poet can persuade his reader by imitating natural things. Such an art of persuasion was at first the chief purpose not so much of poetry as of rhet., yet poets too needed to persuade readers to the basic truths of their poetry whether it was deliberately verisimilitudinous or not. By the 15th c. in Italy and by the 16th c. in northern Europe, poetics frequently rested on the principles and practices of rhet. because that was the substance of education and, further, because both shared the common end of persuasion.

Extant syllabi and lectures from humanist schools of the 15th and 16th cs. illustrate the close alliance between rhet. and poetics. Humanist students were taught Lat. grammar and syntax followed by orations, imitating historical and imagined speeches; they also practiced fables, biographies, epistles, and descriptions. Regardless of form, such exercises promoted deliberative, judicial, and demonstrative speeches that would discuss an issue, argue a point, or award praise or blame; after this, students would move on to disputations and debates.

Indeed, the rhetorical *techne* taught in the humanist schools provided esp. imaginative ways to think, write, and speak, such as *prosopopoeia* (q.v.), the creation (or feigning, q.v.) of a fictive persona; and *topographia*, the description (or creation) of places. The rhetoric studied in humanist schools also taught the value and practice of *ethos* (q.v.), or the feigned persona of the speaker, and *pathos* (q.v.), the ways in which a speaker (or poet) puts his audience into a particular frame of mind. Such classroom lessons were easily transferred into poetic technique, esp. since Aristotle's chief rhetorical end, probability, was transformed into verisimilitude (q.v.) by Cicero (*De inventione* 1.21.29).

VII. CONCLUSION. One of the important Cl. texts for Ren. p. is Epistle XLV of the Roman philosopher Seneca. According to Seneca, art is best understood as an imitation determined by the four causes of Aristotle's *Prior Analytics*. As Seneca applies them, the first cause is actual matter (such as the bronze of a bronze statue); the second cause is the agent (the artist or workman); the third is the form (the sense of the form and function of a statue); and the fourth is purpose (money, reputation, religious devotion). What became crucial for Ren. p., however, is Seneca's own "fifth cause"—the model or original against which the new creation is made and to which it therefore always, implicitly or explicitly, refers. The theory of models was consonant with the Ren. interest in turning away from the Middle Ages to Gr. and Roman texts for an understanding of form, genres, and *techne*, reinforcing both the understanding and practice of poetry. Cl. models lie behind not only the epics of Ariosto, Tasso, Spenser, and Milton, but the *Praise of Folly* of Erasmus, such plays as Shakespeare's *Othello* and Ben Jonson's *Volpone*, and such epic fiction as Sidney's *Arcadia* and Cervantes' *Don Quijote*.

The It. Ren. critics and their Sp., Fr., and Eng. successors were the founders of modern European crit. and modern European lit. as well. The Dutch and Ger. critics of the Ren. added little that was new. The theories that were produced by Ren. critics were learned, sophisticated, and detailed, but they were often divorced from the realities of the literary marketplace. This was esp. true of theories of drama. Lope de Vega confessed that, of his 483 comedies, "all except six of them sin grievously against art." In other words, the only way de Vega or anyone else prior to the collapse of the neoclassical spirit could talk about art was in the terms formulated and promulgated by Ren. p., and these terms were for the most part irrelevant to the kind of drama that Lope was writing. See also FICTION; IMAGINATION; IMITATION; INVENTION; RHETORIC AND POETRY; RULES.

BIBLIOGRAPHIES: *For Fr. and Eng.*, see Patterson and Smith below. For It.: R. C. Williams, "It. Crit. Treatises of the 16th C.," *MLN* 35 (1920); W. Bullock, "It. 16th-C. Crit.," *MLN* 41 (1926); Weinberg. *For Sp.*, see Menéndez y Pelayo, *Historia de las ideas estéticas en España*, 9 v. (1883–92), v. 2. *For Eng.*: G. Saintsbury, *Hist. of Crit. and Literary Taste in Europe* (1900–4), v. 2—convenient though inadequate; V. Hall, *Lit. Crit.: Plato to Dryden* (1970).

COLLECTIONS: *English*: Smith—collects the major Ren. prosodists and critics; J. E. Spingarn, *Crit. Essays of the 17th C.*, 3 v. (1907); E. W. Tayler, *Lit. Crit. of 17th-C. England* (1967). *French*: Patterson—a history, but contains copious excerpts from Ren. essays; B. Weinberg, *Crit. Prefaces of the Fr. Ren.* (1950), *Trattati di poetica e retorica del cinquecento*, 4 v. (1970–74); B. Fabian, *Poetiken de Cinquecento*, 25 v. (1967–69); A. Gilbert, *Lit. Crit.* (1940)—a generous selection in tr. *Italian*: the opinions and comments of most of the It. critics are collected in what amounts to a commonplace book of crit. by U. Nisieli (pseud. for B. Fioretti), *Proginnasmi poetici*, 2 v. (Florence, 1639); and see Weinberg (above). *Spanish*: no satisfactory collection.

SECONDARY WORKS: *Books*: K. Borinski, *Die Poetik der Ren.* (1886); F. E. Schelling, *Poetic and Verse Crit. of the Reign of Elizabeth* (1891); W. H. Woodward, *Vittorino da Feltre and Other Humanist Educators* (1897); K. Vossler, *Poetische Theorien in der ital. Frühren.* (1900); F. Padelford, *Select Trs. from Scaliger's* Poetics (1905); I. Scott, *Controversies over Imitation of the Ren. (incl. tr. of Erasmus' "Ciceronianus")* (1910); H. Charlton, *Castelvetro's Theory of Poetry* (1913); *The New Art of Writing Plays, by Lope de Vega*, tr. W. T. Brewster (1914); C. Trabalza, *La critica letteraria nel rinsaciamento* (1915); D. L. Clark, *Rhet. and Poetic in the Ren.* (1922); C. S. Baldwin, *Ren. Literary Theory and Practice* (1939); M. T. Herrick, *The Poetics of Aristotle in England* (1930), *The Fusion of Horatian and Aristotelian Lit. Crit., 1531–1555* (1946), *Comic Theory in the 16th*

C. (1950), *Tragicomedy* (1955); R. J. Clemens, *Crit. Theory and Practice of the Pléiade* (1942); T. W. Baldwin, *William Shakspere's Small Latine & Lesse Greeke*, 2 v. (1944); H. Wilson and C. Forbes, *Gabriel Harvey's Ciceronianus* (1945); V. Hall, Jr., *Ren. Lit. Crit.* (1945), "Scaliger's Defense of Poetry," *PMLA* 63 (1948); W. Lily, *A Shorte Intro. of Grammar and Brevissima Institutio*, 3d ed. (1567), ed. V. J. Flynn (1945); J. W. H. Atkins, *Eng. Lit. Crit.: The Renascence* (1947); J. Burckhardt, *The Civilization of the Ren. in Italy* (1950); J. E. Spingarn, *A Hist. of Lit. Crit. in the Ren.*, 2d ed. (1954); R. R. Bolgar, *The Cl. Heritage and Its Beneficiaries* (1954); W. S. Howell, *Logic and Rhet. in England, 1500–1700* (1956); Weinberg; P. O. Kristeller, *Ren. Thought, I, II* (1961, 1965), with selections in *Ren. Thought and the Arts*, 2d ed. (1990); B. Hathaway, *The Age of Crit.: The Late Ren. in Italy* (1962); O. B. Hardison, Jr., *The Enduring Monument* (1962), *Prosody and Purpose in the Eng. Ren.* (1989); A. Garcia Barrio, *La Formacion de la teoría moderna: La topica Horatiana en Europa* (1963); D. Bush, *Mythology and the Ren. Trad. in Eng. Poetry*, rev. ed. (1963); M. Vitale, *La Questione de la langua* (1967); J.-C. Chevalier, *Histoire de la syntaxe: Naissance de la notion de complément dans la grammaire française (1530–1750)* (1968); J. E. Seigel, *Rhet. and Philosophy in Ren. Humanism* (1968); R. Weiss, *The Ren. Discovery of Cl. Antiquity* (1969); A. Patterson, *Hermogenes and the Ren.* (1970); F. G. Robinson, *The Shape of Things Known: Sidney's* Apology *in Its Philosophical Trad.* (1972); D. Attridge, *Well-Weighed Syllables* (1974); W. J. Kennedy, *Rhet. Norms in Ren. Lit.* (1978); A. Weiner, *Sir Philip Sidney and the Poetics of Protestantism* (1978); R. L. Montgomery, *The Reader's Eye: Studies in Didactic Literary Theory from Dante to Tasso* (1979); C. Greenfield, *Humanist and Scholastic Poetics, 1250–1500* (1981); L. Holtz, *Donat et la trad. de l'enseignement grammatical* (1981); I. Silver, *Ronsard and the Hellenic Ren.*, 2 v. (1981); T. Greene, *The Light in Troy* (1982); M. Donker and G. M. Muldrow, *Dict. of Literary-Rhetorical Conventions of the Eng. Ren.* (1982); W. Trimpi, *Muses of One Mind* (1983); *Jacopo Mazzoni's* On the Defense of the Comedy of Dante, tr. R. L. Montgomery (1983); M. W. Ferguson, *Trials of Desire: Ren. Defenses of Poetry* (1983); J. H. Meter, *The Literary Theories of Daniel Heinsius* (1984); *Englische Literaturtheorie von Sidney bis Johnson*, ed. B. Nugel (1984); V. Kahn, *Rhet., Prudence, and Skepticism in the Ren.* (1985); K. Eden, *Poetic and Legal Fiction in the Aristotelian Trad.* (1986); A. F. Kinney, *Humanist Poetics: Thought, Rhet., and Fiction in 16th-C. England* (1986), *Continental Humanist Poetics* (1989); *Ren. Genres*, ed. B. K. Lewalski (1986); D. K. Shuger, *Sacred Rhet.* (1988); S. K. Heninger, Jr., *Sidney and Spenser: The Poet as Maker* (1989); B. Vickers, *Cl. Rhet. in Eng. Poetry*, 2d ed. (1989).

Articles: See esp. M. W. Bundy, "'Invention' and 'Imagination' in the Ren.," *JEGP* 29 (1930); H. S. Wilson, "Some Meanings of 'Nature' in Ren. Lit. Theory," *JHI* 2 (1941); G. Giovannini, "Historical Realism and the Tragic Emotions in Ren. Crit.," *PQ* 32 (1953); B. Sozzi, "La Poetica del Tasso," *Studi Tassiani* 5 (1955); S. L. Bethell, "The Nature of Metaphysical Wit," *Discussions of John Donne*, ed. F. Kermode (1962); O. B. Hardison, Jr., "The Two Voices of Sidney's *Apology for Poetry*," *ELR* 2 (1972); E. Kushner, "The Concept of Invention and Its Role in Ren. Lit. Theory," *Neohelicon* 8 (1980); N. Struever, "Lorenzo Valla: Humanist Rhet. and the Critique of the Cl. Langs. of Morality," *Ren. Eloquence*, ed. J. J. Murphy (1983);

V.H.; A.F.K.; O.B.H.

RENAISSANCE POETRY. "The Ren." as a historical term is so elastic and so geared to geographical and temporal amplitudes that we will say merely that it occurred in Europe sometime between the completion of Dante's *Divina commedia* in Italy (1307–21) and Milton's *Paradise Lost* in England (1667). In Italy the Ren. is confined to the 1400s, whence it spread to France and almost simultaneously to Spain and Portugal and later to England and Northern Europe. It is sometimes linked to the invention of printing and in art history to the rejection of Byzantine formalism in favor of natural representation, and it has come to be associated with modern ideas such as the supremacy of the individual and the emergence of the modern state, as well as the recovery of Cl. antiquity in its exuberant proclamation of a self rejoicing in its physicality and freed from the shackles of religious bondage. The fact that it began in Italy but that our Eng. name for it derives from the Fr. points to some of the difficulty of definition.

Ren. p. began with the vernacular poetry of Petrarch (1304–74), whose *Canzoniere* and *Trionfi* provided the impetus, the topoi, and the vocabulary of Western lit. for the following two centuries. The question of when the Ren. began and ended can be debated endlessly, but if we start with the poems of the *Canzoniere*, we can make a clear demarcation between Petrarch and the work of Dante in *La vita nuova*, and the *Commedia*, whose achievement Petrarch must have considered complete in its exploitation of the vernacular and the Aristotelian-Thomistic synthesis now considered characteristic of the high Middle Ages. Petrarch turned to the embryo sonnet sequence (q.v.) of *La vita nuova* and exploited the formal devices of lyric form without Dante's prose commentary and without the Aristotelian-Thomistic frame of the *Commedia*. The love ethic is like Dante's, as the progress of the *Trionfi* proclaims, but the elaboration of the symptoms of the love wound and its consequences over 366 poems provided an eloquence that captured the imaginations and imitative faculties of almost every poet for the next 200 years. More than 200 editions of the *Canzoniere*, often with commentaries, were printed during the 15th and 16th cs. Commentaries like that of Pietro Bembo (1470–1547) emphasized the linguistic purity of Petrarch, and the often reprinted com-

mentary of Alessandro Vellutello mapped the occasion and place of many of the poems, turning the *Canzoniere* into the autobiographical confession so dear to the hearts of the 19th and 20th cs. Petrarchan influence (see PETRARCHISM) was the signal that other vernacular lits. had reached what we now call the Ren.; the recognition of Petrarch's poetry characterized a national lit.'s awareness of itself as a contender for the honors paid to the classics.

The endless elaboration of the basic Petrarchan formula of ardent poet-lover pursuing an aloof blonde lady to no avail, either through her good sense or her death, ricocheted across Europe, the Petrarchan sonnet sequences producing the densest mass of love poetry (q.v.) ever produced in the West. No poet of worth avoided the sonnet (q.v.), and most attempted the sonnet sequence, although few had the poetic stamina to carry the plan through to the death of the lady and after, as did Dante and Petrarch. The impulse was so strong that even women established themselves in the mode, such as Vittoria Colonna (1492– 1547) and Gaspara Stampa (ca. 1523–54) in Italy and Louise Labé (?1520–65) in France. In England alone more than 60 sonnet sequences were written between 1580 and 1630, incl. those of Sir Philip Sidney (1554–86), Samuel Daniel (ca. 1562–1619), Michael Drayton (1563–1631), Edmund Spenser (1552–99), Fulke Greville, (1554–1628) and William Shakespeare (1564–1616).

But to concentrate on Petrarch's influence on sonnet lit. alone is to miss the richness of the Petrarchan mode. His fictional amatory involvement with Laura is also the metaphoric pretext for political dreams that included his friends and a desire that the papacy return from its Babylonian captivity in Avignon to its rightful place in Rome. More than ten percent of the poems in the *Canzoniere* are devoted to friends or to the plight of Rome and the corruption of the Papacy, a fact which led Vellutello to sequester those poems in a separate section of his edition. Rome and his friends are very much a part of the matrix and outreach of Petrarch's poems, urging us to see Laura not only as a woman but as a laurel to be won, just as Apollo won his laurel through his pursuit of Daphne, as told by Ovid in the first book of the *Metamorphoses*. The myth literally came true on April 8, 1341, when Petrarch was crowned poet laureate (q.v.) on the very Capitoline hill of Rome celebrated in the Ovidian myth. His coronation proclaimed him through his unfinished Lat. epic, *Africa*, and his widely disseminated polemical and philosophical prose works a political poet as well as a lover, and it is this side of the Petrarchan heritage that influenced even the devel. of the epic (q.v.) in the Ren.

The Middle Ages seemed content to recount endlessly the exploits of three of the Seven Worthies, Charlemagne, Arthur, and Alexander, in works in both Lat. and the vernacular tongues, the most famous now being the OF *Chanson de Roland*, but the heroics of Roland changed radically when, having crossed the Alps, Roland became Orlando. In the late 15th and early 16th c., Orlando was transformed into a Petrarchan lover as well as an epic hero. The transformation was helped along by Aeneas' dalliance with Dido in Virgil's *Aeneid*, with all that liaison's threat to Roman security. City after city in Italy took up the threat of this transformed hero to dynastic security. In Florence Luigi Pulci (1432–87) wrote his rollicking *Morgante maggiore* (1483), in which a roistering giant named Morgante becomes the squire of Orlando after his conversion to Christianity. A few years later a slightly different aspect of the Orlando story was taken up in Ferrara by Matteo Maria Boiardo (1441–94) in *Orlando innamorato* (1495), a work left unfinished at his death. Lodovico Ariosto (1474–1533) took up the unfinished work of Boiardo in his *Orlando furioso* (1532), in which Orlando's love for the fair Angelica finally drives him to madness until his wits are restored to him, literally from an apothecary jar where they are stored in the sphere of the moon. Ariosto's comic genius made his *Orlando* the model of It. epic-romance, and the infinite variety of his invention, linking the love antics of Orlando and dozens of other characters, spliced with the serious claims of the antecedents of the Este dynasty of Ferrara, proclaimed a new and comic version of Virgil's *Aeneid* in which serious political questions were triumphantly celebrated through the mad exploits of a brawny Petrarchan lover. The fact that this epic-romance lover does not resemble the plaintive, grieving lover of the *Canzoniere* is less the fault of Ariosto and his followers than of our deficient sense of the breadth of Petrarchism because Ariosto ransacks the Petrarchan vocabulary and topoi to fill out the story told by Virgil in the fourth book of the *Aeneid*.

The pattern of love-besot heroes and serious political consequences is continued in the *Gerusalemme liberata* (1581) of Torquato Tasso (1544–95), who turned from the exploits of Charlemagne to those of another of the Seven Worthies, Godfrey of Bouillon, in the first Crusade. Here, amidst the serious battles to win back Jerusalem from the Saracens, is the love story of Rinaldo and Armida, a beautiful enemy sorceress, through whose marriage at the end of the poem Tasso intended to give the Este another dynastic genealogy. The dynastic concern of these Ren. epics had enormous influence outside Italy, as evinced by *The Faerie Queene* of Edmund Spenser (1590–96), who made a dynastic genealogy for his sovereign Elizabeth I through the marriage of his heroine Britomart to Arthegall. Even Virgil's *Aeneid* had to partake of the romance impulse when Mapheus Vegius (1407–58) added a 13th book to the poem celebrating Aeneas's marriage to Lavinia as well as his death and stellification, a comic resolution that was printed in most 16th-c.

editions. The Petrarchan love ethic in its concern for political significance extends even to the *Os Lusíadas* (1572) of Luís Vaz do Camões (1524?–80), who redid the Petrarchan love search as Vasco da Gama's discovery of the unknown and fabulous Indies and, like Donne addressing his mistress in Elegy 19, "O my America! my new-found land," rewarded his hero for that victorious voyage with the sensuous celebration of Tethys and her nymphs, in which the dynastic marriage becomes nationalized to reward not merely the hero but the multitude of heroes that characterize Portugal.

Nonetheless, the fate of the epic in the 16th c. was generally incompletion of the epic plan. Spenser finished only six books of his projected 24. Ariosto left the *Cinque canti*, which may or may not have been intended to fit into the 46 cantos of the *Orlando furioso.* Tasso rewrote the *Gerusalemme liberata* as *Gerusalemme conquistata* (1593), in which he excised many of the romantic episodes which today we consider the glory of the poem (Tasso thought his revision was the better poem). Pierre Ronsard (1524–85) struggled endlessly to finish his epic *Franciade*, recounting the struggles of Francus, son of Hector, who bears the same relation to France that Aeneas bears to Rome, but the poem attained to only four books, incl. the love interest of Clymene, Ronsard's revisionary Dido figure. In all these epics the amplification of the love affairs is integrated into the political schemes of dynastic success, and their incompletion echoes Petrarch's incomplete epic, *Africa.* The form in which these epic loves appears may be Virgilian, but the fact that love is a central issue in these Ren. epics is Petrarchan, bolstered by his younger contemporary, Giovanni Boccaccio (1313–75), whose *Teseida* (1340–42) and *Filostrato* (1339–40) developed similar themes in the *ottava rima* stanza that was to become standard in subsequent It. narrative poems in the Ren. In spite of its putative source in the 8-line *strambotto* (q.v.), the ottava rima (q.v.) looks and behaves suspiciously like the octave of a sonnet.

It would be wrong to pretend that Petrarch is responsible for all the forms of poetry that emerged in the Ren., for very often he is only part of an impulse to recapture the classics in the vernacular that would become increasingly apparent in the centuries that followed. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the Ren. outbreak of Ovidian love poems, the erotic epyllion (q.v.), depicting in luxurious detail a seduction, or rape, or failure of some love encounter that metamorphosed the participants, or at least one of them, into something that he or she was not before the encounter. Ovid had been firmly recaptured in the Carolingian Ren. of the 12th c., and Petrarch had helped his friend, the Benedictine Pierre Bersuire (Petrus Berchorius, 1290–1362) with iconographical details for his lengthy and influential commentary on the *Metamorphoses.* Petrarch's *Canzoniere* in all its exfoliations is based on the Ovidian myth of Apollo's pursuit of Daphne, hence Laura, hence laureation. The form of the epyllion has been traced back to Catullus's poem about the marriage of Peleus and Thetis (64). The genre was unusually popular in England, where Marlowe's *Hero and Leander* (1598) and Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis* (1593) established the form either in couplets (Marlowe) or in a 6-line *ababcc* stanza (Shakespeare).

Pastoral (q.v.) poetry took a new turn in the Ren., either imitating the harsh, satiric verse of Mantuan or the soft, mellifluous verse of Sannazaro. Although pastoral was early established as a mode in the Hebraic and Cl. trads., it is the most difficult of modes to decipher because its relation to the society that produces it changes constantly. The vehicle of pastoral metaphor is transparently clear—shepherds caring for sheep, lamenting unavailing loves or dead shepherds—but the tenor is always shrouded in the more complicated personal and political actions of the societies that the poet wants to mirror and clarify. The mode brings together "The Lord is my shepherd" of Psalm 23 and Jesus's "I am the good shepherd" with the formal endeavors of the Sicilian Triad (Theocritus, Moschus, and Bion), imitated and brought into the Lat. trad. by Virgil in his *Eclogues.*

Pastoral poetry in the Cl. trad. calls out for the peg of allegory (q.v.), some name, e.g. Edward King in Milton's *Lycidas* or Keats in Shelley's *Adonais*, to accommodate that uneasy delight we take in that mode which Dr. Johnson described as "easy, vulgar, and therefore disgusting." Johnson objected to Milton's imposition of the pastoral mode on the sacred truths of Christianity, and his irritation with Milton poses a major problem of reader response to the mode, thereby ignoring the easy accommodation of Christian pastoral to Cl. mode that led Paschasius Radbertus first to write a Christian lament for his dead bishop in the pastoral mode (9th c.). Attempts to allegorize the figures and actions of Virgil's *Eclogues* have met with equal uneasiness, not because Caesar and the politics of Republican Rome were not intended as part of the meaning by Virgil but because those meanings now seem to get in the way of the verbal excellence, freed from the constraints of historical significance.

Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio all wrote formal Lat. pastoral eclogues (q.v.) in imitation of Virgil, and what historical ghosts lurk under the superb Latinity of their verses broach the same problems as Milton's and Virgil's, but in the 15th c. some help came through the division of the pastoral mode into two branches: the "rough" and the "smooth." The rough branch was created by the eclogues of Baptista Spagnuoli Mantuanus (Mantuan, 1448–1516), whose rough diction was used to satirize ecclesiastical or political abuses. The smooth was used for amatory and consolatory eclogues and derived mainly from the *Arcadia* of Jacopo Sannazaro (?1458–1530). The pastoral is

to be found everywhere in Ren. p., from Marlowe's simple lyric "Come live with me and be my love" to the more complicated verse structures of Spenser's *Shepheardes Calender* (1579) or the poetic interludes of Sidney's *Arcadia* (1590–93). The pastoral also figured prominently in the re-emergence of drama, beginning with Poliziano's *Favola di Orfeo* (1472). The two most famous Ren. pastoral dramas are Tasso's *Aminta* (1573) and Guarini's *Il pastor fido* (1583), followed by the spate of *bergeries* in France, and culminating in Francis Beaumont's *The Faithful Shepherdess* (1608–09) and Ben Jonson's unfinished *The Sad Shepherd*. Sannazaro introduced the rational innovation of the piscatory eclogue and was imitated in this fishy innovation by Phineas Fletcher, somewhat pre-empted by Milton's "pilot of the Galilean lake."

The proliferation of lyric forms in Ren. p. recaptured many Cl. forms and imitations of authors not pursued during the Middle Ages, e.g. Horace, Catullus, Juvenal, Marital, and the *Greek Anthology*. In Florence alone there were Lorenzo de Medici (1449–92), Angelo Poliziano (1454–94), Pietro Bembo (1470–1547), and Giovanni della Casa (1503–56). In Spain this new Ren. awareness is signaled by the publication of the posthumous works of Juan Boscan (ca. 1490–1542) and Garcilaso de la Vega (1503–36) in *Las obras de Boscan y alqunas de Garcilaso de la Vega* (1543), which created a whole new school of poetry led by Fernando de Herrera (1534–97), and in England by Richard Tottel's *Songs and Sonnets* (1557), a collection that introduced the works of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey (?1517–47) and Sir Thomas Wyatt (ca. 1503–42) among others. In France there is no sudden posthumous recognition of the new impulses. The work of *les grands rhétoriqueurs* (q.v.) is punctuated by the work of Clement Marot (ca. 1496–1544) and the *Délie* (1544) of Maurice Scève (ca. 1500–60), but the concerted announcement of a deliberate change comes with the work of the Pléiade (q.v.) and its critical manifesto, *La Deffense et illustration de la langue française* (1549) by Joachim Du Bellay (1523–60), second only to Pierre Ronsard (1524–85) in that illustrious poetic group. What the French accomplished through the loose association of the Pléiade is equalled in England by the influence of John Donne (1571–1633) and Ben Jonson (1572–1637) on the Eng. poets of the 17th c., who may be divided into the metaphysical poets (q.v.; followers of Donne) and Cavalier poets (q.v.; neoclassical followers of Jonson).

Emphasis on the new modes and genres in the vernaculars should not make us unmindful that many of the poets mentioned continued to write verse in Lat. (see LATIN POETRY, *Renaissance and Post-Renaissance*) and that neither in Lat. nor in the vernacular did they abandon their essentially Christian outlook on the world. The prevalence of serious religious poetry in the period has been either undervalued or isolated as a special kind of poetry, with as great a gap between "sacred" and "secular" poetry as between Neo-Lat. and vernacular. Most critical attention has been focused on "devotional" poetry—that is, personal, private, and lyric—and numerous studies of St. John of the Cross (1542–91) in Sp. and, in Eng., of Donne, George Herbert (1593–1633), Richard Crashaw (1612–49), Henry Vaughan (1622–95), and Thomas Traherne (1636–74) have explored the artistry of their religious zeal, but seldom has the relationship between the religious and the secular been examined. The motivation of the religious poet has been subjected to the most severe scrutiny, which might equally well have been expended on the reality of the numberless sonnet mistresses who supposedly enlivened the dreary orthodoxy of their poets' daily lives.

We have also established too great a distance poetically between the Protestants and the Roman Catholics, in ways that obscure the basic unity of Christian faith which overrides theological disagreement. It is too easy to set up the undeniable landmarks of conflict such as the Reformation and Counter-Reformation as points of literary discrimination, but to set up either of these historic actions as a guide to literary discriminations leads to a too easy dismissal of the Middle Ages as the necessary matrix of whatever we mean by the Ren. Although the rejection of Lat. liturgy and devotions opened up a great need for vernacular liturgies and hymns (q.v.) and translations of the Bible, one cannot therefore argue that the Reformation is responsible for a new poetics. Petrarch translated the Penitential Psalms into rhythmic Lat. prose not as a rebuff to Jerome's Vulgate but as a spur to the improvement of Latinity. Aretino translated them with a narrative frame of David's remorse over the death of Uriah, a form that Sir Thomas Wyatt adopted into Eng. and for which he was most remembered in 16th-c. England; and neither had the Reformation or politics as an incentive. Sir Philip and Lady Mary Sidney's metrical translations of the entire psalms showed more interest in making the Psalms available in Eng. than in Protestant polemics, although the Reformation made the translation a more pressing issue. Louis Martz showed many years ago that Roman Catholic manuals of meditation provided the logical structure for Protestant poets in 17th-c. England.

The impulse to sing the praises of one's faith took many forms in the Ren., but few critical studies have examined the longer narrative or discursive encounters with religious subjects, such as Sannazaro's *De partu virginis* (1526) or Tasso's *Le sette giornate* (1594) or Du Bartas' *Le premier sepmaine* (1578) or Maurice Scève's *Microcosme* (1562). All of these poems are attempts to make vivid and intellectually apprehensible the truths of a Christian universe in conflict. To ignore them as part of Ren. p. is like the unthinkable critical

act of omitting religious painting from a history of art in the Ren.

See also: EPIC; IMAGINATION; IMITATION; INVENTION; LYRIC SEQUENCE; PETRARCHISM; PASTORAL; PLEIADE; RENAISSANCE POETICS; RHETORIC AND POETRY; ROMANCE; SONNET; SONNET SEQUENCE.

Schipper; W. W. Greg, *Pastoral Poetry and Pastoral Drama* (1906); J. M. Berdan, *Early Tudor Poetry* (1920); *The Love Poems of Joannes Secundus*, ed. and tr. F. A. Wright (1930), with valuable essay on Neo-Lat. poetry; A. Scolari, *Ludovico Aristo* (1930); A. Meozzi, *Il Petrarchism europeo: secolo XVI* (1934); Patterson; C. S. Lewis, *The Allegory of Love* (1936), *Eng. Lit. in the 16th C. Excluding Drama* (1954); C. Privitera, *La poesia e l'arte di Torquato Tasso* (1936); L. C. John, *The Elizabethan Sonnet Sequences* (1938); *CBEL*, v. 1; L. Bradner, *Musae Anglicanae: A Hist. of Anglo-Lat. Poetry 1500–1925* (1940); V. L. Rubel, *Poetic Diction in the Eng. Ren.* (1941)—wider scope than title indicates; P. Van Tieghem, *La Lit. lat. de la Ren.* (1944); E. Donadoni, *Torquato Tasso*, 3d ed. (1946); M. Prior, *The Lang. of Tragedy* (1947); R. Tuve, *Elizabethan and Metaphysical Imagery* (1947); *Historia general de las literaturas hispanicas*, ed. G. Diaz-Plaja, 6 v. (1949–68); D. Alonso, *Poesia española* (1950); C. M. Ing, *Elizabethan Lyrics* (1951); H. Smith, *Elizabethan Poetry* (1952); B. Weinberg, *Fr. Poetry of the Ren.* (1954); L. L. Martz, *The Poetry of Meditation* (1954); E. M. W. Tillyard, *The Eng. Epic and its Background* (1954); W. Mönch, *Das Sonett: Gestalt und Gesch.* (1955); *CBFL*, v. 2; G. deF. Lord, *Homeric Ren.: The Odyssey of George Chapman* (1956); H. Weber, *La Création poétique au XVIe siècle*, 2 v. (1956); L. B. Campbell, *Divine Poetry and Drama in 16th-C. England* (1959); A. Kernan, *The Cankered Muse: Satire of the Eng. Ren.* (1959); G. Dickinson, *Du Bellay in Rome* (1960); J. Hollander, *The Untuning of the Sky: Ideas of Music in Eng. Poetry, 1500–1700* (1961); R. Montgomery, *Symmetry and Sense: The Poetry of Sir Philip Sidney* (1961); I. Silver, *Ronsard and the Hellenic Ren. in France*, 2 v. (1961, 1987); J. Thompson, *The Founding of Eng. Metre* (1961); O. B. Hardison, Jr. *The Enduring Monument* (1962), *Prosody and Purpose in the Eng. Ren.* (1989); *Ren. and Baroque Poetry of Spain*, ed. E. Rivers (1964); G. Castor, *Pléiade Poetics: A Study in 16th-C. Thought and Terminology* (1964); P. Thompson, *Sir Thomas Wyatt and his Background* (1964); J. W. Lever, *The Elizabethan Love Sonnet*, 2d ed. (1965); W. L. Grant, *Neo-Lat. Lit. and the Pastoral* (1965); G. Mazzacurati, *Misure del classicismo rinascimentale* (1967); L. Forster, *The Icy Fire: Studies in European Petrarchism* (1969); *New CBEL*, v. 1; R. O. Jones, *Golden Age Prose and Poetry* (1971); P. V. Marinelli, *Pastoral* (1971); S. Fish, *Surprized by Sin* (1971); B. W. Wardropper, *Sp. Poetry of the Golden Age* (1971); D. Attridge, *Well-Weighed Syllables* (1974); I. D. McFarlane, *Ren. France, 1470–1589*, v. 2 of *A Lit. Hist. of France*, ed. P. E. Charvet (1974); Wilkins; J. Nohrnberg, *The Analogy of the* Faerie Queene (1976); D. Javitch, *Poetry and Courtliness in Ren. England* (1978); A. L. Prescott, *Fr. Poets and the Eng. Ren.* (1978); B. K. Lewalski, *Protestant Poetics and the 17th-C. Religious Lyric* (1979), ed., *Ren. Genres* (1986); S. Greenblatt, *Ren. Self-Fashioning* (1980); C. Freer, *The Poetics of Jacobean Drama* (1981); G. Hibbard, *The Making of Shakespeare's Dramatic Poetry* (1981); R. Peterson, *Imitation and Praise in the Poetry of Ben Jonson* (1981); T. Greene, *The Light in Troy* (1982); M. Donker and G. M. Muldrow, *Dict. of Literary-Rhetorical Conventions of the Eng. Ren.* (1982); J. Goldberg, *James I and the Politics of Lit.: Jonson, Shakespeare, Donne, and their Contemporaries* (1983); J. Guillory, *Poetic Authority: Spenser, Milton and Lit. Hist.* (1983); M. Quilligan, *Milton's Spenser: The Poetics of Reading* (1983); D. Quint, *Origin and Originality in Ren. Lit.* (1983); L. Woodbridge, *Women and the Eng. Ren.: Lit. and the Nature of Womankind, 1540–1620* (1984); A. A. Parker, *The Philosophy of Love in Sp. Lit., 1480–1680* (1985); G. Waller and M. Moore, *Sir Philip Sidney and the Interp. of Ren. Culture* (1985); J. E. Howard, "The New Historicism in Ren. Studies," *ELR* 16 (1986); A. Kinney, *Essential Articles for the Study of Sir Philip Sidney* (1986); *Ren. Genres*, ed. B. K. Lewalski (1986); W. Maynard, *Elizabethan Lyric Poetry and its Music* (1986); W. Sessions, *Henry Howard Earl of Surrey* (1986); H. Dubrow, *Captive Victors: Shakespeare's Narrative Poems and Sonnets* (1987); A. Patterson, *Pastoral and Ideology: Virgil to Valery* (1987); G. T. Wright, *Shakespeare's Metrical Art* (1988); T. P. Roche, Jr., *Petrarch and the Eng. Sonnet Sequence* (1989); Hollier; A. R. Jones, *The Currency of Eros: Women's Love L. in Europe, 1540–1620* (1990); R. Greene, *Post-Petrarchism* (1991).

T.P.R.

RENGA. Japanese linked poetry. Although joined poems (*lien-chü*) were composed earlier in China, they did not have the codified nature of *r.*, nor did they develop out of the practice of poetic sequences, as *r.* did. *R.* developed from integrated sequences of *waka* (q.v.) in Japanese royal collections and from shorter (esp. 100-poem) sequences modeled on the collections. *R.* also had ancestry in the capping of one part of a *waka* by one poet with a second part by another: e.g. two lines of 7 + 7 syllables added to three of 5, 7, and 5. In the 12th c., waka poets composed *r.*, alternating 3- and 2-line stanzas in a nonserious (*mushin*) fashion. Play led to earnest (*ushin*) *r.* At first, impressive stanzas were sought. Later, the greatest *r.* master, Sōgi (1421–1502), emphasized the integrity of sequences along with variety in impressiveness of stanzas and variance in closeness and distance of connection.

A typical *r.* sequence comprised 100 stanzas composed by about three poets at a single sitting (*za*) of about three hours. A given stanza was therefore composed in less than three minutes. Given the complexities of the *r.* code, that meant (as the last practitioner of *r.* put it) that 20 years