

Early Modern German Literature 1350–1700

Edited by
Max Reinhart

Rochester, New York u.a.

CAMDEN HOUSE

[2007]

Poetics and Rhetorics in Early Modern Germany

Joachim Knappe

FROM ANTIQUITY ON, REFLECTION ON MEANS of communication — on texts in general and poetic texts in particular — brought about two distinct genres of theoretical texts: rhetorics and poetics. Theoretical knowledge was systematized in these two genres for instructional purposes, and its practical applications were debated down to the eighteenth century. At the center of this discussion stood the communicator (or, text producer), armed with procedural options and obligations and with the text as his primary instrument of communication. Thus, poeto-rhetorical theory always derived its rules from and reflected the prevailing practice.¹

This development began in the fourth century B.C. with Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and *Poetics*, which he based on the public communicative practices of the Greek *polis* in politics, theater, and poetic performance. In the Roman tradition, rhetorics² reflected the practice of law in the forum (*genus iudiciale*), political counsel (*genus deliberativum*), and communal decisions regarding issues of praise and blame (*genus demonstrativum*). These comprise the three main speech situations, or cases (*genera causarum*). The most important theoreticians of rhetoric were Cicero and Quintilian, along with the now unknown author (presumed in the Middle Ages to have been Cicero) of the rhetorics addressed to *Herennium*. As for poetics, aside from the monumental *Ars poetica* of Horace, Roman literature did not have a particularly rich theoretical tradition. The Hellenistic poetics *On the Sublime* by Pseudo-Longinus (first century A.D.) was rediscovered only in the seventeenth century in France and England; it became a key work for modern aesthetics.

The classical theoretical works from antiquity were available in the Middle Ages and Renaissance.³ Their use in communication and textual theory, however, remained the exclusive domain of scholars who had little interest in vernacular texts and whose theories reflected the hermetic Latin discourse of classroom exercises. Certain poetics and rhetorics written in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, however, became particularly influential; these included Galfridus de Vinosalvo's *Poetria nova* (ca. 1210) — so named to contrast with the "old poetics" of Horace's *Ars poetica* — which was transmitted in hundreds of manuscripts into the fifteenth century. It is a kind of textual grammar with rules and techniques for formulating Latin verse and prose. The only poeto-rhetorics by a German from this period was the *Laborintus* (Labor Within, before 1250), written by the grammarian Eberhard the German, who was educated in Paris and Orléans.

The development of poeto-rhetorical theories in early modern Germany will be the subject in this chapter in two parts. Part 1 reviews the state of German source materials between the thirteenth and seventeenth centuries. Part 2 attempts a unified theory of early modern German-language poetics and rhetorics.

Source Materials in Germany to 1600

The rhetorics and poetics of the fifteenth century had two major goals:⁴ to make classical knowledge of these areas known in a pure form (epistemology), establish Latin-language sources (linguistics) for contemporary scholarship, and bring the pertinent genre and text models up to the sophistication of classical Latinity (textuality); and to establish classical antiquity as the single standard for all discourses.⁵ Nearly all German humanists in the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries adhered to and promoted this standard. In Germany after the invention of the printing press, Latin rhetorics and poetics continued to be published regularly, though with somewhat different contents and purposes than before.

Latin Rhetorics

The classical system of rhetoric concerned the competence and effectiveness of the orator and led to expertise in four component areas: speech situations, stages of text production, parts of prose speech, and stylistics, especially rhetorical figures. Humanists dedicated monographs and comprehensive systematic studies alike to these concerns. Primers on stylistics (*elocutio*) facilitated the acquisition of a Neo-Latin prose style comparable to that of classical Latinity. This demanded mastery of elegance, synonyms, vocabulary — Erasmus's *De duplici copia verborum ac rerum* (The Double Treasury of Words and Things, 1512) was the standard source book — and sentence construction (*compositio*). The fifty principles of textual stylistics outlined by Albrecht von Eyb (1420–75) in his *Praecepta artis rhetoricae* (Principles of the Art of Rhetoric, 1457) were considered indispensable.⁶ The *Ars oratoria* (printed ca. 1485) of Peter Luder (ca. 1415–72),⁷ adapted and elaborated the three speech situations: judicial speech (*genus iudiciale*), deliberative political speech (*genus deliberativum*), and epideictic speech for special occasions (*genus demonstrativum*); examples accompanied the theoretical presentation of each genre. Systematic *officia* rhetorics (*officia*, “offices”) followed, such as the *Epithoma rhetorices graphicum* (Perfect Summary of Rhetorics, 1496) of Jacob Locher (1471–1528) or the *Margarita philosophica* (Philosophical Pearl, 1503) of Gregor Reisch (ca. 1470–1525), and brought back the classical five-stage scheme of speech production to the center of attention.⁸ This scheme begins with the cognitive operations of the orator: discovery or invention (*inventio*) and arrangement (*dispositio*); proceeds to the semiotic: manner and style (*elocutio*); and concludes with the performative: memorization (*memoria*) and performance (*actio*). This ancient system remained, with variations, the core of

humanistic rhetorics throughout the early modern period, as reflected in the *Rhetorica contractae* (Condensed Rhetorics, 1621) of Gerhard Johannes Vossius (1577–1649)⁹ or *De arte rhetorica* (On the Art of Rhetoric, 1569) of the Jesuit Cyprrianus Suárez (1524–93).¹⁰ The theory of the parts of a speech was integrated into this rhetorical system. In 1492 Conrad Celtis (1459–1508) expanded the system to include epistolary theory, modeling his *Epitome in utramque Ciceronis rhetoricam* (Summary of Both of Cicero's Rhetorics)¹¹ on the Hispano-Italian Jacobus Publicius's recent *Oratoriae artis epitoma* (Summary of the Art of Oratory, 1482).¹² Epistolary theory, an offshoot from the tradition of *ars dictaminis* (art of formulating), became one of the most significant humanistic enterprises.¹³

Latin rhetorical theory in Germany developed steadily over the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and achieved a comprehensive and highly differentiated form in the seventeenth century.¹⁴ To the humanists of the Renaissance, rhetoric always implied writing. Prose writing has special importance in Philipp Melanchthon's (1497–1560) *Elementa rhetorices* (1531)¹⁵ and occupies a central position in the *Praecepta rhetoricae inventionis* (1556) of his pupil David Chytraeus (1530–1600). Melanchthon's innovation consisted of placing alongside the political, legal, and demonstrative genres of speech a fourth: the didactic (*genus didascalicum* or *didacticum*), which he understood as the scientific or informative genre. He also paid great attention to *elocutio*, the theory of style and formulation, with its vast corpus of rhetorical figures.¹⁶ The Frenchman Pierre de La Ramée (Petrus Ramus, 1515–72), indeed, in *Rhetoricae distinctiones in Quintilianum* (1549),¹⁷ reduced the whole system of rhetoric to *elocutio* (especially figuration) and performance. The *Rhetorica* (1548) of his pupil Omer Talon (Audomarus Talaeus, ca. 1510–62) was one of the most frequently reprinted rhetorics in seventeenth-century Germany,¹⁸ Ramist influence lies behind the twofold systems of the *Institutiones rhetoricae* (1613) of Conrad Dieterich (1575–1639) and the *Teutsche rhetorica* (1634) of Johann Matthäus Meyfart (1590–1642).¹⁹

Latin Poetics

Rhetorics and poetics represent a theoretical division of labor, reflecting the premise that all varieties of texts are heteronomous (functional, not autonomous) and that they have communicative goals. Their ancient theoretical sources were largely identical in the late Middle Ages and the early modern period. Whether they were writers of rhetorics or poetics, all relied on Quintilian's authority. Joachim von Watt (Vadianus, 1484–1551), the author of *De poetica et carminis ratione* (Of Poetics and the Structure of Poetry, 1518), is one notable example.²⁰ The theory of rhetoric specifically focuses on communicative cases calling for practical prose texts, and it elucidates the stages of production and performance (including prose style, figuration, and syntax). The regular appearance of chapters on metrics (*numerus*) in the *compositio* part owes to the relatedness of metrics to prose rhythm and clauses, as described in part two of Vossius's *Commentaria rhetorica* (1630). Metrics falls under stylistics and figuration (*elocutio*), which constitute an intersection between rhetorics and poetics.

The theory of poetics concentrates specifically on aesthetically constructed texts that may be subsumed essentially under the forms known today as epic, drama, and lyric.²¹ The following groupings of Latin poetics produced in Germany can be distinguished down to the end of the sixteenth century according to general content:

1. *Metrics*, in which the prosody and structure of Latin verses and other poetic forms are presented and sometimes supplemented with stylistic illustrations and references: Luder's lectures of 1462 on meter; Jakob Wimpfeling's *De arte metricandi* (1484); Celtis's *Ars versificandi et carminum* (The Art of Versification and of Poems, 1486); Laurentius Corvinus's *Structura carminum* (1496); Jacob Magdalius's *Stichologia* (The Art of Making Verses, 1503); Heinrich Bebel's *Ars versificandi* (1506); Ulrich von Hutten's *De arte versificatoria* (1511); Johannes Murmellius's *Versificatorie artis rudimenta* (ca. 1511); Eobanus Hessus's *Scribendorum versuum ratio* (Method of Writing Verse, 1526); Jacobus Micyllus's *De re metrica* (1539); and Johannes Claius's *Prosodiae libri tres* (1570) and *Grammatica germanicae linguae* (1578).²²
2. *Poetic elegantiae*, in which elegant text passages and compositional models are collected: Eyb's *Margarita poetica* (Poetic Pearl, 1472); Hermannus Torrentinus's *Elucidarius carminum* (Explanation of Poems, 1501); Georg Fabricius's *Elegantiae poeticae ex Ovidio, Tibullo, Propertio elegiacis* (Elegant Expressions from the Elegiacists Ovid, Tibullus, and Propertius, 1549); *Elegantiarum ex Plauto et Terentio libri ii* (Two Books of Elegant Expressions by Plautus and Terence, 1554); *Elegantiarum puerilium ex Ciceronis epistolis libri tres* (Three Books of Elegant Expressions for the Youth from Cicero's Letters, 1554); and Johann Buchler's *Officina poetica* (Poetic Laboratory, 1605).²³ Torrentinus says in his *Praefatio* that he means to provide the essential elements for the kind of elegant poetry being demanded today. He also includes in his editorial apparatus a glossary of definitions relating to mythology, such as who Apollo was, or Antigone.
3. *Genre poetics and drama commentaries*: Joachim Camerarius's *Commentatio explicationum omnium tragoediarum Sophoclis* (Preparation for the Explications of All the Tragedies of Sophocles, 1556); Melanchthon's *Epistola de legendis tragoediis et comoediis* (Letter on Reading Tragedies and Comedies, 1545); Micyllus's *De tragoedia et eius partibus* (On Tragedy and its Parts, 1562); and Daniel Heinsius's *De tragoediae constitutione* (On the Structure of Tragedy, 1611).
4. *Commentaries on the poetics of Aristotle and Horace*: Jodocus Willich's *Commentaria in artem poeticam Horatii* (Commentaries on the Poetic Art of Horace, 1545); Veit Amerbach's *Commentaria in artem poeticam Horatii* (1547); Johannes Sturm's *Commentarii in artem poeticam Horatii* (1576); Johannes Schosser's *Disputatio de tragoedia ex primo libro Aristotelis* (Disputation on Tragedy from the First Book of Aristotle, 1569); and Heinsius's *De tragoediae constitutione*.

5. *Apologies for poetry*: Thomas Murner's *De augustiniana hieronymianaque reformatione poetarum* (About the Reform of Poetry according to Augustine and Jerome, 1509); Bonifacius Helfricht's *Declamatio in laudem poeticae* (Declamation in Praise of Poetry, 1548); Zacharias Orth's *Oratio de arte poetica* (1558); Johannes Caselius's *Pro arte poetarum oratio* (1569);²⁴ and Gregor Bersmann's *De dignitate atque praestantia poetices* (On the Dignity and Nobility of Poetry, 1575).
6. *Universal poetics* deal in a summary fashion with authors, genres, themes, and forms, as well as with the role of poetry in society: Vadianus's *De poetica*;²⁵ Fabricius's *De re poetica libri iiii* (1556–72); and Jacob Pontanus's *Poeticarum institutionum libri iiii* (1594).

German Rhetorics and Poetics in Germany to 1700

German Rhetorics

German-language rhetorics of the Old High German period — the first vernacular rhetorics in Europe — is represented only by Notker Teutonicus in St. Gallen.²⁶ No independent German rhetorics from the Middle High German period have been transmitted. In 1472, during the transition to the Early New High German period, a single short verse treatment appeared in German as a component of moral didactic literature, *Die Räte von der Rede* (Advice for Speaking), a translation of the *Doctrina dicendi et tacendi* (Doctrine of Speaking and Keeping Silent, 1245) of Albertanus Brixiensis (ca. 1190–after 1250).²⁷ German rhetorics began to appear as early as the first half of the fifteenth century, long before the grammars, dialectics, and poetics of the sixteenth century.²⁸ Thus, rhetorics became the gateway to German literature within the trivium, the first three, language-based, disciplines among the seven *artes liberales*. Few German rhetorics were produced during the sixteenth or first half of the seventeenth century. This changed markedly after the Thirty Years' War (1618–48), when a rich and varied literature of rhetorical theory began to appear.²⁹ The majority of German baroque rhetoricians did not deal with the entire system of the classical five stages of production, however, but only with specific areas of everyday rhetoric. With respect to the development of German rhetorics from the fifteenth to the end of the seventeenth century, five groupings emerge:

1. *Epistolary rhetorics*.³⁰ The earliest German rhetorics dealt especially with epistolary communication in the vernacular, a distinct form of practical communication that had been responding since the fourteenth century to the rise of a universal German administrative language and to the penetration of writing into all areas of daily life. A number of handwritten rhetorics containing the rudiments of epistolary theory in German predate the advent of printing.³¹ The *Formulare und Tütsche rhetorica* (Formulary and German Rhetorics) of 1478 was one of the first printed epistolary rhetorics. Epistolary, notarial, and chancery rhetorics occupy the greatest part of Friedrich Riederer's (ca. 1450–ca. 1508) systematic *Spiegel der*

waren Rhetoric (Mirror of True Rhetoric, 1493).³² German rhetorical works most often printed down to the eighteenth century concerned the composition of epistles and other written forms relevant for chanceries; together they made up about one-sixth of the entire production of rhetorical literature.³³ The trend culminated in Kaspar Stieler's 4,000-page *Teutsche Sekretariat-Kunst* (German Art of the Secretary) of 1673/74. Of increasing significance — a sign of the modern, highly regulated activity of communication and of increasing social stratification — was *Titellehre*, a guide to recognizing proper social ranks and using correct conventions of address accordingly.³⁴

2. *Stylistics*. German stylistics, first written within the framework of epistolary theory, compiled rules and examples for figural stylization, relating both to figures of speech as well as to the structuring of rhetorical elements. The first of these was the *Figurenlehre* (Doctrine of Figuration, 1478) of the Esslingen chancery director Niklas von Wyle (ca. 1415–79).³⁵ In his *Spiegel*, Riederer produced an impressive German adaptation of Eyb's fifty Latin *praecepta*.³⁶ Independent treatises on German figuration and stylistics were published rarely; most were targeted for inclusion in larger works. Meyfart's *Teutsche rhetorica* is an example of a pure study of figural stylistics. Caspar Goldtwurm's (1524–49) *Schemata rhetorica* (Rhetorical Figures, 1545) became a standard resource work also for Protestant homiletics.
3. *Rhetorics of composition and model speeches*. This grouping, for which the most significant are Christian Weise's (1642–1708) *Politischer Redner* (Political Orator, 1677) and Johann Riemer's *Lustige Rhetorica* (Cheerful Rhetorics, 1681), includes instructions for composing specific kinds of texts as well as collections of model speeches for all occasions. Other important examples include the anonymous *Schatzkammer schöner zierlicher Orationen* (Treasury of Well-made Orations, 1597), Johann Rudolf Sattler's *Instructio oratoris* (The Orator's Instruction, 1618), and Balthasar Kindermann's *Der Deutsche Redner* (The German Orator, 1660).³⁷
4. *Conversational and behavioral rhetorics*. A rich literature on courtly behavior and ordinary polite conversation evolved during the Baroque, since mastery of highly regulated communicative rituals (whether at princely courts or public venues) had become necessary for the practitioner's reputation and social standing. Albertanus's *Die Räte von der Rede*, which concerned the conditions and standards of proper communicative behavior, was not only the first but also one of the most successful rhetorics of the early modern period. Some 105 manuscripts were made of the original Latin version alone; thirty-eight printed editions were published between 1471 and 1546 as well as several German translations, in addition to the standard one of 1472.³⁸ Translations of well-known Italian works on the culture of courtly conversation began to appear in the mid-sixteenth century and had a great impact in Germany.³⁹ Among the most influential were Baldassare Castiglione's *Il Cortegiano* (1528), translated by Laurenz

Kratzer as *Hofman* (Courtier, 1566); Giovanni della Casa's *Galateus* (1558), translated by Nathan Chytraeus as *Das Büchlein von erborn, höflichen und holdseligen Sitten* (The Little Book of Honorable, Polite, and Charming Manners, 1597); and Stefano Guazzo's *La civil conversatione* (1574), translated by Nicolaus Rucker as *Von dem bürgerlichen Wandel und zierlichen Sitten* (About Civil Behavior and Polite Manners, 1599). Original works followed somewhat later, including Gutthäter Dobratzky's *Wol-qualificirter Hofe-Mann* (The Cultivated Courtier, 1664) and August Bohse's *Der getreue Hoffmeister* (The Loyal Courtly Teacher, 1706), which described proper *conduite* in social situations.⁴⁰ An early primer on behavior for Protestant ministers was written by Niels Hemmingsen: *Pastor, hoch-nothwendige Unterrichtung* (The Pastor's Indispensable Instruction, 1562).⁴¹

The literature on *Komplimentierkunst* (the art of compliment) treated the different ritualized forms — verbal and nonverbal, written and oral — of courteous behavior (congratulations, recommendations, reverences, felicitations, condolences).⁴² These included Johann Georg Greflinger's *Complimentir-Büchlein* (A Manual for Making Compliments, 1645), Georg Philipp Harsdörffer's *Poetischer Trichter* (The Poet's Funnel, 1647–53), and Julius Bernhard von Rohr's *Einleitung zur Ceremonial-Wissenschaft der grossen Herren* (Guide to the Ceremonial Science of Ruling Men, 1728). In order to hold one's own in conversation and correspondence, a great amount of factual knowledge was necessary; *Weise* indeed regarded factual knowledge as the key to rhetorical competence. These knowledge-based works, especially prominent during the Baroque, included sayings and other suitable formulas for effective communication. Notable are the *Alamodische Damen Sprichwörter* (A la Mode Ladies' Sayings, 1648), Harsdörffer's *Frauenzimmer Gesprächspiele* (Playful Colloquies for the Ladies, 1641–49), and Johann Adam Weber's *Hundert Quellen der Unterredungs-Kunst* (One Hundred Sources of the Art of Conversation, 1676).

5. *Systematic officia rhetorics*. The five-stage system of production and performance was not only maintained in the reprints of the classic texts but also formed the explicit foundation for many German works by rhetorics, including Riederer's *Spiegel*, Wolfgang Ratke's *Allgemeine RednerLehr* (Universal Instruction for Orators, 1619), Riemer's *Lustige Rhetorica*, *Weise's Gelehrter Redner* (The Learned Orator, 1692), and Johann Christoph Gottsched's (1700–1766) *Ausführliche Redekunst* (Comprehensive Rhetorics, 1736).

German Poetics

The German-language theory of poetics evolved only gradually over the centuries. During the Middle High German *Blütezeit*, poetic works were sometimes interrupted by digressions that commented, either positively or negatively, on practices of fellow poets (that of Gottfried von Strassburg in his

Tristan und Isolde is a famous example).⁴³ Only toward the end of this period did poetological reflection become an independent enterprise in the German vernacular. Five groupings of German poetics may be distinguished between the late thirteenth century and the end of the Baroque:

1. *Prologue poetics*. Excursive poetological discussions were inserted in the prologues of works by three poets around the turn of the fourteenth century, beginning with Konrad von Würzburg (ca. 1230–87) in his prologues to *Partonopier und Meliur* (1277) and the *Trojanischer Krieg* (before 1287). Konrad wrote in the literary tradition of noble courtly conventions; but given the rise of urban culture, with its accompanying changes in communicative environment, he was obliged to rethink poetological principles. By contrast, Heinrich von Hesler's *Apokalypse* (before 1312) and Nikolaus von Jeroschin's (d. ca. 1345) *Deutschordenschronik* (Chronicle of the Teutonic Order, 1331–41) belonged intimately to the sphere of communication of the Teutonic Order.⁴⁴ Hesler as well as Jeroschin were devoted to the metric principles of German didactic poetry and developed a body of paradigmatic rules for its practice by the order. Hesler considers both the subject matter (*materie*) as a whole as well as the meaning (*sin*) of the particular text.⁴⁵
2. *Meistersinger tablatures and Schulkünste* (arts of the "schools" for singers) relate to a precisely defined area of communication, prescribing solid norms for the urban circles of poets and singers first established in German towns in the fifteenth century.⁴⁶ The *Merker* ("marker," that is, judge), shielded from the audience, applied these norms in noting the mistakes of the singers. The rules were specific to hermetic groups — in Nuremberg songs were subject to a ban on publication — and texts were recorded in handwritten form for internal documentation. The approximately sixty *Schulkünste*, mostly in verse, and the few extant *Tabulaturen* (tablets containing the codified rules), comprise the sources for our knowledge of the rules of the *Meistersinger*: the *Nürnberger Schulzettel* (Nuremberg Tablature, 1540), the *Colmarer Gemberbuch* (Colmar Tablature, 1549) of Jörg Wickram; the *Steyrer Tabulatur* (1562) of Lorenz Wessel of Essen, the *Iglauer Tabulatur* (1571), the *Breslauer Tabulatur* (1598), and the *Memminger Tabulatur* (1660).⁴⁷
3. *Meistersinger ordinances* supplemented the purely technical tablatures. In these ordinances, *Meistersinger* behavior was legally codified by the city authorities. Among the few extant texts are the *Freiburger Artikel der Singer* (Freiburg Singer Articles, 1513), the *Strassburger Meistersingererlasse* (Strasbourg Meistersinger Records, 1598 and 1633), the *Augsburger Meistersingerordnung* (Augsburg Meistersinger Ordinance, 1611), and the *Iglauer Schulordnung* (Iglau School Ordinance, 1615).
4. *Histories of the Meistersinger* began to be written toward the end of the sixteenth century, a development that coincided with the decline of the actual practice. The most important of these are Adam Puschmann's *Gründlicher Bericht des deutschen Meistergesanges* (Thorough Report on the German

- Master Song, 1571), Cyriacus Spangenberg's *Von der Edlen und Hochberühmten Kunst der Musica* (On the Noble and Renowned Art of Music, 1598), and Johann Christoph Wagenseil's *Buch von der Meistersinger holdseligen Kunst* (Book of the Meistersingers' Charming Art, 1697).⁴⁸
5. *Poetics of the Baroque.* Meistersinger poetics were discontinued in the first half of the seventeenth century. The hiatus owed in part to the cultural catastrophe of the Thirty Years' War, but also to the new theory of German poetry propounded in the *Buch von der Deutschen Poeterey* (Book of German Poetics, 1624) by Martin Opitz (1597–1639), which burst the confines of urban-based, artisan-driven *Meistergesang*. Opitz and his colleagues considered *Meistergesang* hopelessly antiquated, and they distanced themselves from its theoretical discourse. After Opitz, the standards established in Neo-Latin literature by Celtis, Wimpfeling, Bebel, Vadianus, and others, also became normative for German literature.⁴⁹ German poetics thus sprang from two sources: classical rhetorics and humanistic poetics. The traditional principles of poetics now appeared in the form of a reformed German language. Theorists insisted that modern vernacular poets were due the same respect as their Latin-language counterparts and that the German language should be acknowledged alongside the other national languages of Europe. The purpose of German poetics was in the first place to refine the German language to a degree that made it competitive with them.⁵⁰

A wave of German poetics arose about twenty years into the war. The continuity of baroque poetological theory may be discerned in the following chronological list of influential works: Philipp von Zesen's *Deutscher Helicon* (German Helicon, 1641), Johann Peter Titz's *Von der Kunst Hochdeutsche Verse und Lieder zu machen* (On the Art of Composing High German Verses and Songs, 1642), Johann Klaj's *Lobrede der Teutschen Poeterey* (In Praise of German Poetry, 1645), Martin Rinckart's *Von Teutschen Versen, Fusstritten und vornehmsten Reim-Arten* (On German Verses, Meters, and Primary Rhyme Patterns, 1645), Johann Rist's *Poetischer Schauplatz* (The Stage of Poetry, 1646), Harsdörffer's *Poetischer Trichter* (1647), Justus Georg Schottel's *Teutsche Vers- oder Reimkunst* (The Art of German Verse or Rhyme, 1656), Zesen's *Deutsch-lateinische Leiter* (German-Latin Guide, 1656), Kindermann's *Der deutsche Poet* (The German Poet, 1664), August Buchner's *Anleitung zur Deutschen Poeterey* (Introduction to German Poetry, 1665), Sigmund von Birken's *Teutsche Rede-bind- und Dicht-Kunst* (German Art of Versification and Poetry, 1679), Daniel Georg Morhof's *Unterricht von der Teutschen Sprache und Poesie* (Instruction in German Language and Poetry, 1682), Stieler's *Die Dichtkunst des Späthen* (Poetical Treatise of the Late One, 1685), and Weise's *Curioser Gedanken von Deutschen Versen* (Curious Thoughts on German Verses, 1691). Gottsched's *Versuch einer Critischen Dichtkunst* (Attempt at a Critical Theory of Poetry, 1730) and *Ausführliche Redekunst* represent the simultaneous conclusion of baroque poetics and the beginning of a new aesthetic trend.

Toward a Unified Theory of Early Modern German Poetics and Rhetorics

Theoretical Positions to 1700

Three years before the end of the Thirty Years' War, Johann Klaj (1616–56) writes at the beginning of his *Lobrede der Teutschen Poeterey*: “Unser durch die blutigen Mordwaffen ausgemergeltes Teutschland / ruffet uns / seinen Hetzgeliebten / zu: Redet / Redet / Redet, daß ich gelehrter absterbe” (Our Germany, gutted by the bloody weapons of murder, calls to us, her beloved ones: Speak, speak, speak, that I might die more learned). This is an emphatic avowal that, even in times of war, vernacular German has the power to communicate knowledge that validates its humanity.⁵¹ As of 1645, the two theories concerning human speech, namely, rhetorics and poetics, were still understood as integrally related theories of communicative action and text production.⁵² Although historically, as explained at the beginning of this chapter, they derived from distinct traditions,⁵³ focusing on one of them leads to ignoring their essential unity. It is as wrong to think of early modern poetics as a latecomer in rhetorical theory as it is to think of rhetorics as a mere handmaiden to poetics.⁵⁴ Their themes complement one another and overlap only at specific points (especially in the theories of form and figuration).⁵⁵ Both genres would yet undergo significant transformation in the eighteenth century in the process of philosophical change.⁵⁶

Grammar books also played a role in the standardization of High German.⁵⁷ According to Schottel's *Ausführliche Arbeit von der Teutschen HauptSprache* (A Thorough Study of the German Principal Language, 1663), German had evolved into a linguistic vehicle of efficient use “in den Abschieden / in den Catzleyen / Gerichten und Trükkereyen” (in its imperial diets, in its ministries, courts, and printing offices). The goal now, he maintains, should be to find a universal, binding code of communication, “communis Germaniae Mercurius” (like the god Mercury, suitable for the whole of Germany; chap. 2.1).

Even before the fifteenth century, rhetoric was regarded as the source both for the fundamentals of communication in general as well as for the prose forms of practical written communication in particular. Poetry, on the other hand, was considered the source for the theory of the written production of aesthetic texts; poetic texts were also expected to follow general rhetorical principles. Practitioners of aesthetic communication in the seventeenth century followed developments in both rhetorics and poetics; books concerning either theoretical area stood side by side in libraries. The ancient Greek representatives of rhetoric and poetry, the orator Demosthenes and the poet Homer, enjoy equal status in Opitz's *Poeterey*: “Das ist Demosthenes. Welcher ob er zwar als der vornemeste redener in hohe ehren gehalten worden, ist doch der rhum nicht geringer denn Homerus erlanget” (That is Demosthenes, who, though it was as the greatest orator that he was so highly esteemed, has gained no less fame than Homer; chap. 8).

Many of the theoretical questions of modern (sociological) communications, particularly with respect to media, would arise, of course, only after the early modern period. But interest was occasionally expressed in the special problem of performance (writing vs. speech) — rhetorics and poetics were, after all, simultaneously theories about how to formulate texts (production) and how to apply them (performance) and certainly were not intended as guides for textual analysis in the sense of modern literary criticism. This is not to suggest, however, that rhetorics and poetics did not implicitly provide analytical paradigms useful for classroom instruction or that in individual cases literary-historical and literary-critical perspectives did not begin to manifest themselves. Morhof's *Unterricht* and Albrecht Christian Rotth's *Vollständige Deutsche Poesie* (Complete German Poetics, 1688) provide strong evidence of this.⁵⁸

We may now turn to three topics, or problems, related to the dynamics of communication that were of particular interest to German rhetorics and poetics of the late Middle Ages and the early modern period:

1. *Communicative interaction* primarily has to do with the active communicator (orator or poet) but also with the partners in communication (audience), forms of social interaction (settings and *genera causarum*), and rules of interaction (*aptum* and *decorum*).
2. *Communicative performance* concerns what is communicatively acceptable in society, what social purpose is served by the communicative forms treated in rhetorics and poetics, and what kind of communicative performances they should generate (the role of literature in general, individual text genres, etc.).
3. *Text as communicative instrument* deals with theories of textual construction and the employment of texts in communicative interaction. What are the possible kinds of texts (genres), techniques of construction (structuring), and principles of construction (form criteria, aesthetics)?

Communicative Interaction: *Orator* and *Poeta*

As early as the fifteenth century, Sebastian Brant (1457–1521), the renowned author of the European bestseller *Das Narrenschiff* (The Ship of Fools, 1494), was responding to the potential offered by the printing press by making adjustments in his communicative role.⁵⁹ In theoretical circles, questions about the social functions of the *orator* and the *poeta* were receiving vigorous attention, as were related questions about changing goals, rules, boundaries, pertinent skills, and forms of interaction. In *Die Räte von der Rede*, Albertanus contemplates the relationships of interactive partners (senders and receivers) and the complex conditions of communication for every utterance in every social context. As sender, or speaker, the communicator must decide how to express his relationship with the addressee verbally and how to regard his communication partner; he is always conscious of which rhetorical strategies will achieve the specifically intended meaning and motivation.

Ancient theory separated the spheres of interaction between orator and poet. The orator was responsible for practical communication in the public

sphere (decisions about the *genera causarum*). Albertanus addresses four communicative cases: sermon, letter, messenger report, and court defense. The poet, on the other hand, as Julius Caesar Scaliger (1484–1558) points out in the first volume of his renowned *Poetices libri septem* (Seven Books of Poetics, 1561), is responsible for aestheticized forms of communication, that is, for specialized genres and forms of poetry. Brant exploits the possibilities of the recently invented printing press for composing and distributing “journalistic” texts, thereby putting himself in the tradition of the German minstrel, who performed tasks of practical communication in aesthetic form. This tradition of occasional poetry (*Gelegenheitsdichtung*; Latin *casualcarmina*) and occasional poet (*Gelegenheitsdichter*) continues into the sixteenth century, notwithstanding the distinct preference of the Reformation for prose.

The sudden appearance of German-language rhetorics in the fifteenth century was one answer to the new developments in communicative demands. *Scriptorality* — the written, or textual, alternative to *orality*, the traditional performance-based conceptualization of rhetorics and poetics (this extended to texts in musical compositions as well) — advanced rapidly to become the assumed norm of performance in all relevant areas, including epistolary rhetorics,⁶⁰ and remained so for the next two centuries. As a consequence, the orator came to be treated as a “writer” in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century rhetorical theory.⁶¹ Riederer’s *Spiegel der waren Rhetoric* is the most important testament to this historico-cultural development. Riederer systematically distinguishes the person (or institution) sending the communication from the expert who actually writes the communication. In the early modern period, writers capable of epistolary communication were still important to agencies (both individuals and institutions) that depended on the epistle in social transactions. Riederer therefore had good reason to include an expansive theory of the writer at the beginning of his rhetorics — one of the most original texts in early modern rhetorical theory.⁶² In addition to other ancient and humanistic works, Riederer adduces the authority of Cicero’s *De oratore*, in which the orator as public communicator is central to rhetorical theory. In emulating Cicero, Riederer discerns an analogy between modern and ancient instruments of communication: the modern writer with his chancery epistle corresponds to the ancient orator with his oral speech. Riederer is speaking of the professional *Schreiber*, “als der fürsten vnd cantzelschreiber, der Stett, rat und gerichtschreiber, notarien, vnd ander, die sich der practic üabend vnd neerend” (as princely and chancery writers, municipal writers, council and court writers, notaries, and others who carry out and cultivate the practice; lxii). Compared to private individuals who engage in writing, these experts possess a higher level of competence with regard to “tütscher wort, vnd die ze ordnen vnd formlich zu verfügen” (German words and the ability to order and shape them). Riederer constructs a graduated typology ranging from schooled and experienced writers to those who are still learning. This entails acquaintance with law: only well-trained writers in this “kunst vnnd gestalt der Rhetoric” (art and form of rhetoric) can guarantee that their compositions are legally sound. Riederer finds this confirmed in Cicero’s *De oratore*, book 1, which, among other things, talks about the necessity of the orator’s knowledge of law.

Orality as the primary condition of rhetorical communication naturally had its place in the various Latin and German rhetorical systematics (especially Riederer's *Spiegel* and Goldtwurm's *Schemata rhetorica*) until about 1600. Monological oral speech itself, however, became a discrete theoretical subject in Germany only after German-language rhetorics were established. Specialized literature on the classical monological speech arose only after 1566, with the translations of Italian conversational classics; these were followed in the early seventeenth century with works on courtly speech and occasional speech, most notably Sattler's *Instructio oratoris* and his *Werbungsbüchlein* (Little Book of Courtship, 1611), the first two independent German rhetorics to deal explicitly and primarily with the speaker.⁶³

After 1600, German rhetorics expanded to include discussions of the orally performing speaker, particularly with respect to the communicative conditions of baroque courtly culture and bourgeois occasional speech (*Kasualrede*). Meyfart's *Teutsche Rhetorica* includes the various speech acts of the military commander, of whom rhetorical competence is expected. He then turns to the speech of the diplomat, who at court wishes to cull the favor of the prince and his councilors. Princely court hearings are included as well, for a well-constructed speech can move the prince as judge to lean toward one of the parties. In his treatment of the office of preaching (*Predigtamt*), for which elegance is also essential, Meyfart names typical speech acts that a clergyman should master: "Tröstungen / Warnungen / Vermahnungen / Widerlegungen / Unterrichtungen" (consolations, warnings, admonitions, refutations, instructions; 35). He also stresses that any social class can be made to appear more positively by expert use of rhetorical ornamentation: "Die WohlRedenheit gleisset wie ein Hyacinth an den Bürgern / grünet wie ein Smaragd an den Edlen / pranget wie ein Jaspis an den Fürsten" (Eloquence gleams like a hyacinth on the citizenry, radiates green like an emerald on the nobles, and shines like a jasper on princes).

We now turn to the theory of the special communicative role of the poet, known in poetics as *poetology* (literally, the theory of the poet).⁶⁴ Konrad von Würzburg speaks of the functional role of the poet and about the literary-communicative conditions of interaction; in the prologue to *Partenopier und Meliur* he observes that poets constitute a distinct social institution, or tradition, or communicator class of *Meister*. "In Wort und Melodie haben die Meister so Treffliches geschaffen, daß man sich an ihren herrlichen Werken ein vorzügliches Beispiel nehmen kann" (The *Meister* have created such wonderful things in word and melody that their splendid works may serve as excellent examples).⁶⁵ The art of poetry had attained a significant degree of self-confidence with respect to its technical possibilities, but Konrad complains about those poets who, for all their ambition, lack genuine talent and consequently — since common people lack powers of discrimination and will buy anything, good or bad, on the market — impede the careers of truly gifted poets. In the prologue to the *Trojanischer Krieg* he expresses this complaint through the allegory of the nightingale, which ignores the necessities of life, "denn sie findet ihr Lied so schön und so lieblich, daß sie sich zu Tode singt.

Ein wahrer Dichter soll sich daran ein Beispiel nehmen und nicht auf seine Kunst verzichten, weil man nicht nach ihr verlangt und sich nicht um sie kümert” (for she finds her song so beautiful and lovely that she sings herself to death. A true poet should learn from this and not neglect his art, because one dare not desire it and then ignore it). With these words the poet is given the opportunity to choose between taking part in a communicative interaction or rejecting it. Thus a position of poetic self-referentiality has been attained even before 1300, asserting the liberty to cancel the expected communicative contract; indeed, the poet may step out of any rhetorical interaction. This had been unthinkable only a few decades earlier for Gottfried von Strassburg.⁶⁶

This tendency toward a socially distinct role for the poet evolved into a hermeticism, or esotericism, in the *Meistersinger* schools — private, guild-like associations that sprang up in many German cities in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The Freiburg Articles of 1513 describe a fraternal community with strict rules for membership; it is a kind of mythical brotherhood with common privileges that were believed to have been pledged by Emperor Otto in Mainz.⁶⁷ As with the trades, external guests in these singing communities were given special status. Quasi-religious regulations gave the brotherhoods an aura of piety that restricted public access. The *Colmarer Ordnung der Meistersingerschule* (Colmar Meistersinger School Ordinance) of 1549 states that only “Doctores, Priester, Edelüt vnd alle Radtsuerwandte sampt vnsern bruodernn vnd schwestern einen freyen zuogang zuo vns habenn” (doctors, priests, nobility, and all members of the city government, as well as our brothers and sisters, have free access to us). The proscription of publications of *Meistergesang*, expounded in paragraph 35 of the Nuremberg Tablature, relates to this general retreat from social communicative contexts: the group will give public performances only a few times per year.

The esoterica of the brotherhoods included strict regulations, even threats of punishment extending to behavior outside the singing school itself. The Iglau School Ordinance prescribes exact rituals, including seating orders, gestures, and attire. Singers are expected to behave in a seemly fashion in inns and are not to sing on the streets at night; disreputable persons are to be turned away from the performances. The singing group must be mindful of its actions and view itself as an institution. Thus, all important matters were recorded and kept in an archive. The goal of the group’s activities was to optimize technical skills to the level of *Meisterschaft* (mastery). The inversion of this idea was the ambitious but unskilled *Gelegenheitssinger* (occasional singer) described in the Colmar Ordinance: he lacks all skill and travels from pub to pub; he is to be expelled. The internal instrument for judging performance and ranking skill levels was the publicly staged singing competition, in which prizes were awarded as the judge deemed fit. Not surprisingly, the songs contain an abundance of the motifs of challenge, competition, and excellence.⁶⁸

The theoreticians of the Baroque — foremost among them Martin Opitz — rejected the sixteenth-century ideal of the guild poet-singer who mastered the technical skills of versification and submitted to group discipline. In chapter 1 of his *Poeterey* Opitz emphatically denies a purely technical view of poetry:

“bin ich doch solcher gedanken keines weges, das ich vermeine, mañ könne jemanden durch gewisse regeln vnd gesetze zu einem Poeten machen” (I am in no way of the opinion that someone can be made into a poet through particular rules and laws). In chapter 3 he repudiates the expectation that a poet should be on call with some conventional verses for any social event. Such a pragmatic understanding of the work of poets, he says, is degrading:⁶⁹ “Es wird kein buch, keine hochzeit, kein begräbnüß ohn vns gemacht; vnd gleichsam als niemand köndte alleine sterben, gehen vnser gedichte zuegleich mit jhnen vnter” (No book, no wedding, no funeral is carried out without us; and it is as if no one can die alone without our poems being buried with them). The poetry of the true poet escapes this fate by refusing to be bound to concrete, practical situations. Opitz saw as one of his primary challenges the deprivatizing of poetry: to create, beyond function, a certain autonomous space for poetry as an aesthetic form of verbal interaction, granting its performance the status of a unique communicative event — an appropriation of the Renaissance ideal of the autonomy of the arts. For Opitz, the arts should be far more than ornamentation to social communicative life.

Baroque poetics thus generally presumed a more open sphere of communication in both writing and oral performance than had previously been the case. All narrow restrictions on communication were dismissed, at least in theory. Opitz’s *Poeterey* is motivated by high seriousness of purpose, assuming a national perspective in which German poetry is of proprietary interest to all Germans in cultural competition with other nations. It is by no means true of Germany, he writes in chapter 3, “das es nicht eben dergleichen zue der Poesie tüchtige *ingenia* können tragen, als jergendt ein anderer ort vnter der Sonnen” (that its industrious gifts cannot contribute to good poetry just as much as any other country under the sun).

The printing press had long since created new conditions for the distribution and performance of literature.⁷⁰ Printing and the culture of scriptorality were now presumed conditions for poetry and drama; still, oral performance in specific, ritualistic contexts — though these were no longer determinants in the poetic process — remained common, and the poet continued to be understood essentially, as in the Latin theoretical literature, as orator-poet. Withdrawal from the social communicative context is never intended, not even when Opitz seems to give preference to the solitary poet over the public orator. The *poeta doctus* lives in and is active within the communicative world; he devotes himself to reclusive study because it is essential to the poetic process, but ultimately he does what he does for the sake of society.

The poet was regularly identified in German-language poetics, as in the *Poet* (1665) of August Buchner (1591–1661), by the technical term *orator*, just as in the Latin-language poetics, such as Vadianus’s *De poetica*.⁷¹ Scaliger’s *Poetices*, which the German Baroque accepted as a primary authority, justifies the poetic art in an introductory chapter. This apologia offers nothing essentially new to the traditional understanding of the poetic process in which poetry is conceptualized as a kind of rhetoric and the poet as a particularly eloquent and subtle speaker.⁷² Still, the Renaissance conception of

inspired poetry gave the seventeenth-century German orator-poet a unique fashioning, lifting, by force of its inner, de pragmatizing logic, the communicative activity of the poet above the merely practical forms of mundane human interaction.⁷³

Opitz too draws a distinction between the ambitious dilettante and the true poet: “Doch muß ich gleichwohl bekennen, das auch an verachtung der Poeterey die jenigen nicht wenig schuldt tragen, welche ohn allen danck Poeten sein wollen, vnd [. . .] ihre vnwissenscheit vnter dem Lorbeerkrantz verdecken” (And I must also observe that there are certain others guilty of bearing scorn for poetry, namely those who wish to be poets without deserving it and veil their ignorance behind the laurel wreath; chap. 3). What distinguishes them is not the mechanical art of rhyme and singing but rather divine inspiration and natural talent: the work of real poets comes (he recalls Plato here) from nature and divine inspiration. Opitz does not exaggerate this side of the ancient rhetorical opposition of talent and learned technique (*natura* and *ars*),⁷⁴ since this would be to ignore the indispensability of “vbung” (exercise) and “fleiss” (hard work). However, while granting the usefulness of technique, *furor poeticus* is not given to imitation:⁷⁵ “ein Poete kan nicht schreiben wenn er wil, sondern wenn er kan” (a poet cannot write when he wants but when he is able). This certainty is expanded by Opitz’s successors.⁷⁶ In 1645 Klaj writes in his *Lobrede der Teutschen Poeterey*:

Gleichwie aber das Eisen von Magnet zwar gezogen wird / kein Mensch aber weis die stumme Krafft: Also wird die Dicht- und Reimkunst nicht durch Menschliche Wirkungen / sondern durch sonderbare Himmelsnade eingegossen: sie wird nicht von dem Meister / sondern aus den süßen Vorgeschwätze und Gesäussel der Ammen / erlernen: nicht in den Schulen aus dem Münde der Lehrer gefasset / sondern aus den Mütterlichen Milchbrünlein eingesogen [. . .]: Ein König und Poet die werden nur geboren.⁷⁷

[Just as iron is attracted to a magnet, but no man understands its silent power, the art of poetry and rhyme is infused not by human strategies but by special divine grace; not learned from the master but rather from the sweet babblings and murmurings of wet-nurses; not comprehended in schools from the mouths of teachers but rather sucked in through the motherly fountains of milk: A king and a poet are only born.]

Buchner says in his *Poet* (12–13) that the poet is a “Macher über alle Macher / oder Meister über alle Meister” (doer above all doers, or master above all masters), compelled to do justice to the “Hoheit diser Kunst” (majesty of this art) through diligent study and daily practice. The gradual liberation and expansion of the concept of the poet is also apparent when Opitz, adducing Horace in contrast to the narrow moral rules of *Meistersinger* doctrine, allows a degree of personal license with respect to temperament, appetite for wine, or penchant for erotic libertinage. Still, this license by no means releases the poet from social obligation.

Communicative Performance

In *Teutsche Rhetorica* (1634) Meyfart defines rhetoric as follows:

ein Kunst von einem vorgesetzten Ding zierlich zureden / vnd künstlich zuverreden. Es heisset aber zierlich reden / nicht mit lustigem Gethön die Ohren füllen / sondern mit weisen / scharffen vnd druchdringenden Machtsprüchen: auch mit außerlesenen / zu der Sach dienlichen vnd heilsamen Worten reden. (59–60)

[an art of speaking gracefully on a given topic and persuading artfully. To speak gracefully does not mean to fill the ears with sweet-sounding expressions, however, but rather with meaningful, incisive, emphatic formulations: with well-chosen words as well, which are useful and salutary to the topic.]

Both classical conceptions of rhetoric are alluded to here: as the art of formulating well (*ars bene dicendi*) and as the art of persuading (*ars persuadendi*). Meyfart's contemporaries certainly would have accepted his definition for all forms of communication, both practical and poetic.⁷⁸

No doubt existed in the early modern period that poetry was a communicative act.⁷⁹ Opitz avows in chapter 8 that poetry reaches its social, indeed historical purpose, only insofar as it can continue over time to persuade and move worthy individuals.

Welches denn der grösste lohn ist, den die Poeten zue gewarten haben; daß sie [. . .] von grossen vnd verständigen Männern getragen [. . .] in die bibliotheken einverleibet, öffentlich verkauffet vnd von jederman gerhümet werden. Hierzue kömpt die hoffnung vieler künftiger zeiten, in welchen sie fort für fort grünen, vnd ein ewiges gedächtniß in den hertzen der nachkommenen verlassen.

[The greatest reward that can await poets is when they are recited by great and understanding men, incorporated into libraries, publicly sold, and praised by all. There is also the hope for a long future in which they continue to bear fruit and leave a lasting memory in the hearts of generations to come.]

This passage reflects the fundamentally rhetorical orientation of early modern poetics. While Opitz's *Poeterey* initiated the de pragmatizing tendency in writing poetry, it is important not to construe this as his wish to prescribe for aesthetic texts a free, playful character. Depragmatization rather means that poetry should deal primarily with universal topics that transcend specific occasions and that are not exhausted in casuistic or situational pursuits. In principle the heteronomy (or, functionality) of poetic expression is never in doubt; the ideology of artistic autonomy would arise only in the future⁸⁰ — in any case, Opitz refutes it emphatically: “So ist auch ferner nichts nährischer, als wann sie meinen, die Poeterey bestehe bloß in jhr selber; die doch alle andere künste vnd wissensschaffen in sich helt” (There is nothing more foolish than thinking that the art of poetry consists only in itself, when in fact it contains within itself all other arts and sciences; chap. 3).

Theoreticians between Konrad von Würzburg and Buchner generally shared this opinion. All subscribed to the two principles famously articulated by Horace in verses 333–34 of his *Ars poetica*: good poetry must simultaneously be useful (*prodesse*) and delightful (*delectare*). Both principles were seminal in the textual theories of Cicero and Quintilian: a text should persuade (*persuadere*); its content should profitably instruct (*docere*) or even prove (*probare*); it should also arouse (*movere*) and affect the senses (*flectere, delectare*). Thus Opitz: “Dienet also dieses alles zue vberredung vnd unterricht auch ergetzung der Leute; welches der Poeterey vornemster Zweck ist” (All this then serves to convince and instruct, but also to delight, which is the loftiest goal of poetry; chap. 3). Aesthetic pleasure provides the difference-making elements missing in purely prosaic and expository texts: “wie alles mit lust vnd anmutigkeit geschrieben wird, so wird es auch nachmals von jederman mit dergleichen lust vnd anmutigkeit gelesen” (what is written with joy and grace will later be read by everyone with the very same joy and grace; chap. 8).

In Konrad’s prologue to *Partenopier und Meliur* an allegory of blossoms and fruit connects sensual, aesthetic form and intellectual content, a precept of literary theory as late as the eighteenth century.⁸¹ By following its own, autonomous aesthetic law, art leads the audience to specific communicational targets in a rhetorically persuasive manner. The listener should be so charmed by the artistic offering that instruction occurs naturally. This means imparting three things: sensual delight (*delectare*); lessons on life, especially on principles of aristocratic behavior for the individual as well as for the nation (the *docere* of ethics); and expressiveness (the *docere* of rhetorics).⁸²

The *Meistersinger* essentially shared this view. An extant placard from the official ratification of the Freiburg Articles states the purpose of *Meistergesang* and the concept of the *Meistersinger* as learned poet: *Meistergesang* promotes the spiritual and moral virtues of the members of its fraternity; the traditional seven liberal arts constitute its foundation; poetry and the sciences are inseparably connected.⁸³ The “göttliche Kunst” (divine art) of the masters of the liberal arts is to be anchored in the “ungelernte Leien” (uneducated laity) — something that priests cannot achieve with their sermons but that *Meistersinger* accomplish “mit übersüßisten Gedichten ze singen in den zwölf meisterlichen Tönen” (with incomparably sweet poetry sung in the twelve master melodies). The texts of the songs incorporate the teachings of the liberal arts and apply them performatively. They follow the rules of logic and grammar and are metrically based on the mathematical rules of the *ars metrica*, or *Arismetrica*. In all cases they function according to the *ars rhetorica*, “die Rede in zierlicher Ordnung ze behalten nach Tulio und sinen Nachfolgern” (to keep the composing of speech in an artistic order according to Tullius [Cicero] and his successors). Likewise, songs and melodies obey the rules of *ars musica*. On the authority of all of these arts, the *Meistersinger* sought to rejuvenate the prestige of the poetic arts.

Of much greater importance than this rejuvenation of art, however, especially after the Reformation, was the goal of praising God in song as a form of worship or religious proclamation. It would be hyperbolic to claim to discover

in *Meistergesang* an afterlife for the concept of the *poeta theologicus*; still, established religious and biblical themes do run throughout the official singing exercises. The Freiburg Articles assure a close connection with religious cultic practices (singing in church, predominance of religious themes in songs, concerts in monasteries). Indeed, the Freiburg city government attempted to establish the fraternity in such a way, “daß dennoch Gott der allmächtig dadurch gelobt, die Selen getrost, und die Menschen zu Ziten so sie dem Gesang zuhorten, von Gotslästerung, auch vom Spil und anderer weltlichen Ueppigkeit gezogen wurden” (that God Almighty thereby be praised, souls comforted, and hearers of the songs turned away from blasphemy, gambling, and other worldly excess). The Colmar Ordinance had similarly strict formal regulations against offensive language in the singing schools. As a rule, only biblical themes were permitted; in the guild room after official performances, swearing was forbidden; nor could idle stories about God or the mother of Jesus be told or sung, though respectable stories — such as from Roman history — were acceptable after dinner. The Nuremberg Tablature permits the performance of non-religious songs (school exercises, fables, farces) only before the regular singing school.

For modern baroque poetics, poetry became *prima philosophia* as understood by Petrarch in his *Epistolae familiares* (X,4), and the concept of the *poeta philosophus* was now dominant, notwithstanding Opitz’s excursus in chapter 2 on theology as the origin of poetry. Opitz strongly denies that poets wish to make themselves agreeable only through “ergetzung” (*delectare*) rather than equally through “vnterrichtung” (*docere*). On the contrary, poetry is “die erste Philosophie, eine erzieherin des lebens von jugend auff, welche die art der siten, der bewegungen des gemütes vnd alles thuns vnd lassen lehrte” (the first philosophy, an educator of life from youth forward, which teaches the cultivation of manners, the animation of the mind, and all that should be done or left undone). Buchner subscribes to the same premise in his *Poet*, that wisdom and virtue are and have always been the chief goals of poets.

Text as Communicative Instrument

Rhetorics and poetics deal with communicative processes in the world, with communicative interaction, and with the various roles assumed by people in communication. Both genres have an extrinsic perspective, directed toward the external contexts of interaction and effectiveness. And because they simultaneously deal with the most important communicative tool, the text, the genres also have an intrinsic perspective, focused on the internal structures of texts as well as the rules and procedures of text production.

The classical five-part rhetorical system operated within a broader three-stage scheme of text production: the planning stage (*intellectio*); the heuristic stage, with its preparatory cognitive processes (*inventio, dispositio*); and the stage of formulation (*elocutio*). Memory and performance (*memoria, actio/promuntiatio*) completed the process. The theory of rhetoric thereby offered a production and performance model for all semiotic areas, including poetry, the sister discipline of rhetoric; the model was also partially assimilated in early

theories of music and art.⁸⁴ Of primary importance for poetics were the author's initial production tasks (*officia*). Opitz recognized this connection to rhetorical systematics in Pierre de Ronsard's *Abrégé de l'art poétique français* (1565), which he claimed, in his fifth chapter, as his major poetological source.⁸⁵ Finally, Opitz focuses on the theory of textual genres, an expected part of all poetics.

This intrinsic perspective had been cultivated since Aristotle, particularly by Horace, as a systemic self-reflection on facts specific to the work of the poet; hence, the theory of poetics should be called *poeseology* (the theory of making poems).⁸⁶ As we observed in Konrad's prologue to *Partenopier und Meliur*, the logic of poetry was already independent by that time; literary tradition had created its own norms. High-courtly formalism represented the ideal standard, mastery of which was self-evident and in need of no external authority.⁸⁷ The intrinsic focus on the technical aspects of poetic text production only intensified with *Meistergesang*. The artisan ideal of perfection, achievable through technical mastery, extended to the creation of precisely defined textual structures. *Meistergesang* characteristically evinced blindness for what a later time would take to be the special qualities of a work of art; it had virtually no vocabulary by which aesthetic ideas might be formulated.⁸⁸ Indeed, as Karl Stackmann has noted, *Meistergesang* had no term for *beauty*. If "art" is ascribable to *Meistergesang* at all, it is to the quality of the *correct*, of conformity to general normative values.⁸⁹

This aesthetic blindness was overcome in the seventeenth century. Technical aspects of text production found new contexts, particularly under the demands of modern education, which elevated humanistic eloquence to the reigning stylistic ideal. The highest form of eloquence, and the new touchstone of elite education, was the metered and rhymed poem, rendered with painstaking imitation of the hallowed models. Birthdays, weddings, name days, the assumption of office — every occasion required an honorific poem, the requisite implements of which were canonized in poetics, now considered an *ars* in its own right alongside the traditional trivium.⁹⁰

Genre

Classical rhetoric dealt explicitly only with prose speech (Greek *logos*, Latin *oratio*).⁹¹ Rules were developed for the discovery of topics (contents) and tectonics (sections), and were related to the three situational cases of rhetorical invention. In the seventeenth century this genre system was reduced in some aspects but expanded in others, adding new rationalizations, or *Kasnistik* (casuistry). During the course of the Thirty Years' War it became clear that the era of great political speeches at courts and provincial diets was gone for good.⁹² The political function of speeches became increasingly a matter of ceremony — paying homage, honoring ambassadorial service, providing ornamentation for commemorative events.⁹³

Gottsched's *Ausführliche Redekunst* later drew from this development pertinent consequences for a new theory of genre. Taking modern texts as his point of departure, he rejects the ancient rhetorical tripartite scheme of text

production, arguing that radical changes in modes of governing have rendered obsolete both the *rathschlagende* (deliberative) and *gerichtliche* (judicial) genres; thus he subsumes modern speech production almost exclusively under the *erweisende* (epideictic) genre of *genus demonstrativum*. Otherwise, however, he retains the general rules of rhetoric and the validity of the specific genres of antiquity. In the “Besondern Teil” (Special Section) of his *Redekunst* he identifies the most important modern rhetorical genres: 1. “grosse Lobreden oder sogenannte Panegyricis” (great encomia, or so-called panegyrics); 2. “Trauerreden oder Parentationen” (funeral speeches, or *parentationes*); 3. school speeches; 4. university speeches; 5. “Hof- und Staatsreden” (court and state speeches); 6. “Standreden, Personalien und Trostschriften” (eulogies, life sketches, and consolations); 7. “Verlobungs- Trauungs- und Strohkranzreden” (speeches at engagements, weddings, and wedding roasts); and 8. sermons. Several introductory sections also deal with the subjects of translation and imitation of classical speech models. Gottsched’s intent is not to diminish the question of genre but to update it. He also wishes to establish a common set of rules for all modes of speech:

Wir läugnen es nicht, daß es nicht heute zu Tage allerley Arten von Reden geben sollte, davon die Alten nichts gewußt haben: Z.E. unsere Predigten, unsere Huldigungs- und Landtagsreden u.s.w. Allein ungeachtet wir von diesen Arten, in dem zweyten Theile unserer Redekunst, ins besondere handeln werden: so ändern doch dieselben in den allgemeinen Regeln der Redekunst nichts. Denn gesetzt, daß wir alle heutigen Reden, auch in drey Gattungen eintheilen wollten; nämlich lobende, lehrende und complimentirende Reden [. . .]: so würde doch auch diese Abtheilung in den Hauptbegriffen der Beredsamkeit nichts ändern. (126)

[We cannot deny that there are many kinds of speeches today of which the ancients knew nothing, such as our sermons, our homages, orations at provincial diets, etc. We shall deal specifically with these genres in the second section of our *Redekunst*, though they change nothing in the general rules of rhetoric. Assuming that we did wish to divide the various kinds of modern speech into three types, namely, speeches that praise, instruct, and compliment, such an ordering of the main concepts of rhetoric would not change a thing.]

Some two hundred years before Gottsched, text genre theory for practical written communication, which had been developing since the fifteenth century, was summed up by Alexander Hüge (ca. 1460–1529) on the title page of his epistolary rhetorics, *Rethorica unnd Formularium teütsch* (German Rhetorics and Formulary, 1528). It is apparent that German writing-rhetorics dealt with many formulaic text genres:

vilerley Episteln, Supplicationes, gerichtlicher proceß mit vor vnd nach-genden anhangen, fründlichen vnd vnfründlichen schrifftten, anlässen, verträgen, außsprüchen, tagsatzungen, geleitten, klagen, vrteilen, verkündungen, gewälten, kundtschafften, manrechten, vidimus, Appellationen, Commissionen, Rotweilischen vnd Westfälischen schrifftten, vrfehden,

Testamenten, Gemechten, übergabungen, Widem, pfründ, Stiftungen, Patrimonien, Presentationen, kauff, gült vnd leigeding, hinderlegungen, schadloß, manungen, quittantzen, schuld, eestewr, heyrats vnd verzeihungen, vogteybrieffen.

[various kinds of epistles, supplications, court trials with pre- and post-trial attachments, amicable and inimical texts, occasions, contracts, declarations, hearings, escorts, complaints, judgments, proclamations, restraints, notices, letters of dunning, attestations, appellations, commissions, writings for the court of Rottweil or the courts of Westphalia, oaths of truce, testaments, accords, transfers, dowries, benefices, endowments, patrimonies, presentations, purchases, payment and loan contracts, escrows, indemnities, appeals, receipts, debts, marriage taxes, certificates of marriage, pardons, and jurisdictions.]

Christian Weise's critique of such rigid formulaicism shows just how much the discipline had changed by the late seventeenth century. The school rector maintains that the ancient system of the *genera causarum* has lost its relevance, and he gives instructions for the composition of texts in actual demand in schools, churches, and politics.⁹⁴ For Weise the *cheria*, that is, "a pregnant sentence borrowed from some other author, and worked out by certain rules" (*OED*), becomes the primary model for text composition. In all instances, academic training must proceed according to rational methods derived from core philosophical principles, suitable for being put into good textual form by the learned and prudent orator.

Poetics is concerned with completely different kinds of texts: generally speaking, for all verse genres, or standardized verse texts. Opitz looked primarily to Neo-Latin literature and reclaimed these models for German. His first interest lies in the subject matter (*res*) of texts and their inner structures (*inventio* and *dispositio*). He specifically addresses the genres of heroic epos, tragedy, comedy, satire, epigram, eclogue, elegy, echo, hymns, and sylvan and lyrical poetry (including the ode). Some two decades later, in his *Poetischer Trichter*, Harsdörffer deals expansively with plays but ignores these smaller, lyrical genres.⁹⁵ From our modern perspective, it is astonishing just how many contemporary genres were *not* discussed in seventeenth-century poetics.⁹⁶

Modes of Speaking

Genres were organized not only according to content but often also by conventional modes of speaking — to use modern parlance, according to formal structures that obey specific "overcode" rules. Early German rhetorics usually treated questions of genre in a lengthy chapter on elocution containing the rich arsenal of rhetorical figures.⁹⁷ In this area, rhetorics and poetics were brought into a close relationship, and a number of poetics, such as Stieler's *Dichtkunst des Spahnen*, expanded the chapter to extraordinary length.⁹⁸ Opitz dedicates chapter 6 of his *Poeterey* to formulation and stylistics, focusing on the language-use principles of *elegantz*, *composition*, and *dignitet* from the third rhetorical stage of production and encompassing word choice, usage (including archaisms,

neologisms, and barbarisms), sentence structure, and rhetorical figures.⁹⁹ Rhetorical suitability (*aptum, decorum*) occupied the highest regulative principle for stylistic decisions.¹⁰⁰ All poetics included a chapter on the *licentia poetica*, on the poet's limited freedoms within the rhetorical regulative system.¹⁰¹

Also unique to poetics was the chapter on metrics and versification; it overlapped only minimally with the *numerus* (metrics) chapter of rhetorics, which dealt with clause construction in prose texts. Opitz handles this issue in his decisive chapter 7 on meter and strophic form, the technical core of his poetics, where he sets out his rule for German accentuating verse.¹⁰² Verse technique was central to poetics as early as the prologue poetics of the Teutonic Order. Heinrich von Hesler and Nikolaus von Jeroschin were the first theorists after Otfried (ninth c.) to deal explicitly and extensively with German verse. Hesler calls for purity of rhyme and aesthetic unity of the individual verse, which is to have four accents just as it did among the ancient masters. Hesler deals with unaccented syllables and anacrusis as well as abbreviations, inclination,¹⁰³ elision, and syncope. Hesler and Jeroschin recommend the same classical means for balancing and providing metrical rhythm in order to avoid too much brevity or too great length in their verses.¹⁰⁴

At this early time, the demands of scriptorality and orality were similar. Konrad conjoins the techniques of spoken text and song (*rede unde sanc*), applying the performative verbs *sagen*, or *sprechen*, and *singen*, often in the double-form: *sagen und singen*, meant to achieve the elaborate effect of "edele doene und edeliu worte" (noble melodies and noble words).¹⁰⁵ Albertanus's Latin theory of the same period was based in classical orality, of course, and focused on performance principles. Preformulated written texts obviously played no part in his thinking, for he specifies neither concrete structures of text formulation nor rules for written preformulation. *Meistergesang* of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries also presumed the oral and situational conditions of performance and communication of poetic texts: thus its strictly codified guild rules, which evince the same tendency toward extreme regulation of the forms of textual communication stipulated in contemporary rhetorics for writing.¹⁰⁶ It has been argued that the very establishment of the schools, with their apparatus of regulations and tablatures, was proof of the artificial, normative character of *Meistergesang*, which distanced itself aesthetically from conventional poetry.¹⁰⁷ In this view, the *Merker*, as art referee, supervised and evaluated these regulations as an expression of aesthetic quality in the various skill areas: purity of rhyme, metrical and musical exactness, diction, and content. Four observations obtain with respect to the art of rhyme in *Meistergesang*: the bulk of regulations consisted of rules for rhyming; rhyming mistakes were especially egregious transgressions; skill at rhyming was the most important artistic quality; and instruction in artistic rhyming was the indispensable component of a masterful poetics. While all of this applied in the first place to sung texts, the *Meistergesang* tablatures likewise addressed the linguistic side of the songs in a detailed manner.

It would appear that the older scholarly assumption — based on the erroneous claim that no related theories of German poetry, or even versification,

existed in Germany — that Opitz had no previous exposure to German-language theoretical influences must be modified.¹⁰⁸ For one thing, *Meistergesang* theory served Opitz effectively at least as a negative foil; for another, the new rudiments of a theory of verse and prosody had already been formulated in the *Prosodiae* (1570) and *Grammatica germanicae linguae* (1578) of Johannes Claius (1535–92). Claius in fact developed a theory of German syllabic accent, having worked it out through a comparison with the prosody of the classical languages.¹⁰⁹ Opitz consulted this theory in composing his *Poeterey*.

Poetic Fiction and Narrativity

In following the humanist differentiation — taken from the *Nichomachean Ethics* of Aristotle — between *poiesis* (textual construction), especially of fictions, and *praxis* (communicative intervention), baroque poetics honed a new conception of the poet and poetry (as the poet's own work).¹¹⁰ There had been no place for a theory of fiction in the older German poetics. Even in the Latin poetics the question of fiction presented special difficulties in sixteenth-century Germany.¹¹¹ *Meistergesang's* simplistic solution was to restrict subject matter to biblical themes. This changed with Opitz's *Poeterey*. Going back to the Greeks, specifically the ninth chapter of Aristotle's *Poetics*, Opitz took the concepts of mimesis and fantasy as his points of departure. According to Aristotle, poetry should only simulate natural relationships in order to demonstrate the potentialities of reality. In Opitz's formulation in chapter 3: "die ganze Poeterey [bestehe] im nachäffen der Natur" (the whole of poetry consists in the imitation of nature), which means that the poet should not so much describe things as they are, "als wie sie etwan sein köndten oder solten" (but as they could or should be). But the depiction of potential realities requires employment of the imagination — this is the new conception of the poet as master not only of *diction* but of *fiction* as well (to borrow Gérard Genette's terms).¹¹² The old rhetorical doctrine of *inventio* thus regains importance in poetic theory:

Die worte vnd Syllaben in gewisse gesetze zue dringen, vnd verse zue schreiben, ist das allerwenigste was in einem Poeten zue suchen ist. Er muß *euphantasiotós*, von sinnreichen einfällen vnd erfindungen sein, muß ein grosses vnverzagtes gemüte haben, muß hohe sachen bey sich erdencken können, soll anders seine rede eine art krieges, vnd von der erden empor steigen. (Chapter 3)

[Setting words and syllables according to certain principles and writing verses accordingly is the very least to be expected of a poet. He must possess *euphantasiotós* (Quintilian 6.2.30), imaginative and inventive ideas, must be of an undaunted spirit, and must be able to conceive of lofty things if his speeches are to be exceptional and rise above the earth.]

In his *Poet*, Buchner expands on these ideas in terms of the Aristotelian concepts of *mythos* (Latin *fabula*), *mimesis* (depiction, as semiotic simulation of reality), and *mimetes* or *poietes* (simulator, or maker of textures). A precursor of Buchner, the Jesuit Pontanus (*Poeticae institutiones*, Teaching in Poetics, 1594), for whom

the *fabulosa fictio* (fictional story) was nothing less than the formative soul of the poetic work,¹¹³ saw the poet engaged as simulator and maker in the activity of representing human actions. Pontanus uses *imitari* (to imitate) and *ingere* (to fabricate) synonymously, in keeping with the Aristotelian understanding of *mimesis* as “depiction,” as interpreted in late-sixteenth-century Italian poetics; Latin *ingere* is likewise employed as “to depict.” Even when the focal concern of depicting is the simulation of the sensually evident (*procreando*), as opposed to purely informative reporting (*narrando*), and even though it seems that poets create works out of nothing (*e nihilo*), the problem of fiction remains unsolved. For *ingere* (German *fingieren*) is meaningful only in making visible something that is universal, and this cannot be accomplished through imitation of what is historically accidental or individual. Pontanus elaborates on this relationship in connection with the epos.

The new emphasis on the poet as no longer merely versifier but as producer and depicter of semiotic and artistic realities reflects a theoretical turn toward Aristotle’s *Poetics*. Aristotle’s rhetorical theory concerns questions of human intellectual guidance, for which, in his nineteenth chapter, he adduces the concept *diánoia* (intellect, mind); his poetic theory concentrates on the production of simulative representations or semiotic depiction (*mimesis*). According to Buchner (26) such results obtain especially in the process of fabricating narration; the poet gets his name, after all, from the Greek word for “to make.” In practice this means that he has to produce either a new work or one based on an existing one, striving mimetically “gleich einem mahler” (like a painter), who depicts something “das mans erkennen kann” (that one can recognize). The poet is not to argue dialectically like a philosopher, dissecting, dividing, and distinguishing, but should rather portray an object as a semiotic image, as “sein äusserlich wesen und der Augenschein” (its outward being and as it appears to the eye) — a work, that is, that serves the act of viewing. Poetic production consists of “thun und wircken” (doing and effecting). “To make” (*schaffen*) reality in a work is not the same as finding reality through “inquiry” (*erkundigen*), as the scholar does: *erkundigen* reflects the “verborgene Natur” (hidden nature) of the scholar, which motivates the investigation of causes and qualities.

In this narrative process the poet finds his true calling. Opitz had already dealt with the epos; the prose novel and other forms of narrative prose texts would not become poetological subjects until the second half of the century.¹¹⁴ Until then they will be treated only generally under the rubric of *historia* and categorized according to classical rhetorical theory (Cicero, *De oratore* 2.36; Vossius, *Commentaria rhetorica* 2.4.3).¹¹⁵ Just as Vadianus in *De poetica et carminis ratione*, Buchner in his *Poet* views the fable as the ideal narrative form and uses it as a basis for elaborating the new conception of German poetry.¹¹⁶ Buchner argues that ancient poets had created the fable for instruction in divine things, a form more enigmatic than some but clearer than others (such as the riddle), thus existing in the middle ground between knowledge and uncertainty. In its literary form its truth was readily believable, though it simultaneously gave rise to doubt, “weil Sie so wunderliche und seltzame Sachen erzehlete”

(because it dealt with such fantastic and strange things; 8). But this was precisely the intention, for it spurred people to think more deeply about things. In the course of its development it evolved to the extent,

daß endlich die Fabel nicht nur ein Stück Ihrer Wercke / sondern das Werck selbst worden / [. . .] / und züfoderst diejenigen für Poeten gehalten / die eine Fabel fein künst- und zierlich abhandelten. Die aber solches nicht thaten / die wurden etwa Sängler oder Versmacher geheissen. [. . .] Hier hat nun der Poet seinem Nahmen ein Genüge gethan / und sich desselben allerdings fähig und würdig gemacht / indem Er nicht allein die in Warheit wesende Sachen / herrlicher fast / als Sie für sich beschaffen / sondern auch diejenigen / so niemals gewesen / gleich als wären Sie / fürzustellen / und / so zu reden / von neuen zu schaffen gewußt. [. . .] Aus welchem allen erscheinet / wie hoch und herrlich die Poeten anfangs gehalten / ja Gott selbstn gleich geachtet worden seyn. (9–11)

[that the fable was no longer just a part of their poetic works but became the work itself. And first and foremost those who could fashion a fable in an accomplished and graceful manner were considered the real poets, while those who did not were called singers or versifiers. In this way the poet lived up to his name and showed himself capable and worthy of it by not only presenting things that actually existed before (and doing so almost more splendidly than in their original form), but also by conceiving of new ones that had never existed, indeed in such a manner as if they had, and as though he were now recreating them afresh. All this explains why poets at first were held in high, even god-like esteem.]

Both Opitz and Buchner contributed to the development of an elementary narrativity that anticipates Genette's theoretical discourse of *histoire*.¹¹⁷ Opitz explains in chapter 5 that the narrative verse epos need not be as precise as historiographical writings, though one must handle the narrative freedom "mit solcher ordnung, als wann sich eines auff das andere selber allso gebe, vnd vngesucht in das buch keme" (in such an order as if one thing moved naturally to the next and thus entered the book effortlessly). The narrative epos form has, like fiction, broad license to deal with "allerley fabeln, historien, Kriegskünste, schlachten rathschläge, sturm, wetter, vnd was sonstn zue erweckung der verwunderung in den gemütern von nöthen ist" (all kinds of made-up stories, histories, information on wars and battles, reports about storms and weather, and whatever else might awaken amazement in people's minds). For Buchner narration becomes, on the one hand, the mimetic form par excellence (hence his use of the mirror metaphor), and, on the other, a free space for pictorial, that is, poetic, "making" in its most original sense:

Also wenn Er von weltlichen Händeln / und die in der Menschen Leben vorlauffen / zu schreiben gesinnet / damit wir daraus / als in einem Spiegel / zu sehen haben / was etwa in unserm Leben krumm und unrecht / so erzehlet Er nur den blossen Verlauff / nach denen umständen / als sie hergegangen sind / hergehen sollen oder können / in einer sonderbahren Ordnung und Art / durch welche Er von den

Geschichtschreibern unterschieden wird / denen Er sonst fast gleich kommt. Denn die Historici ebener massen den blossen Verlauf der Geschichte erzehlen / das andere aber des vernünftigen Lesers Urtheil und Nachsinnen anheim stellen. (*Poet*, 28–29)

[When therefore he determines to write about events in the world and in the lives of individuals, as if we were looking into a mirror and viewing what is twisted and wrong in our lives, he simply relates the pure course of the story line according to the circumstances as they occurred, or should or could occur, in a specific order and manner. In doing so, he distinguishes himself from the historiographers, with whom he is otherwise nearly identical. For historiographers must likewise relate the simple course of events and leave everything else to the judgment and reflection of the intelligent reader.]

Summary

One of the great epistemic achievements of Renaissance Humanism was the development of a modern theory of communication. From the fifteenth century on, ancient sources concerning communication assumed new importance in scholarly discourse under the organizational genres of rhetorics and poetics. Two publication dates mark this development: 1430, the first major humanistic general rhetorics in Latin, by the Byzantine Georgios Trapezuntios,¹¹⁸ then teaching in Rome; and 1508, the first printed Greek edition of Aristotle's *Poetics*. The independent turn to the European vernacular languages ran parallel to this development. In Germany two other publication dates mark the beginning of vernacular humanism: 1493, the first major humanistic general rhetorics in German, Riederer's *Spiegel der waren Rhetoric*; and 1624, Opitz's *Buch von der Deutschen Poeterey*. The temporal distance between these two works is significant. The rhetorical theory of the fifteenth century arose out of the classical rhetorical tradition and was adapted relatively early for the new practical, vernacular written forms of communication (especially letter writing); this was not the case for poetic theory. Down to the early seventeenth century, German sources, especially *Meistergesang*, betrayed their theoretical indebtedness to the indigenous German tradition. But *Meistergesang* theory, essentially a reductionist and regulated continuation of the doctrine of medieval *Minnesang* and *Sangspruch*, was rejected in Germany in the late Renaissance in favor of simultaneously renewing the ancient paradigm and developing a unique structure for German language and literature. Using the model of Latin and French treatises, Opitz treated German literature as a purely theoretical problem. There now arose in Germany a rich literature in the sister areas of rhetorics and poetics, as a result of which a new understanding of the communicator (whether as *orator* or *poet*) and the possibilities for social interaction came about, together with an intensified and greatly differentiated arsenal of text models for every kind of communication. This theoretical development ended around 1750. The baroque codifications and its taxonomies of occasional poetry could not answer the new demands for the

authenticity of personal experience and its correlative deregulation of authority. In the eyes of Goethe's contemporaries, all forms and conditions of communication had to give way to the postulates of naturalness, sensibility, and originality. For rhetorics and poetics this signified an epochal transformation.

Translated by Michael Swisher

Notes

¹ See Martin Opitz, "Vorrede," *Buch von der Deutschen Poeterey* [sic], 1624 (repr. of first ed.), 7th ed., ed. Henrik Becker (Halle/Saale: Niemeyer, 1962).

² The metaconcept *rhetorics*, like *poetics*, has both a singular and a plural usage and denotes a systematic view of *rhetoric*, the art or technique of persuasion.

³ Paul Klopsch, *Einführung in die Dichtungslehren des lateinischen Mittelalters* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1980).

⁴ For an overview of sources see Wilfried Barner, *Barockrhetorik: Untersuchungen zu ihren geschichtlichen Grundlagen* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1970); Dieter Breuer and Günther Kopsch, "Rhetoriklehrbücher des 16. bis 20. Jahrhunderts: Eine Bibliographie," in *Rhetorik: Beiträge zu Ihrer Geschichte in Deutschland vom 16. bis 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Helmut Schanze (Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum 1974), 217–92; James J. Murphy, comp., *Renaissance Rhetoric: A Short Title Catalogue of Works on Rhetorical Theory from the Beginning of Printing to A.D. 1700* (New York: Garland, 1981); Adam Skura, *Katalog druków XV–XVIII w. z zakresu poetyki i retoryki* (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo U, 1987); Joachim Knappe, "Barock," *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik* (hereafter: *HWR*) (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1992), cols. 1285–332; Knappe, "Elocutio," *HWR* (1994), cols. 1022–83; Murphy and Martin Davies, "Rhetorical Incunabula: A Short-Title Catalogue of Texts Printed to the Year 1500," *Rhetorica* 15 (1997): 355–470.

⁵ Joachim Knappe, "Humanismus," in *Literaturwissenschaftliches Lexikon: Grundbegriffe der Germanistik*, ed. Horst Brunner and Rainer Moritz (Berlin: Schmidt, 1997), 144–46.

⁶ Knappe, "Elocutio," 1047–49. See in this volume the chapter by John L. Flood.

⁷ See Frank Baron, "Peter Luder," in *German Writers of the Renaissance and Reformation, 1280–1580*, vol. 179 of *Dictionary of Literary Biography*, ed. Max Reinhart and James Hardin (Detroit: Gale, 1997), 129–34.

⁸ See Joachim Knappe, *Allgemeine Rhetorik: Stationen der Theoriegeschichte* (Stuttgart: Reclam, 2000).

⁹ Barner, *Barockrhetorik*, 265ff.; C. S. M. Rademaker, *Life and Works of Gerardus Joannes Vossius (1577–1649)* (Assen: von Gorcum, 1981); Ralph Häfner, *Götter im Exil: Frühneuzeitliches Dichtungsverständnis im Spannungsfeld christlicher Apologetik und philologischer Kritik* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2003).

¹⁰ Barbara Bauer, *Jesuitische "ars rhetorica" im Zeitalter der Glaubenskämpfe* (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1986).

¹¹ The second is the *Ad Herennium*, ascribed to Cicero.

¹² Franz Josef Worstbrock, "Die Brieflehre des Konrad Celtis: Textgeschichte und Autorschaft," in *Philologie als Kulturwissenschaft: Studien zur Literatur und Geschichte*

des Mittelalters, ed. Ludger Grenzmann, Hubert Herkommer, and Dieter Wuttke (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987), 242–69.

¹³ Kurt Smolak, ed., Erasmus von Rotterdam: *De conscribendis epistolis / Anleitung zum Briefeschreiben*, vol. 8 of *Erasmus: Ausgewählte Schriften* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1980).

¹⁴ For more on the genres of rhetoric in Germany during the baroque period see Knappe, “Barock,” 1289ff.

¹⁵ Knappe, “Elocutio,” 1052–54.

¹⁶ Joachim Knappe, *Philipp Melanchthons Rhetorik* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1993), 30 and 40.

¹⁷ See Knappe, *Allgemeine Rhetorik*, 237–59.

¹⁸ Knappe, “Barock,” 1287.

¹⁹ Knappe, “Barock,” 1290.

²⁰ Karl Stackmann: “Quaedam Poetica: Die meisterliche Dichtung Deutschlands im zeitgenössischen Verständnis,” in *Literatur, Musik und Kunst im Übergang vom Mittelalter zur Neuzeit*, ed. Hartmut Boockmann (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995), 132–61, here 139 and 149.

²¹ The novel as such is of course not yet explicitly mentioned. See overviews in Heinz Entner, “Zum Dichtungsbegriff des deutschen Humanismus,” in *Grundpositionen der deutschen Literatur im 16. Jahrhundert*, ed. Ingeborg Spriewald, Werner Lenk, and Heinz Entner (Berlin: Aufbau, 1976), 330–98; Gunter E. Grimm, *Literatur und Gelehrtentum in Deutschland: Untersuchungen zum Wandel ihres Verhältnisses vom Humanismus bis zur Frühaufklärung* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1983), 80–94; Bernhard Asmuth, “Anfänge der Poetik im deutschen Sprachraum: Mit einem Hinweis auf die von Celtis eröffnete Lebendigkeit des Schreibens,” in *Renaissance-Poetik/Renaissance Poetics*, ed. Heinrich F. Plett (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994), 94–113. For an introduction to poetics see Werner Jung, *Kleine Geschichte der Poetik* (Hamburg: Junius, 1997).

²² Entner, “Zum Dichtungsbegriff”; Hermann Wiegmann, *Geschichte der Poetik: Ein Abriss* (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1977), 39–49; Reiner Schmidt, *Deutsche Ars Poetica: Zur Konstituierung einer deutschen Poetik aus humanistischem Geist im 17. Jahrhundert* (Meisenheim am Glan: Hain, 1980), 63ff.; Franz Josef Worstbrock, “Die ‘Ars versificandi et carminum’ des Konrad Celtis: Ein Lehrbuch eines deutschen Humanisten,” in *Studien zum städtischen Bildungswesen des späten Mittelalters und der frühen Neuzeit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983), 462–98; Heinz Entner, “Der Weg zum Buch von der Deutschen Poeterey,” in *Studien zur deutschen Literatur im 17. Jahrhundert*, ed. Entner (Berlin: Aufbau, 1984), 82–84; Asmuth, “Anfänge der Poetik”; Jörg Robert: *Konrad Celtis und das Projekt der deutschen Dichtung* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2003).

²³ Knappe, “Elocutio,” 1047.

²⁴ Entner, “Zum Dichtungsbegriff,” 388.

²⁵ Entner, “Zum Dichtungsbegriff,” 368 and 383; Stackmann, “Quaedam Poetica.”

²⁶ Knappe, *Allgemeine Rhetorik*, 175–206.

²⁷ Reproduction in J. Knight Bostock, *Albertanus Brixiensis in Germany* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1924), 79–115.

²⁸ Joachim Knappe and Bernhard Roll, eds., *Rhetorica deutsch: Rhetorikschriften des 15. Jahrhunderts* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2002).

²⁹ Some writers indeed began to enjoy impressive publication numbers. See Knappe, “Barock,” 1289.

³⁰ Paul Joachimsen, “Aus der Vorgeschichte des ‘Formulare und deutsche Rhetorica’” (1893), *Gesammelte Aufsätze: Beiträge zu Renaissance, Humanismus und Reformation*, ed. Notker Hammerstein (Aalen: Scientia, 1970), 23–120; Dietmar Till, *Transformationen der Rhetorik: Untersuchungen zum Wandel der Rhetoriktheorie im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2004), 197–98; texts in Knappe and Roll, eds., *Rhetorica deutsch*, and Jürgen Fröhlich, *Bernhard Hirschvelders Briefrhetorik (Cgm 3607): Untersuchung und Edition* (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2003); bibliography in Reinhard Nickisch, *Die Stilprinzipien in den deutschen Briefstellern des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts: mit einer Bibliographie zur Briefschreiblehre (1474–1800)* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969).

³¹ From 1420: Clm 6009, 170^r–178^v; from 1427: Cgm655,444^{ra}–480^{rb}.

³² Knappe, *Allgemeine Rhetorik*, 207–36.

³³ Knappe, “Barock,” 1295.

³⁴ Joachim Knappe, ed., “Niklas von Wyle: Unterweisung,” in Knappe and Roll, eds., *Rhetorica deutsch*, 185–203, here 189.

³⁵ See in this volume the chapter by John L. Flood.

³⁶ Knappe, *Allgemeine Rhetorik*, 218–22.

³⁷ Georg Braungart, *Hofberedsamkeit: Studien zur Praxis höfisch-politischer Rede im deutschen Territorialabsolutismus* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1988), 50ff.; Till, *Transformationen der Rhetorik*, 111ff.

³⁸ Angus Graham, “Who Read Albertanus? Insights From the Manuscript Transmission,” in *Albertano da Brescia: Alle origini del Razionalismo economico, dell’Umanesimo civile, della Grande Europa*, ed. Franco Spinelli (Brescia, 1996), 69–82; Joachim Knappe, ed., “Albertanus Brixiensis: Die Räte von der Rede,” in Knappe and Roll, eds., *Rhetorica deutsch*, 235–52; here also for a discussion of the translation of 1472, 235ff.

³⁹ Emilio Bonfatti, “Verhaltenslehrbücher und Verhaltensideale,” *Zwischen Gegenreformation und Frühaufklärung: Späthumanismus, Barock, 1572–1740*, ed. Harald Steinhausen, vol. 3 of *Deutsche Literatur: Eine Sozialgeschichte* (Reinbek: Rowohlt, 1985), 74–87; Karl-Heinz Göttert, “Konversation,” *HWR* 4 (1998), cols. 1322–33.

⁴⁰ For further sources see Knappe, “Barock,” 1296.

⁴¹ Knappe, “Barock,” 1297.

⁴² Manfred Beetz, *Frühmoderne Höflichkeit: Komplimentierkunst und Gesellschaftsrituale im altdutschen Sprachraum* (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1990); Dietmar Till, “Komplimentierkunst,” *HWR* 4 (1998), cols. 1211–32.

⁴³ At ll. 4589–823. Wolfram von Eschenbach is the only poet he criticizes. All the others (Hartmann von Aue, Bliigger von Steinach, Veldeke) he praises and wishes to imitate. On the general subject see Günther Schweickle, ed., *Dichter über Dichter in mittel-hochdeutscher Literatur* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1970).

⁴⁴ See in this volume the chapter by Graeme Dunphy.

⁴⁵ Carl von Kraus, “Die metrischen Regeln bei Heinrich von Hesler und Nikolaus Jeroschin,” *Festschrift Max H. Jellinek* (Vienna: Österreichischer Bundesverlag für Unterricht, Wissenschaft und Kunst, 1928), 57.

- ⁴⁶ See in this volume the chapter by Peter Hess.
- ⁴⁷ Bert Nagel, *Meistergesang* (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1971), 63–76.
- ⁴⁸ See Horst Brunner, afterword, *Johann Christoph Wagenseil: Buch von der Meister-Singer Holdseligen Kunst (Aus: De civitate Norimbergensi commentatio)*, ed. Brunner (Göppingen: Kümmerle, 1975).
- ⁴⁹ Entner, “Zum Dichtungsbegriff”; Worstbrock, “Brieflehre”; Asmuth, “Anfänge der Poetik”; Stackmann, “Quaedam Poetica.”
- ⁵⁰ Joachim Dyck, *Ticht-Kunst: Deutsche Barockpoetik und rhetorische Tradition*, 3rd ed. (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1991), 14.
- ⁵¹ Conrad Wiedemann, “Engel, Geist und Feuer: Zum Dichterselbstverständnis bei Johann Klaj, Catharina von Greiffenberg und Quirinus Kuhlmann,” *Literatur und Geistesgeschichte: Festgabe für Heinz Otto Burger*, ed. Reinhold Grimm and Wiedemann (Berlin: Schmidt, 1968), 85–109.
- ⁵² Wilfried Barner, “Spielräume: Was Poetik und Rhetorik nicht lehren,” *Künste und Natur in Diskursen der Frühen Neuzeit*, ed. Hartmut Lauffhütte (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2000), 1:33–67. Barner remarks that they accompany the early modern period as a kind of ideal *Doppelgänger* (33).
- ⁵³ Dietmar Till, “Affirmation and Subversion: Zum Verhältnis von ‘rhetorischen’ und ‘platonischen’ Elementen in der frühneuzeitlichen Poetik,” *Zeitsprünge: Forschungen zur Frühen Neuzeit* 4, no. 3 (2000): 181–210, here 182.
- ⁵⁴ See Dyck, *Ticht-Kunst*, 7: “eine späte Blüte am weitverzweigten Baum der rhetorischen Theorie”; *ibid.* 25.
- ⁵⁵ Dietmar Till: “Poetik (A.),” *HWR* 6 (2003), cols. 1304–7, here 1306.
- ⁵⁶ Till, *Transformationen der Rhetorik*.
- ⁵⁷ Joachim Knappe, “Humanismus, Reformation, deutsche Sprache und Nation,” *Nation und Sprache: Die Diskussion ihres Verhältnisses in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, ed. Andreas Gardt (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000), 103–38. See in this volume the chapter by Renate Born.
- ⁵⁸ Renate Hildebrandt-Günther, *Antike Rhetorik und deutsche literarische Theorie im 17. Jahrhundert* (Marburg: Elwert, 1966), 54ff.; Dyck, *Ticht-Kunst*, 10–12; Glenn Most, “Rhetorik und Hermeneutik: Zur Konstitution der Neuzeitlichkeit,” *Antike und Abendland* 30 (1984): 62–79; Klaus Petrus, *Genese und Analyse: Logik, Rhetorik und Hermeneutik im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997), 77ff.
- ⁵⁹ Joachim Knappe, “Autorpräsenz: Sebastian Brants Selbstinszenierung in der Oratorrolle im Traum-Gedicht von 1502,” *Self Fashioning / Personen (selbst)darstellung*, ed. Rudolf Suntrup and Jan R. Veenstra (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2003), 79–108.
- ⁶⁰ Joachim Knappe, ed., “Briefrhetoriken,” in Knappe and Roll, eds., *Rhetorica deutsch*, 38–182.
- ⁶¹ Joachim Knappe, introduction, in Knappe and Roll, eds., *Rhetorica deutsch*, 11–36.
- ⁶² It is supplemented by a typology of patronage. Knappe, *Allgemeine Rhetorik*, 231.
- ⁶³ Braungart, *Hofberedsamkeit*, 52; Till, *Transformationen der Rhetorik*, 111ff.
- ⁶⁴ Barner, “Spielräume,” 34–35.
- ⁶⁵ Modern High German version here and in subsequent Konrad quotations taken from Walter Haug, *Literaturtheorie im deutschen Mittelalter von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des 13. Jahrhunderts*, 2nd ed. (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1992); in English translation as *Vernacular Literary Theory in the Middle Ages: the German*

Tradition, 800–1300 in its European Context, trans. Joanna M. Catling (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997).

⁶⁶ On the *contratto comunicazionale* see Livio Rossetti, *Strategie macro-retoriche: la "formattazione" dell'evento comunicazionale* (Palermo: Univ. Facoltà di lettere e filosofia, 1994), 31–36. With respect to Gottfried see Haug, *Literaturtheorie im deutschen Mittelalter*, 361.

⁶⁷ *Colmarer Ordnung der Meistersingerschule* (1549), 404, note 2. It is available in full in *Alsatia* 10 (1873–74): 97–110. The poet Frauenlob, one of the twelve old masters of *Meistergesang* responsible for the creation of its tradition, is buried in the cloister of the Mainz cathedral. See Stackmann, "Quaedam Poetica," 146.

⁶⁸ Stackmann, "Quaedam Poetica," 147.

⁶⁹ Rudolf Drux, *Martin Opitz und sein poetisches Regelsystem* (Bonn: Bouvier, 1976); Wulf Segebrecht, *Das Gelegenheitsgedicht: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte und Poetik der deutschen Lyrik* (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1977), 202–3; Till, "Affirmation und Subversion," 198ff.

⁷⁰ See in this volume the chapter by Stephan Füssel.

⁷¹ Stackmann, "Quaedam Poetica," 149.

⁷² Thus the standard exempla upon which Scaliger bases his argumentation; Dyck, *Ticht-Kunst*, 14.

⁷³ Christoph J. Steppich, *Numine afflatur: Die Inspiration des Dichters im Denken der Renaissance* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2002).

⁷⁴ Florian Neumann, "Natura-ars-Dialektik," *HWR* 6 (2003), cols. 139–71; Till, *Transformationen der Rhetorik*, 77ff.

⁷⁵ Entner, "Zum Dichtungsbegriff," 383f.

⁷⁶ Wiedemann, "Engel, Geist und Feuer"; Theodor Verweyen, "Dichtungstheorie und Dichtungsverständnis bei den Nürnbergern," in *"Der Franken Rom": Nürnbergs Blütezeit in der zweiten Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts*, ed. John Roger Paas (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1995), 178–95; Till, *Transformationen der Rhetorik*, 67.

⁷⁷ *Lobrede*, 20. On the principle of *poeta nascitur, orator fit* see Till, "Affirmation und Subversion," 201ff.

⁷⁸ Barner, *Barockrhetorik*, 74ff.

⁷⁹ Dyck, *Ticht-Kunst*, 25–39.

⁸⁰ It is postulated indeed as autarchy in the *l'art pour l'art* ideology of the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century *Kunstperiode*. See Stackmann, "Quaedam Poetica," 149.

⁸¹ "[D]ie schönen und makellosen Blüten, die eine Dichtung zunächst trägt und die dann zu Früchten werden, das ist das unterhaltende Vergnügen, das wie die Blütenpracht des Mai über das Herz kommt und den, der sie sieht, erfreut. [. . .] Was verstehe ich nun unter der Frucht, die auf die Blüte des Gedichts folgt? Es sind der nützliche kluge Rat und die vortreffliche Beispielhaftigkeit, was beides mit dem Gewicht der Lehre diejenigen besser macht, die willens sind, auf das zu achten, was man ihnen in Wort und Sang vorträgt." [The beautiful, unblemished blossoms that poetry bears and that become fruit are the pleasure that comes over the heart like the splendor of blossoms in May and gives joy to whoever sees it. What do I mean by the fruit that follows the blossom of the poem? It is the useful wise counsel and the superb exemplarity that, combined with the weight of instruction, improve the person who pays attention to what is presented in word and song.]

- ⁸² Haug, *Literaturtheorie im deutschen Mittelalter*, 352ff.
- ⁸³ The following two paragraphs are indebted to Stackmann, "Quaedam Poetica," 115–53.
- ⁸⁴ Joachim Knappe, "Rhetorizität und Semiotik: Kategorietransfer zwischen Rhetorik und Kunsttheorie der Frühen Neuzeit," in *Intertextualität in der Frühen Neuzeit: Studien zu ihren theoretischen und praktischen Perspektiven*, ed. Wilhelm Kühlmann and Wolfgang Neuber (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1994), 507–32.
- ⁸⁵ Entner, "Der Weg," 34–35.
- ⁸⁶ Barner, "Spielräume," 34–35.
- ⁸⁷ Haug, *Literaturtheorie im deutschen Mittelalter*, 355.
- ⁸⁸ This point is well demonstrated in the art of the German Renaissance. See Christopher Wood, "Germany's Blind Renaissance," in *Infinite Boundaries: Order, Disorder, and Reorder in Early Modern German Culture*, ed. Max Reinhart (Kirksville, MO: Thomas Jefferson UP, 1998), 225–44.
- ⁸⁹ Stackmann, "Quaedam Poetica," 151–52.
- ⁹⁰ Dyck, *Ticht-Kunst*, 13.
- ⁹¹ Joachim Knappe, "Rede," *Reallexikon der deutschen Literaturwissenschaft* (2003), 3:233–35.
- ⁹² Braungart, *Hofberedsamkeit*, 49.
- ⁹³ See examples of this in Till, *Transformationen der Rhetorik*, 111–12.
- ⁹⁴ Till, *Transformationen der Rhetorik*, 127–28. In this volume in the chapter "Education in Early Modern Germany" (section: "New Pedagogical Approaches of the Seventeenth Century"), Wilhelm Kühlmann discusses analogous changes in German education in the seventeenth century.
- ⁹⁵ Bernhard Asmuth, "Poetik (Frühe Neuzeit: Deutschland)," *HWR* 6 (2003), cols. 1339–54, here 1342.
- ⁹⁶ Barner, "Spielräume."
- ⁹⁷ For an overview of the figures see Joachim Knappe and Armin Sieber, *Rhetorik-Vokabular zur zweisprachigen Terminologie in älteren deutschen Rhetoriken* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1998), 89–136.
- ⁹⁸ Asmuth, "Poetik," 1343.
- ⁹⁹ Knappe, "Elocutio," 1025–32.
- ¹⁰⁰ Barner, *Barockerhetorik*, 150–51.
- ¹⁰¹ Barner, "Spielräume," 55.
- ¹⁰² Erich Trunz, "Die Entwicklung des barocken Langverses," *Euphorion* 39 (1938): 427–68; Christian Wagenknecht, *Weckherlin und Opitz: Zur Metrik der deutschen Renaissancepoesie* (Munich: Beck, 1971). Unlike Greek and Latin, which determine the accent by syllable length, German verse, according to Opitz, is to reflect natural word accent.
- ¹⁰³ *Inclination*: "the throwing of the accent on an enclitic upon the last syllable of the word to which it is attached" (*OED*). Kraus, "Die metrischen Regeln," 60–61.
- ¹⁰⁴ "Beide wägen, d.i. rhythmisieren ihre Verse auf die gleiche Weise mit den Mitteln der älteren Kunst, und beide gewinnen einen äußeren Behelf, ihre Verse zu messen und dadurch vor zu großer Kürze oder Länge zu bewahren, in der Zählung der Silben eines jeden Verses, die an ein bestimmtes Maß gebunden sind. Aber dieses Maß ist nur nach

unten das gleiche, nämlich sechs Silben, während nach oben Jeroschin nur neun, Hesler dagegen noch zehn Silben zulässt." Kraus, "Die metrischen Regeln," 73–74.

¹⁰⁵ See Haug, *Literaturtheorie im deutschen Mittelalter*, 352–53.

¹⁰⁶ Knappe, introduction, 22–23.

¹⁰⁷ This and the remainder of this paragraph is based on Bert Nagel, *Meistergesang* (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1971), 52.

¹⁰⁸ Entner, "Der Weg," 20.

¹⁰⁹ Schmidt, *Deutsche Ars Poetica*, 100–107; Entner, "Der Weg," 21 and 82–84.

¹¹⁰ Entner, "Der Weg," 379; Philipp Rippel, "Nachwort," *Niccolò Machiavelli: Il principe/Der Fürst*, trans. and ed. Rippel (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1986), 240; Georg Braungart, "Praxis und poesis: zwei konkurrierende Textmodelle im 17. Jahrhundert," in *Rhetorik zwischen den Wissenschaften: Geschichte, System, Praxis als Probleme des "Historischen Wörterbuchs der Rhetorik,"* ed. Gert Ueding (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1991), 87–98.

¹¹¹ Entner, "Zum Dichtungsbegriff," 354ff., and Entner, "Der Weg."

¹¹² Gerard Genette, *Fiktion und Diktion*, trans. Heinz Jatho (Munich: Fink, 1992).

¹¹³ The analysis in the remainder of this paragraph derives largely from Entner, "Zum Dichtungsbegriff," 379ff.

¹¹⁴ Barner, "Spielräume," 57–58.

¹¹⁵ Joachim Knappe, "Historie" in *Mittelalter und früher Neuzeit: Begriffs- und gattungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen im interdisziplinären Kontext* (Baden-Baden: Koerner, 1984), 397–98; Joachim Knappe, "Narratio," *HWR* 6 (2003), cols. 98–106.

¹¹⁶ Entner, "Zum Dichtungsbegriff," 378–79.

¹¹⁷ Knappe, "Narratio."

¹¹⁸ John Monfasani, *George of Trebizond: A Biography and a Study of His Rhetoric and Logic* (Leiden: Brill, 1976).