

THE NEW
PRINCETON
ENCYCLOPEDIA
OF POETRY
AND POETICS

ALEX PREMINGER
AND T. V. F. BROGAN
CO-EDITORS

FRANK J. WARNKE,[†] O. B. HARDISON, JR.,[†]
AND EARL MINER
ASSOCIATE EDITORS

PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS

1993

Copyright © 1993 by Princeton University Press

Published by Princeton University Press
41 William Street, Princeton New Jersey 08540
In the United Kingdom:
Princeton University Press, Chichester, West Sussex
All Rights Reserved

Preparation of this volume was made possible in part by generous grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities, an independent federal agency dedicated to furthering the values of humane scholarship and culture in America, and by grants from other major foundations and private donors who wish to remain anonymous. Without their support this book would not have been possible. Publication has been aided by a grant from the Lacy Lockert Fund of Princeton University Press.

Library of Congress Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
The New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics
Alex Preminger and T. V. F. Brogan, co-editors;
Frank J. Warnke, O. B. Hardison, Jr., and
Earl Miner, associate editors

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references

ISBN: 0-691-03271-8 (hardback edition)

ISBN: 0-691-02123-6 (paperback edition)

1. Poetry—Dictionaries. 2. Poetics—Dictionaries.
3. Poetry—History and Criticism.

I. Preminger, Alex. II. Brogan, T. V. F. (Terry V. F.)

PN1021.P75 808.1'03—dc20 92-41887

Princeton University Press books are printed on acid-free paper and meet the guidelines for permanence and durability of the Committee on Production Guidelines for Book Longevity of the Council on Library Resources.

Composed in ITC New Baskerville and custom fonts
Designed and produced by Leximetrics, Inc., South Bend, Indiana
Printed in the United States of America

7 9 10 8

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

- [1024] - RENAISSANCE POETICS

[p. numbers refer upwards. I.e. read them as being at the bottom of the page]

(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. Giraldo 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 *Philosophia antiqua poetica* (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 septern* (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 Gracian's *Agudeza y arte de ingenio* (Cleverness and the Art of Wit, 1642) in Spain and Immanuele Tesauro's *II 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.

- [1025] – RENAISSANCE POETICS

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 delgoverno 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 françoise* (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 Maniere defaire des vers en franfois, 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 Camoes in Portugal, Ronsard in Fr., and Spenser and Milton in Eng. But

- [1026] - RENAISSANCE POETICS

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 poétique 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-

- [1027] - RENAISSANCE POETICS

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 poétique 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

- [1028] - RENAISSANCE POETICS

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.