

Jurlique Spies

Rhetoric, Rhetoricians and Poets



Studies in Renaissance Poetry
and Poetics

AMSTERDAM UNIVERSITY PRESS

Rhetoric, Rhetoricians and Poets

Rhetoric, Rhetoricians and Poets
Studies in Renaissance Poetry and Poetics

MARIKE Snavs

(IDS. HENK DIWTS AND TON VAN STRIEN)

AMSTERDAM UNIVERSITY PRESS

This publication has been made possible thanks to a financial contribution by the *Faculteit der Letteren* of the *vrije Universiteit*, Amsterdam, the *vereniging voor Christelijk Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek*, Amsterdam.

Cover illustration: *Eloquence*, Hendrick Goltzius, 1584
Cover design: NAP, Sabine Mannel, Amsterdam
Lay-out: Fontline, Nijmegen

ISBN 90 5356 400 4

© Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam, 1999

All rights reserved. Without limiting the rights under copyright reserved above, no part of this book may be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise), without the written permission of both the copyright owner and the author of this book.

Contents

<i>Chapter 1</i> The Rhetoric of Ronsard's 'Hymne de l'Or'	5
<i>Chapter 2</i> From Disputation to Argumentation: the French Morality Play in the Sixteenth Century	13
<i>Chapter 3</i> Between Epic and Lyric: the Genres in <i>le Scaliger's Poetices Libri Septem</i>	
<i>Chapter 4</i> Scaliger in Holland	
<i>Chapter 5</i> Developments in Sixteenth-Century Dutch Poetics: from 'Rhetoric' to 'Renaissance'	17
<i>Chapter 6</i> The Amsterdam Chamber De Eglentier and the Ideals of Erasmian Humanism	51
<i>Chapter 7</i> Rhetoric and Civic Harmony in the Dutch Republic of the Late Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Century	57
<i>Chapter 8</i> Helicon and Hills of Sand: Pagan Gods in Early Modern Dutch and European Poetry	
<i>Chapter 9</i> Amsterdam School-Orations from the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century	79
<i>Chapter 10</i> Mennonites and Literature in the Seventeenth Century	93
<i>Chapter 11</i> Women and Seventeenth-Century Dutch Literature	

Chapter 12

Argumentative Aspects of Rhetoric and Their Impact on
the Poetry of Joust van den Vondel

125

List of Works published by Marijke Spies - 1973-1999

Tabula (irutulatoria)

Editors' note on the text

This volume contains a selection of essays by prof dr. Marijke Spies on various topics in Neo-Latin, French and Dutch renaissance and 17th century literature. The selection has been made by herself; the arrangement, however, by the editors. Apart from some minor corrections and a standardisation in the references to literature, the text follows the original sources, indicated in the footnotes at the beginning of each chapter. Chapters 1 and 3 have been translated from the French by dr. Elizabeth Daverman.

Henk Duits

Ton van Strien

I

The Rhetoric of Ronsard's 'Hymne de l'Or'

For more than fifty years, ever since the 1935 publication of the complete works of Ronsard in eight volumes by Paul Laumonier, the *Hymnes* have been the subject of many fruitful studies. The relationship to classical and humanist rhetoric has been increasingly emphasized, not only concerning style but also argumentation - they both have been at the centre of these discussions. Thus, it will come as no surprise that it is with some hesitation that I take up this subject once again. Still, despite the studies of Frappier, Dassonville, Margolin, Cordon, Demerson, and Cave, there are still questions that need to be answered and points to be considered.

The aspect which I wish to consider here is the composition of the poem. So far, research on this issue has been divided into two groups of observations, both of which appear to have been accepted by scholars and which are not incomparable. On the one hand, most of the hymns are recognized to have a tripartite composition, made up of an initial apostrophe, a central argument, and a final salutation or vow. This observation, which was made by Paul Laumonier in his 1935 edition,¹ was elaborated by Michel Dassonville in 1962.² It was still in the air ten years later when Guy Demerson equated Ronsardian structure with the description of the structure of ancient hymns formulated by Natali Conti in his *Mythologie* (155J). Conti outlined a pattern of (1) praise to the gods, (2) description of their actions, and (3) final prayer. However, even though this identification has offered great insight into the structure from the point of view of the history of the genre, there are a few problems that remain. In the case of the *Hymne de l'Or*, the praise of this 'bien heureux métal' is preceded by a long 'captatio benevolentiae' about which Conti does not comment. Moreover, this tripartite structure appears to be too general to deal properly with the argumentation and, consequently, with the composition of this text, as was pointed out by Albert Py in his edition of the *Hymnes*.³ On the other hand, it was exactly this line of argument in the *Hymne de l'Or*, this discussion for and against a proposed thesis, which led scholars to propose explanatory hypotheses. In 1951, Jean Frappier expressed his disagreement about the parallels with the *i'loriiegium* of Stobaeus put forth by Laumonier, and turned attention to scholastic dialectics. His thesis, which he elaborated at length in 1965,⁴ was wiped away to a certain extent by the enthusiasm following his famous discussion with B. Wein-

herg about whether the intention of the hymn was senous or rroruc." A few years later, jean-Claude Margolin brought together the two positions by identifying the 'pseudo-scholastic' structure as a form of 'declnmatio' in the rhetorical sense, and the *Hymne de l'Or* itself as a paradoxical declaration in the tradition of the *Praise of Folly* of Erasmus." This analysis appears to have gained general assent. Writers such as Alex Cordon and Terence Cave repeat it without adding much commeur.' But again, there are still problems. The structure of the argument of the *Summa Theologica* of Thomas Aquinas, which is the basis of Frappier's reasoning, may resemble that of the *Hymne de l'Or*, but it is not the same. And the paradoxical character of this text does not necessarily evolve from the same type of debate, nor from the same tone that is found in it.

A more detailed analysis revealing the relationships with the principles of rhetoric could help solve some of these problems. There is nothing surprising in this. The relationships between poetry and rhetoric are sufficiently well known that I need not elaborate on this point any further. Nonetheless, I would like to stop for a moment to consider the *Poetics* of Scaliger. This author attributes a rhetorical background to all poetry and *a fortiori* to minor genres, among which figure the hymns.) It has been traditional to compare panegyric poetry with the demonstrative character of rhetoric.¹⁰ Scaliger, however, underscores the deliberative intent of such genres." This is an important point because such an opinion implies a certain dominance of argumentation over ornamentation.

Let us now consider Ronsard. Scaliger distinguishes different types of hymns among the works of Ronsard, and the examples he uses strongly suggest the subjects treated in the two collections of 1555 and 1556. He distinguishes mythical and genealogical hymns such as those to Bacchus, the fictive hymns such as the one to justice, natural hymns such as that to the Heavens, and finally, heroic hymns. Among the hymns that he calls to the fictive gods, he distinguishes two types: one in a more serious style, concerning gods such as Fortune, and another humbler one, concerning human nature, such as the hymn to Poverty."

I do not want to suggest that there is a direct connection between the *Poetics libri septem*, which was only published in 1561, and the *Hymnes* of Ronsard. I do not believe that the information currently available allows such an assertion. But what we can say is that the *Poetics* reflect a certain 'communis opinio', a humanist 'summa poetica' of the times, and that Ronsard was one of the followers of such a poetics - perhaps increasingly so - in which argumentation was as important as ornamentation and imitation.

The structure of the *Hymne de l'Or* is developed as follows:

- vss 1-11: Invocatio to Doris.
- vss 12-58: '*Captatio benevolentiae*' of the author (praise of riches does not imply that the author is avaricious)
- vss 59-72: *Apostrophe* to gold, encomium of its power (money is the goddess of everything).
- vss 73-89: *Proof* of its power (everyone inclines before the wealthy, they possess all power).

- vss 9^o-99: *Example* (Plato was deferential to the tyrant of Sicily).
- vss 100-1^o4: *Sentence* (clever phrase of Simonides).
- vss 105-112: *Argument* on the *utility* of gold (money is necessary to become a scholar).
- vss 113-167: *Arguments* on the *utility* and the *necessity* of gold (money is necessary for everything in life, even wisdom is gained through riches).
- vss 168-186: *Elaboration* on the argument of *necessity* (money is necessary to be able to feed oneself).
- vss 187-198: *idem ditto* (money is necessary to be able to clothe oneself).
- vss 199-224: *Flaboraticm* on the argument of *utility* (money is necessary for all sciences and arts).
- vss 225-232: *idem ditto* (money is necessary to be able to heal oneself when one is sick).
- vss 233-242: *idem ditto* (money is necessary to take care of the body and the spirit).
- vss 243-(254)
-260: *idem ditto* (money is necessary for wartime and for peacetime activities).
- vss 261-266: *Argument* of the *honour* of gold (the Ancients honoured gold).
- vss 267-316: *Elaboration* of the argument of *honour* (mythology: gold is a gift of Jupiter).
- vss 317-322: *COL/elusion* (gold must be respected for its honour and its utility).
- vss 323-333: *Prayer* (may gold come abide with me).
- vss 334-352: *Objection* (poverty is a gift from God) and *refutation* (if that were true, then the plague, famine, and death would also be gifts from God).
- vss 353-372: *Objection* (gold is transitory like the wind, *etc.*) and *refutation* (it is not as fleeting as that, kingdoms sometimes last for more than a thousand years, like those of the kings of France).
- vss 373-388: *Gbiecticn* (philosophers and the great captains of antiquity never had any riches) and *rctutaticn* (many rich men have been virtuous)
- vss 389-394: *Ohjection* (gold is nothing but sand).
- vss 395-400: *Refutation* (scandalous! it feeds us).
- vss 4^o1-416: *Obieaion* (one only gathers goods to leave them to an heir who wastes them) and *reiuatation* (I would rather leave them to my enemies than live in poverty).
- vss 417-422: *Comparison* (I would prefer a hungry lion to the state of poverty).
- vss 423-456: *Objection* (riches are the source of envy, hatred, quarrels, and all of the sins of the world) and *refutation* (that is rather more the case for poverty).

- vss 457-468: *Cbicaion* (rich people are always afraid, whereas the poor sleep peacefully out of doors).
- vss 469-482: *Refutation* (kings know how to defend themselves and are never afraid, whereas the poor who sleep out of doors succumb to illness).
- vss 483-506: *Conclusion* (poverty be cursed).
- vss 507-527: *inoectioe* against *uhuscs* (waste not your goods).
- vss 528-550: *Admonition* (be charitable and give alms to the poor).
- vss 551-556: *tui-octioc* against abuses (do not be avaricious).
- vss 557-564: *idem ditto*.
- vss 565-(572.): *Admonition* (be happy).
- vss (573)-576: *Example* (Priam).
- vss 577-(602.): *Examples* (the father of Ulysses; Tanralus, dropsical man).
- vss (603)-616: *Admonition* (enjoy your riches as long as you live).
- vss 617-624: *Salutation* (it would take a king's treasurer to praise you fittingly rather than a 'schoolboy').

In this analysis, I have followed the divisions indicated by the paragraphs in the printed text. There are only three passages in which this division does not coincide with my reading: vss 254-260, vs. 573 and vs. 603; however, these are variations that are of no consequence.

What we see is a structure that conforms to a great extent to rhetorical form. In its most generally accepted form, "We recognize the exordium (vss 1-58) 'ab auditorum persona', here Doras, and certainly 'ab persona nostra', the author himself. This is the best way to obtain the acceptance of his audience, which is extremely important when the question to be treated is a paradox, or rather, is shocking for the public." It is clearly not a question of narration.¹ This is followed by the confirmation (vss 59-333). It is divided into a proposition or exposition, that is to say, the presentation of the thesis to be proved, "supported by different proofs, such as the testimony, the example, and the aphorism (vss 105-333). This division is common to most rhetoricians.¹⁷ The argumentation rests on the 'loci' of necessity, utility, and honourability, which belong to the deliberative genre and are also recommended by Scaliger in this context." Next comes the refutation (vss 334-16), made up, firstly, of all the objections to which that can be imagined and their successive refutations (vss 334-506), then of invective against those who misuse wealth, and the refutation of these in the form of admonitions (vss 507-616).¹⁹ Lastly we find the peroration (vss 617-624) which very succinctly summarizes the principle points of the argument and in which there is a return to the motif of the exordium to assure once more the acceptance of the public.²⁰

As rhetorical as this structure is, we recognize, nonetheless, in the more emotive exordium and peroration and in the more rational confirmation and refutation, the tripartite form identified by Dassonville. But we also find the characteristics of the hymn as outlined by G. Dernerson. Ronsard placed the proposition after the exordium by giving it the form of an apostrophe praising gold, thus as a true homage in keeping with the definition of Conti. And at the end he places the

peroration, giving it the form of a salutation, which is again a characteristic of a hymn rather than of rhetorical speech. He even includes a final prayer, to which Conti seems to attach a special importance.²¹ Ronsard gives it at the end of his positive argument, that is, before the refutation. This is clearly the most typically rhetorical part of his poem. We could conclude that the form of the hymn as Ronsard knew it from classical and neo-Latin authors, and perhaps also from the theoretical reflections of such writers as Conti, was given a rhetorical composition. An argumentative structure which is not dialectical - such as that of the *Summa Theologica* of Saint Thomas - but rhetorical, was appropriate for such a composition. The one resembles the other, but they are not identical.

The rhetorical argumentation of the *Hymne de l'Or* may be characterized as that of a deliberative discourse on all indefinite and abstract topic, or, in other words, as a thesis. We know that the thesis in the rhetorical sense played quite an important role in classical and humanist education. Stemming from dialectics, it originally consisted of both an argument for and against a proposed thesis. This 'in utrumque parrem disserere' was practised as all exercise in schools, but in the case of a real oration, the orator opted for only one position and only gave the argument against in his refutation. Man; van der Loel, who recently finished a study on the 'declamatio' of the humanists, emphasizes that humanists such as Agricola, Erasmus, and Ramus gave preference to the thesis, in keeping with Cicero, because it allowed for the ideal union between rhetoric and philosophy.²²

We are allowed to think that Ronsard was inspired in writing the *Hymne de l'Or*, on the theoretical level, by this thesis and at the same time was following the example of school exercises. As I have just pointed out, the theory of the thesis is reflected in the composition of the poem as a whole. But we also find a reference in the exordium to the principle of 'in utramque partem disserere' where it originates. In which Ronsard says:

Il peur estre qu'un autre apres moy surviendra
 Qui chanter par deir la Povere voudra:
 Quiconque soir celuy, la chanre sans envye:

(vss 53-55)

It is my belief that Ronsard followed examples of theses found in the editions of 'progymnasmata' of his time in the creation of his poem. These 'progymnasmata' were elementary exercises in rhetoric that were taught in secondary schools and during the first year of university. There were 'progymnasmata' by Theon, Hermogenes, and Aphthonius. Those of Aphthonius in particular, which had been translated from the Greek by Agricola among others, were extremely popular in the sixteenth and seventeenth century.²³ A great number of examples were added to the edition with a commentary by Reinhard Lorichius, whose definitive version appeared for the first time in 1546, among them the theses on poverty and riches. French prints of this edition were in existence as early as 1555.²⁴

The first of these examples is on the aphorism of Ecclesiastes 'pecuniae obediunt omnia', which corresponds to a great extent to that of the *Hymne de l'Or*. It is not an example of a complete thesis, but of one of its parts, namely 'chreia',

which contains only a dry line of argumentation.²⁵ As with our poem (vss 12-58), it begins with an exordium called 'a laude' which explains the moral quality of the topic, *in casu* the wisdom of the king of Israel. This is followed by the argument, first of all, 'ab expositione', which establishes that everyone considers riches to be a queen and serves her, exactly as Ronsard affirms in his proposition (vss 59-72). The argumentation 'a causa' follows, which says that everything that is beautiful and glorious comes from riches, and the argument 'a contrariis', which decries the material misery of poverty and speaks of the abundance of riches. Ronsard uses an identical composition ('a causa' vss 105-316, 'a contrario' vss 334-616), but the arguments he gives are different. I will come back to this point. In the Aphthonius edition of Loricinus, there are 'a simili' arguments that follow in which it is said that everyone serves the wealthy, just as Ronsard says, in verses 73-89; and 'ab exemplo' and 'a testimonia' whose contents are different from those in the *Hymne de l'Or*, as are those of the conclusion."

Let me make myself clear: the correspondence I wish to point out has primarily to do with composition. We know that as far as the contents of his poem are concerned, Ronsard borrowed from the *Hewilegiunt* of Srobncus, and in my opinion a great deal more than P. Laurionier suggests in his edition of the complete works.^v However, there are some concrete similarities, particularly in the beginning of the poem: the exordium, the proposition, and the 'a simili' argument.

What is more striking, perhaps, is the fact that in the body of his poem Ronsard follows the second example found in this edition of Aphthonius. This similarity concerns the refutation (vss 334-506). Almost all of the arguments for and against mentioned by Ronsard are found here, but reversed: riches are blamed and poverty praised. These are arguments that are also found in Stobaeus.^v

What convinces me of the existence of a relationship between the Aphthonius edition of Loricinus and the *Hymne de l'Or* is the third example. This time it has to do with a real thesis, that of the theme of 'divitias non esse summum bonum'. What is striking here is that the refutation is constructed on an accumulation of objections and refutations, as is the case of Ronsard's poem (vss 334-482). Almost all of the other examples of theses found in this edition use such a construction, which proves, moreover, that it is characteristic of the genre. We also find, once again, a few concrete similarities, among them the stereotypical catalogue of evils and sins that stem from riches, and the assertion, that to the contrary, it is poverty that leads to ill, an argument that Ronsard uses in his refutation (vss. 445-456).²⁹

Finally, I believe that there is enough evidence to affirm that Ronsard very probably made use of the Loricinus edition of Aphthonius' *Progymnasmata* in the composition of the *Hymne de l'Or*. Obviously, we cannot exclude the possibility that he might have used another elementary book on rhetoric. The instructions and the examples in such books were stereotypical to a very great extent. Nonetheless, I do not know of any edition which contains examples so similar to the poem of Ronsard. Furthermore, the popularity of the Loricinus

edition, judging from the number of printings in France, makes it very probable that Ronsard was acquainted with it.

His interest in the rhetorical thesis corresponds to that of Erasmian humanism in this form of instruction; implemented by Ramus, for example, in the collège de Presles at the same time that Ronsard was writing his first profane hymns.^v This does not mean that there is nothing in the *Hymne de l'Or* that does not reflect his own genius. The notion that something is honourable when it is characterized as a gift from the gods can be learned from rhetoric.¹¹ But it took a Ronsard to turn it into the great mythological scene we find in the *Hymne de l'Or* (vss 267-316). The fact that irony is the style proper to refutation can be read in Quintilian.^v But it is Ronsard who uses it to ridicule the supercilious manner of traditional arguments praising poverty. This flexibility of style, moving from serious to light, was seen by J.C. Margolin as distinctive of the paradoxical character of the *Hymne de l'Or*.[;] Let us add to his comment that the variations in tone follow the movement of the argument very carefully: self-mockery in the exordium, followed by the relative sobriety of the presentation of the arguments of necessity and utility, but elevation when he speaks of honour; irony in the refutation, and indignation when it comes to the admonitions against misuse. This is a rather simple style in its entirety, adorned only in a few of the more elevated passages, as is appropriate for a hymn to a 'fictitious god tied to human nature' as Scaliger puts it.[<]

The contention that this hymn is paradoxical is true only in the sense given to this word in the sixteenth century. A 'paradox' was the defence of a proposition opposed by public opinion. Contrary to the 'adox' that treats inferior or even vile matters in a comical manner, the paradox is in fact completely serious.¹⁵ When it includes Irony it is only to serve a higher purpose. It is not the tone that has been found to be 'comical' in the *Hymne de l'Or* that defines this hymn as paradoxical, but rather its moral content. The *Praise of Folly* could be defined in the same way.¹⁷ By definition, this genre lends itself to the educational ideal of Erasmian humanism. However, the moral lesson at which Ronsard arrives does not stem from Erasmus, rather, it reflects the mentality of economic progress which characterized that period, as pointed out by Frappier.^s The rhetorical structure of his hymn does not allow us to suppose that the admonition at the end to spend one's riches and to 'prendre avant la mort un plaisir de la vie' (vss 565-616) should be seen as a wink from the author. It was not intended to 'avenge' the poet's condition at the Court during the time of Henry II, as asserts J.C. Margolin,¹⁹ but rather as a 'laudatio temporis sui' which recognized riches as the economic force that was the basis of the new prosperity.

From Disputation to Argumentation: the French Morality Play in the Sixteenth Century*

Morality plays can be characterized as moral arguments put forward by means of personified concepts. The characters in these plays are philosophical, ethical or psychological concepts or phenomena; their interrelations express the conceptual connections among them; and the narrative portrays the expression of a - usually moral, but sometimes also religious or political - lesson. In most cases we see a central protagonist, Mankind, on its, or rather his, way to Wisdom or salvation, respectively helped and hindered in this endeavor by positive and negative forces, mostly virtues and vices and their adherents. The protagonist may be split up into two or more characters or may represent an institution or an event, such as the church or a dinner, instead of a personage; the virtues and vices may be supplemented by religious or institutional personages and personifications; and the goal may be hell instead of heaven. But none of this affects the basic model.'

Given all this, I asked myself whether the structure of these plays might reflect the prevailing techniques of argumentation of the period, and, moreover, whether the changes those techniques underwent when scholastic logic was, at least partly, superseded by humanist dialectic, might have had their influence on the development of the genre as a whole. I found some support for this hypothesis in Joel B. Altman's book on *The Tudor Play of Mind*, published in 1978, in which he argues that in about the year 1500, a rhetorical argumentative type of drama was developed in the humanist circles around Thomas More, based upon the traditional morality play. In these dramas, the Ciceronian way of arguing in *utramque partem*, tending towards the exploration of possible alternatives, replaced the deductive logic which served in the older plays to demonstrate the accepted and unshakeable vision of the world.

Altman, in my opinion, does not, and at that time probably could not, prove his point very convincingly, and he even suggests that arguing in *utramque partem* does not occur in the older dramatic tradition.² Given, however, the preponderant role which argumentation pro and contra played in the scholastic school system, it seems necessary to define the differences between this form of dispute and the more open form of Ciceronian debate before coming to any conclusions

*In: *Rhetorica. A journal of the History of Rhetoric*: vol. 10 (1992), p. 261-271.

regarding the development of drama. In my research into Dutch morality plays of the sixteenth century, such differentiation has proven rather fruitful.'

In this essay, I will try to demonstrate the role of scholastic logic and humanist dialectic in sixteenth century drama on the basis of some French morality plays. I hope that my observations will constitute a model that may be useful for the analysis of this type of play in other languages as well. The German situation in particular may prove to be very interesting, given the perspective which my analysis of the French plays seems to open.

Before concentrating on the differences between scholastic and humanist ways of arguing, however, I must spend some time examining the dominant narrative forms of the French 'moralité', as set out by Werner Helmich in his study on allegorical forms in French fifteenth- and sixteenth-century theater.

The most important form is that of the 'pilgrimage of life', in which Mankind, equipped with all sorts of allegorical attributes such as the Scarf of Faith and the Staff of Hope, travels among personified virtues and vices such as Reason, Religion, Laziness, and Rebellion and to symbolic places like the Inn of Ruin and the Garden of Worldly Pleasures. This motif became popular thanks to the fourteenth-century non-dramatic *Pelerinage de Vie Humaine*, written in two parts by Guillaume de Deguileville in 1331 and 1350.⁴ An example of a morality play on this theme is *Bien Advisé, Mal Advisé*, performed in Rennes in 1439, which had two protagonists - a good one choosing the narrow road by way of Reason, Faith, Humility, Confession, and so forth, to Heavenly Bliss, and a bad one choosing the broad road to the Inn of Ruin and then by way of Poverty, Despair, and so forth, to Hell.⁵ Sometimes, the whole conception of a pilgrimage is superseded by that of a purely moral development, as in *L'Omme Pccbeur*, published in about 1494, in which Mankind first comes to Sin, but after being confronted by God with Illness and Death, is converted, and by Confession and Penance reaches Paradise.'

Quite different is the theme of the 'battle of virtues and vices', which originates in the fourth century with Prudentius' *Psychomachia*. In the *Moralité des sept péchés mortels et des sept vertus*, written at some point between 1380 and 1420, the battles have become discussions: one by one, the vices are won over by the corresponding virtues." In *L'Homme juste et l'Homme Mondain* by Suon Bouguin, performed in 1476, this theme is combined with that of the moral development of two different protagonists, which we encountered in *Bien Advisé, Mal Advisé*. The virtues and vices try in turn to convert or seduce the two central protagonists respectively, until at last the virtues definitively capture l'Homme Juste and the vices l'Homme Mondain.'

Notwithstanding their different narrative themes, the structural framework of these plays is essentially the same - namely, that of a series of consecutive stages. This is most evident in the 'pilgrimage of life' model. It is true that two alternatives are always presented, the good and the bad, but especially in the earlier plays of this type, these alternatives do not confront each other. In the plays of the 'battle of virtues and vices' model, there is of course nothing but confrontation. But there, too, the overall structure is one of consecutive stages, each containing a separate discussion, without the play as a whole being affected by it.

If we consider, however, a somewhat later play of the pilgrimage type such as *L'Homme l'ecbeur*; the dominant structural form is less evident. To make this clear, let us first have a look at its contents.

L'Homme Pecheur, Sinful Mankind, is given an Angel by God, as well as Conscience, Reason, Understanding, and Free Will, to assist him on the road. But Lucifer mobilizes his devils together with Sin, Worldliness, Sensuality, Desperation, Shame, and Fear. In the beginning, the attempts by Sensuality to seduce him are prevented by the good forces, but after Lucifer has sent Concupiscence to assist Sensuality, Mankind gives in. Under the constant protests of Conscience and the Angel, he is brought to Sin. From Sin he comes to Pride, and so forth, to Laziness and all the other sins, until at last he is put on the throne of Pride and dressed up in its garments. At that point, God, at the instigation of Reason and Understanding, allows a trial to take place in heaven in which Justice, on the one side, and Compassion and Mary, on the other, plead respectively against and in favor of Mankind. The conclusion is that Mankind will be confronted by Illness and Death. Initially, Illness is defeated and Mankind continues on his way to Luxury. After a second trial, however, Illness returns and introduces Death. Now Mankind recalls Conscience, who urges him to confess. But before he does so, there is a third trial in which the Devil, against the objections of the Angel and Mary, persuades Justice to condemn Mankind to hell. Now Mankind leans towards Desperation, but Reason and the other good forces persuade him to appeal to Compassion. With the help of Compassion, Mankind reaches Repentance and notwithstanding the persistent attacks from the Devil, Despair, and all the Sins, he comes to the Priest who hears his Confession, and all Sins are banned to hell. After a final trial won by Compassion, Mankind is brought to Penance and from there to the different Virtues and Prayer, Fasting, and Alms. A last attack from Concupiscence is beaten off with the help of Faith, Hope, and Charity. Then, at last God, advised by Divine Wisdom, commands Malady and Death to liberate Mankind's soul, which with Mary's mediation is guided to heaven by Michael, Gabriel, and Raphael, while the Devil is sent back to hell.

I hope my summary of this tear-jerking story enables you to grasp its most important structural features. Mankind goes step by step from bad to worse, from Sensuality to Concupiscence to Sin to Pride, and so on, until Illness and Death reverse his course and he continues, again step by step, from Conscience to Repentance, and so on, to heaven. The constant attacks on Mankind by Conscience in the first half of the Journey and by the Devil and his minions in the second half, do not seem to affect the consecutive character of this development. This is the original 'pilgrimage of life' model. But in this case, it is not merely interrupted, but interwoven with the model of the 'trial in heaven,' which, of course, has an argumentative structure. It is difficult to see which of these structures is the more important, but I tend to favor the consecutive one, because the outcome of the different phases of the process - Illness, Death, Despair, and Compassion - are but steps in the mere succession of events.

Incidentally, this consecutive structure also explains one of the most striking features of these plays: their extreme length. *Ricli Advisé, Mal Advisé* runs to eight thousand verses, and *L'Homme Pecheur* contains 110 less than twenty-two

thousand. Given the succession of separate moments, the possibilities of expansion and addition are virtually unlimited.

All this, however, was to change. After about 1500, not only do we no longer find such lengthy plays, but the plays that were written at that time also show the structure of the scholastic disputation far more clearly.

It has often been remarked that the *quaestio disputata*, being one of the most popular didactic phenomena of the medieval school system, had a considerable influence on the literature of that time. This applies in the first place to philosophical texts: 'But in more poetic literature, its impact is traceable too, for instance in the handling of those themes of the 'battle of virtues and vices' and the 'pilgrimage of life' which we have already encountered.'

Scholastic disputation was not about really debatable matters, but served to give intellectual clarification of and insight into the logical coherence of the universe." In its most elaborate form, developed in the course of the thirteenth century, it consisted of: (a) a short exposition by the master of the thesis to be discussed; (b) an often very complex debate pro and contra by one or more opponents and respondents (the *disputatio* in a stricter sense); after which (c) the master again, being an independent authority, gave the final solution. Originally, this solution had a minor role, but in the course of time it developed into the most important section of the disputation as a whole. It was often divided into different parts and supported by arguments, and it could be followed by (d) the refutation, also by the master, of the objections posed. Solution and refutation together formed the *determinatio*.:- As regards its logical contents, the disputation consisted of a network of syllogistic deductions from a universal proposition which was not itself brought into question.;

I needed to recapitulate these well-known facts to clarify the points I have been tracing about the influence of scholastic logic on the morality plays. For instance, the trial in heaven in *t. Ommc Pccheur* shows clearly the structure of a disputation in four parts, with the Devil and Justice as opponents, the Angel, Compassion, and Mary as respondents, and God as the independent Judge.

Of the numerous morality plays, written from about 1500 onwards, which were published by Hehuich in the second and third parts of his collection of *Moraliutes [rancaiscs]*; no fewer than twelve show more or less clearly the formal structure as well as the logical contents of a *quaestio disputata*. One play, *La Vel/rliuol/ de [oeepb]*, has a libelous plot and is therefore excluded. The structure of the six remaining plays seems to me to correspond to another, more open form of argumentation.

The twelve plays mentioned all show a confrontation between the opposed entities, be it by way of argumentation or by physical combat. And in all cases, this confrontation is brought to an end by the verdict of an independent authority. This judgment may be given in the form of an extensive argument supported by all sorts of proofs, as is the case with the verdict of Experience in *La Condamnacion des Banauetz* (1507 edition) written by Nicolas de La Chesnave between 1503 and 1505, or the judgment may be presented as a simple final solution such as the one given by Divine Providence at the end of Louis Des-Masures' *Bergeric Spirituelle* (1566 edition)." But in all cases, the decision states a

universal and unquestionable truth which puts an end to all further discussion. What follows can only be the unfolding of the consequences - sending the bad forces to hell and the good ones to heaven, as in *Les Blasphémateurs du Nom de Dieu* for example" - which may be regarded as equivalent to the master's final refutation in a real disputation.

Confrontation between opposed entities and resolution by an independent authority (God, Divine Will, Heaven, Truth, Wisdom, and the like) by way of a universal proposition are the features that in my opinion characterize these plays as staged disputations. Again, to make things clear I will give a somewhat more extensive analysis of one such play. Because of its resemblance to *L'Omme? Pccheur*, I have chosen *Le Couvert d'Humanue*, written between 1532 and 1550 by Jean d'Abundance.¹⁶

As a matter of fact, *Le Gouvert* should be placed in the same literary tradition as *L'Omme Pecheur*, *Le Gouvert* may even be regarded as a rigorously abridged and reworked version of *L'Omme Pccheur*. In both plays, the theme of 'the pilgrimage of life' is combined with that of 'the trial in heaven'. The pilgrimage theme in *Le Couvert* even seems to dominate the narrative still more than is the case in the other play. But when we look at the structure of *Le Couvert's* argument we nevertheless recognize a disputation.

Unlike *L'Omme Pecheur*, *Le Gouvert* presents the moral development of Mankind as a real pilgrimage of life. Directed by Temptation to the house of Mortal Sin, Mankind is approached by Remorse. The confrontation between Remorse and, on the other side, Mortal Sin, Temptation, and Luxury, ends with the triumph of the former. Mankind, now dressed as a pilgrim, goes on his way to Penance, helped by Remorse, but constantly attacked by the negative forces. After being admonished by Penance, he falls asleep and then is assaulted again by Temptation and the other vices; and this time he gives in. Real as the pilgrimage may seem with the house of Mortal Sin, the garden of Penance, and the pilgrim's garments that Mankind puts on the play's moral content is nevertheless developed by means of constant discussions between the positive and negative forces and between these forces and Mankind himself. Also, the quality of debate is far greater than in the earlier plays in the same tradition, including *L'Omme Pecheur*. This debate is put to an end by the appearance of Divine Justice and Compassion, who together come to the final verdict: Mankind will be given a last chance if he sends Sin and Error resolutely away. And Mankind does promise to do so.

It is this final solution, ending all possible discussion instead of furnishing just another stepping stone on a continuing path, that gives *Le Gouvert* its character as a disputation. At the same time, this solution also puts an end to the play itself. This too, I think, is a characteristic feature of the disputational morality play, which for this very reason tends to be much shorter than the older consecutive plays.

It is remarkable that, as far as I am aware, this type of play only appeared towards the end of the fifteenth century, when scholasticism was waning. But then, in those times, unlike our own, developments always progressed rather slowly. Despite this fact, not long afterwards still another type of play emerges.

As I said, there are six texts in Helmich's collection of French morality plays that are characterized by what I would like to call a more 'open' form of argumentation." The discussion in these texts is not only more sophisticated than in those of the *disputatio* type, but what is more important in this respect, they are totally devoid of anything akin to an independent authority giving a final and irrefutable solution to the question under discussion. The debate generates its own conclusions by way of opposition, refutation, and counterrefutation. So the argumentative situation is not one of establishing a system of syllogistic deductions from a universal proposition, as in scholastic times, but the progression of, as Melancthon puts it, *rationes contra rationes*:"

To put it bluntly, this is the kernel of the dialectical revolution brought about by Rudolph Agricola and made popular by Melancthon and other humanists." One of the principal features of this revolution was, for instance, the redefinition of the concept of *locus*, which since Boethius' time had assumed the role of a universal proposition serving as the foundation for argument, and which now resumed its original Ciceronian function of an 'empty' residence for propositions and, as such, a means of inquiry.") Another feature is the greater subtlety of the strategies of refutation.²¹

Again, it is possible to illustrate my argument by means of a play in which Sinful Mankind plays the central role. This is Henry de Barran's *L'Homme inuifié par Foy* [Mankind justified by Faith], written in 1552 and published, probably in Geneva, in 1554.²² On the title page, this play is called a tragic comedy, and, like the new Renaissance comedies and tragedies, it is divided into acts (in his case five) and scenes. Nevertheless, it is undoubtedly a morality play.

In the beginning of this play, Mankind is pulled by the Spirit of Anguish, which is sent by the Law, from one side, and by Sin, which is sent by Satan, from the other. 'Pulled,' to be sure, in terms of discussion. All reminiscence of a real pilgrimage of life is absent, except for the fact that at a certain moment, Mankind is blindfolded. In these discussions, Sin is, as in *L'Homme Pecheur*; assisted by Concupiscence (who blindfolds Mankind) and by Death, and the Law is assisted by the Rabbi and Paul. The Rabbi and Paul, however, also have their own discussion; the Rabbi advocates a stern approach and Paul a loving one. After Law has torn the bandage away from his eyes, Mankind in his despair calls for Death and finally, at the instigation of Satan and against the advice of Paul, decides to follow the Rabbi, who hands him over to the Law. Again blindfolded, now by the hand of the Rabbi, Man follows Law and, in doing so, feels free to concede to Concupiscence again. After a long discussion between the Rabbi, Law, and Spirit of Anguish on one side, and Paul on the other side, it is Paul who this time tears the bandage away. At that very moment, Satan, Sin, and Death again assault Mankind. The Rabbi hears, but Paul calls Faith and Grace; and when Mankind is unable to grasp the hands they reach out to him, Paul also calls the Spirit of Love. These virtues chase away Spirit of Anguish, Law, and afterwards also Satan, Sin, and Death. Mankind is converted to Jesus Christ and prays for forgiveness. Satan, Sin and Death reappear but do not get the chance to lead Mankind astray, who professes faith and hope to be the only forces of peace on earth and continues praying.

I hope this summary again helps to make my points clear. First, of course, the narrative of *L'Homme iusti(ie par Fay* is in fact a dialectical argument. Mankind is not sent from one moral station to the other, as in *L. Comme Pecccur*, but is convinced over and over again by arguments put forward sometimes in a visual, but mostly in a verbal way. What is more, the quality of discussion in *L'Homme justifié par Foy* is more sophisticated, even more sophisticated than in *Le Couvert*, thanks to the additional debates between the Rabbi and Paul, between Grace with Spirit of Love, and Law with Spirit of Anguish, and to the different modes of refutation used. The second and more important point, however, is that unlike *Le Couvert*, in *L'Homme iusti(ie par Fay* there is no independent authority - that is, someone not involved in the debate, who gives the final solution. The forces which are introduced to save Mankind - such as Faith and Grace - are introduced as a result of positions taken in the discussion, and they take part in the rest of it. And to the extent that a universal proposition is expressed at the end - that is, that Faith is the only force of spiritual peace - it does not have a status that differs from any other universal proposition put forward earlier in the discussion. Here, the universal proposition seems more like a conclusion to which Mankind comes than the foundation of the argument as a whole.

In short, not only the structure of the play, but also its contents, show the characteristics of a dialectical argumentation more than those of a logical disputation.²³

As regards the question of the *loci*, a comparison of the argumentative analysis of these types of morality plays with Melancthon's treatment of the *loci* used in the *genIs didascalicus* (the sermon) could prove fruitful.²⁴ An additional argument for this suggestion might be that five of the SIX plays of this type that I have seen, have a pronounced Protestant character. The sixth one cannot, I think, be characterized as such, but it was at least printed in 1558 in the city of Gand, at that time a stronghold of the new creed. It was the Protestant school system, as introduced by Melancthon, which made the new dialectical way of reasoning an essential part of rhetoric, and in doing so, contributed a great deal to its popularity." From this perspective, it would indeed be interesting, as I said at the beginning of this paper, to look into the German situation to see if my hypothesis about a relation between the morality play and humanist dialectic is corroborated.

3

Between Epic and Lyric: the Genres in j.C, Scaliger's *Poetices Libri Septem*'

Julius Caesar Scaliger's *Poetices Libri Septem* - undoubtedly the most elaborate poetical treatise published during the sixteenth century - has in modern times received quite divergent critical appraisals. While in the 1940s no one less than Bernard Wemberg emphasized 'the consistency and the general integrity of Scaliger's system', other critics could not find much coherence either in the book as a whole, or in certain sections of it.' This is especially true of the description of the genres in book III. Francois Lecerle, for instance, in his contribution to the colloquium on Scaliger's poetics held in 1983 at the Centre d'Erudes Superieures de la Renaissance de Tours, postulated that Scaliger's treatment of this subject bore witness to the most rudimentary principles of organization only and represented not much more than a medieval catalogue of forms.'

In this article, I will take the opposite stand, arguing that the system lying behind Scaliger's definition of the different genres as well as their hierarchical organization, is based on well-considered categories, which are central to his conception of poetry. As Weinberg showed, this conception consists of two sets of references: to the norms of nature and to the norms of the audience;' all other words, imitation and rhetoric. But the way in which these two sets of references interact, forming an integrated and consistent poetical theory, is not pursued by Weinberg nor, as far as I know, by anybody else. This interaction can perhaps be detected most clearly in Scaliger's genre theory, which gives such a good account of the broad range of poetical forms that characterized his age. Scaliger's poetics is indeed, first and foremost a theory of explanation, a means by which to come to terms with a huge mass of empirical data, augmenting and changing in the course of time at that.» Its prescriptive meaning is based on the conviction that an empirical analysis of earlier achievements could help to direct one's endeavours in any field.

To prove my point, I begin by presenting a survey of general principles as formulated in the first three books of Scaliger's poetics.

In the first chapter of Book I, the author gives a functional definition: poetry imitates with the objective of teaching. As an art of imitation, poetry renders things in words, and in doing so differs from history or science only because it also represents non-existing things or things as they could or should be.' This

* In: Heinrich F. Pöschel (ed.), *Renaissance-Poetik/Renaissance Poetics*. Berlin/New York, Walter de Gruyter, 1994 (p. 260-270).

sounds like the well-known Aristotelian definition of poetry, but as I will argue later, Scaliger transforms Aristotle's concept of poeticalimitation into something quite different.

To Scaliger, however, and this in direct opposition to Aristotle, imitation is not the only characteristic of poetry. In order to teach, it must also embrace all means of persuasion as taught by the art of rhetoric: demonstrative, as well as argumentative and deliberative. Poets must argue the same points of justice, profit, and honour as orators, organizing their arguments according to the same divisions of 'status' and the same rules of disposition."

In between these two issues, Scaliger states rather cursorily that this kind of poetry has grown out of a more primitive type, consisting of songs and entertainments only, to which imitations and persuasions from oratory were added over the course of time: The importance of this remark becomes apparent in the subsequent chapters of Book I, which are primarily historical in scope.

Chapter 2 opens with a discussion of some etymological questions and then presents a historical sketch of the origins and early development of poetry. The final result is the formulation of criteria to make differentiations within poetry itself: that which is imitated (that is, the content), the form of imitation (the verse), and the mode of imitation.⁸ The last of these, the mode of imitation, is further elaborated in Chapter 3, where Scaliger distinguishes three such 'modes': the narrative, in which the author himself speaks; the dialogical, in which the participants rather than the author are represented as speaking; and the mixed, in which both direct and indirect language are used.⁹

It is important to note that, in Scaliger's opinion and in opposition to most Aristotelian poetics, these modes do not constitute genres. He is most explicit on that point: each of these modes can be used for quite different subjects and in combination with quite different types of verse, and every single combination constitutes a separate genre.¹⁰ To Aristotle, the imitation of an action constituted the very essence of poetry. Consequently, to him the first criterion for differentiating between various forms of poetry was how true to life an imitation is: the dramatic, being the most 'realistic', is the highest form, the lyric the lowest, and the epic, as a combination of the two, falls in between them. Only within these *genera* a further differentiation was made, which per force involved just the content - high, low - and the corresponding types of verse." Scaliger's less rigid combinatorial system makes it possible to account for a far more differentiated field of poetical phenomena, as we shall see.

After these first three, very fundamental chapters, the remainder of Book I continues the historical survey, albeit by separate genres, starting with the pastoral as the oldest form.¹¹ The descriptions given in these chapters do not, however, constitute poetical norms. Those will be given in Book III. What Scaliger presents here so abundantly are again, as previously in Chapter 2, empirical data which support his view on the historical development of poetry, from which his genological criteria are deduced." The criteria themselves, as well as the genres constituted by them, will be further discussed in Books II and III.

At the beginning of Book II, Scaliger returns to the two criteria not yet elaborated: content (that which is imitated) and form (the verse in which the Imitation

is cast). There may be some misunderstanding here, because he uses words other than those we are now accustomed to. In accordance with Platonic philosophy, he argues that the things treated in poetry - the 'res' - are the 'images' of abstract, incorruptible 'ideas'. These 'ideas' are the 'forms' that are to be cast into the mould of matter to become real things. In turn, in a poem these 'things' are the 'forms' to be moulded into the substance of language. In other words, the Platonic 'forms' constitute what we call the content, and the linguistic substance constitutes what we call the form of a poem. Book II discusses versification as a specifically poetic linguistic substance.¹⁴

Book III is for the greater part devoted to the 'forms' or 'ideas' that constitute the contents of a poem, as clearly emerges from its title: 'Idea. Rerum divisio'. Here, Scaliger takes the opportunity to equate his conception of 'idea', which until now has been Platonic, with the Aristotelian one, since an Aristotelian would argue that the idea of a house already exists in the mind of the architect before it is built.¹⁵ Again, this is important, because it directly concerns Scaliger's conception of 'imitation'. As things themselves are but the imitations of ideal abstract forms, the poet has the opportunity to 'idealize' reality. In my opinion, this is what Scaliger means when he repeats Aristotle's idea, saying that the poet renders things in words as they could or should be; or, referring to Cicero's famous words, says that he creates in the manner of an 'alternative God'.¹⁶ In my opinion, the very way Scaliger talks about Virgil as the 'divine' who distilled the 'idea' of things from nature in an exemplary fashion, supports this view.¹⁷

What is most important as far as the history of genres is concerned is that the 'forms' that are imitated, whether 'ideas' or 'things', are the different entities and aspects of reality, the *substantia* and *accidentia*. persons with their different qualities, fortunes, ages, activities, families, habits, ways of speaking, moods, morals, and so on; things such as horses, swords, and books; deeds such as battles and sacrifices, places such as heaven, earth, and sea, and so on.¹⁸ This may be Aristotelian: not Aristotelian poetics, as we have seen, but Aristotelian philosophy.

From Book VII, in which Scaliger elaborates on certain points which were unclear, he emphasizes that every expression of things in words is indeed an 'imitation'. Fictional representations should differ from simple statements only quantitatively, because they give more specifications. So the statement 'Aeneas fights' is as much an imitation as the vivid description by means of additions about when, where, and how this event occurred.¹⁹ Following this train of thought he sees the *Aeneis* of Virgil not as the most successful imitation of one complete action, but as the ultimate storehouse of perfect examples of all possible 'things', including all sorts of actions. Scaliger elaborates on this, analysing and quoting, for no less than twenty-three chapters.²⁰

All this concerns what Wellberg has called 'references to the norms of nature', the 'things' to be imitated. But as there are so many of them, they may only constitute the structure of a poem in an exceptional case: that of one coherent action. Many poems, however, contain imitations of several different things and of things that are not actions. As we will see, it is on this point that the 'references to the norms of the audience' come in.

After twenty-three chapters, in Chapter 25 of Book III, Scaliger rather unexpectedly comes back to the question of historical development. He states that originally, poets sang only to amuse, while orators had persuasion as their sole objective. Later, however, they borrowed from each other what they were missing." These are not gratuitous remarks, but indicate that to him contemporary poetics was indeed the outcome of a historical process. Different poetical genres could be discussed from a more normative point of view only after the different constituents of poetry, as they had emerged in the course of time, were described.

Nor can it have been accidental that the orators are called in again exactly at this point of the book's argument. For if teaching is the ultimate function of a poem, its general argument must, per force, be persuasive and its general structure has to be defined at least partially by persuasive elements.» In this connection, the fact that in the beginning of Book III the purpose of imitation is introduced as a fourth criterion of poetry, may perhaps also be regarded as relevant.>' In any case, the structure of most poetical genres is defined by Scaliger in rhetorical terms, as we will see later.

Before discussing poetical genres, however, Scaliger first enters into some other prerequisites of poetry. These are knowledge, which he terms 'prudence,' and the different means to hold the attention of the public: *uarietas*, *efficaCla*, and *suavitas*. Since the figures of thought can help a lot to attain these last three qualities, he presents a rather extensive catalogue of them, too.« As to the structure of poems, only in the chapter on *rarietas* does he make remarks on altering the historical sequence of events to keep the public in suspense and avoid tediousness.» For the rest, structure depends on a poem's genre. The rest of Book III is devoted to the different types of genres.

Scaliger discusses poetical genres in thirty-one chapters, containing about the same number of different types of poems, ranging from the epic to the elegy and epigram. The order of this so-called catalogue of poetical forms is determined by the degree to which they fulfil what Scaliger calls 'universality'. The poem containing the noblest and the most complete spectrum of imitations - that is, the greatest number and the best quality of images of different 'things' - as well as containing both possible modes of representation - the narrative and the dialogical - is the most universal and, therefore, the most prominent.v While the epic - for that of course is the genre that fulfils all these requirements - represents the ideal universality, the other end of the scale is represented by the small poem covering one single subject, expressed by the author himself in a song or in a form derived from it.:' Between these two extremes, the sequence of the other genres depends primarily on the applicability of epic imitations to their contents. All other genres, Scaliger says, are derived from the epic, adapting the universal elements of that genre - principally, idealizations expressed in words - to their own natures."

As with the 'references to the norms of nature' the 'references to the norms of the audience' present us with a sliding scale, too. At the top, in the epic, both sets of norms coincide. Here, the historical sequence of events, which is the imitation of one action, constitutes the first and most important ordering principle. At this level, we have almost nothing but Imitation. The needs of the audience are met

with mainly by variations on the same basic principles - not starting *ab ovo*, and using variations and digressions - all designed to keep the public in suspense and to avoid boredom.> Teaching in these genres takes place mainly by way of demonstration through the colourful and biased description of good and bad actions in the story itself.¹⁰ On the other end of the scale, we find the complete freedom of the short lyric in which the author may present his own subjective opinion in the way he likes." But between these two genres we find a large number of others, differentiated according to content, form, and mode of imitation, in which the order of events is split up and even replaced by other structural principles by which the author organizes his argumentation. It is here that the orators come in and the structural character of a poem is defined by persuasive (that is, rhetorical) criteria.

Let me draw some preliminary conclusions. Poetical phenomena are ordered by Scaliger according to two interacting scales of criteria: one ranging from a universal collection of imitations to the imitation of one single 'thing' only; the other descending from the objective form of historical demonstration implied by epical imitation via a rhetorically persuasive structure to the single subjective proposition. Along these scales we find a subtle diversity of poetical genres, according to three criteria: subject, verse, and mode of imitation.

When we direct our attention to the genres themselves, we see that the quantity - or rather, the intensity - of Imitation is the first attribute to determine their hierarchy. Immediately after the epic, the dramatic genres follow, in which the representation of events is still the most important organizing principle, albeit not in such an absolute way as in the epic itself.

Of course, the dramatic mode itself has a structural consequence because, in opposition to the narrative epic, it implies a concentration in time. But this concerns the imitation.» The same goes for the claim for verity or verisimilitude in representation, being a necessary prerequisite for teaching, moving, and pleasing the audience, and from which Scaliger's conceptions on the unity of time and a certain unity of place are deduced.¹¹ But it is most significant that he does not mention Aristotle's sole real unity: that of action.¹² In the tragedy, for instance, Scaliger's didactic aim implies that the characters of the personages in the play, rather than the action, are the most important elements." These personages are to be presented as positive or negative examples, their moral qualities being transmitted from their emotional reactions to events and defined by the play's final outcome, when the good are rewarded and the bad are punished (the so called poetic justice). Therefore, the plot must contain a variety of, preferably shocking, events.¹³ Here, we recognize the rhetorical qualities *copia* and *varietas*, But the share of rhetoric in the construction of the play is greater still because, in order to realize this copious variety, Scaliger refers to all sorts of rhetorical forms, such as *narrationes*, *decripuonee*, *theses*, *ethopoeiae*, and *prosopopoeiae*, most of these well known from the *progymnasmata* taught at school.¹⁴ Most essential for the instruction of the audience are the *sententiae*, the 'pillars' (as Scaliger calls them) of a tragedy's construction,¹⁵ that may be considered the signposts to the right interpretation.

I hope it will be clear that all these rhetorical elements play an important role, even in such a 'fictional' genre as the tragedy. In other genres, this rhetorical quality becomes progressively important as the fictional quality diminishes. To demonstrate this, I will pass over the two types of poetry that are defined by their subject matter only and that may take on several modes and forms: the satire and the pastoral. Instead, I will pay some special attention to the small genres, of which Scaliger discusses such a great number.

Here, the way in which Scaliger uses his defining categories to create a sort of gliding scale on which all poetic types and forms of his time could be located, becomes most transparent. Some subjects may even be realized in an 'epic' as well as in a 'lyrical' way, the lyric poems being short and subjective, and the epic poems containing a rhetorical disposition of the argument and imitations that approach Virgil's.³⁹

Since 1962, when O.B. Hardison's book on demonstrative poetry, *The Enduring Virgilian Utterance*, was published, a kind of consensus has grown about Scaliger's small poetic genres belonging to the 'epidictic' genre. Their dependence on Menander's *Pen Epideiktikon* is generally accepted and endorsed by DeNee and Vickers.⁴⁰ This conception has the comfortable consequence of Scaliger's poetics being in accordance with the then-current interpretations of Aristotle's poetics, which happened to be rather rhetorical in nature. However, underlining the celebratory functions and the corresponding amplificatory proceedings of these poems does not, I believe, do full justice to Scaliger's intentions. Again, only the 'references to the norms of nature', the imitations, are taken into consideration, while the more structural aspects are neglected. Derruff even goes as far as to formulate that Scaliger did not 'relate the topics of praise to the formal structure of a speech'.⁴¹

The first thing which should be noted is that, although there is an obvious dependency on Menander, his *Peri Epideiktikon* was not the only source for Scaliger's treatment of the small genres. As a matter of fact, he includes quite a lot of deliberative - exhortative and dissuasive - ones, too; especially, but by no means exclusively, in Chapter 105.⁴² I think he must have taken them from a book on *progymnasmata*.⁴³

More importantly, he states in the beginning of this same chapter that all rhetorical genres, including the laudatory, are in fact deliberative.⁴⁴ He discusses this same point rather extensively in the first chapter of his first book, where, as we have seen, he explicates the general principles underlying his poetics. Poetry, as far as references to the norms of the audience are concerned, is to be equated with rhetoric, and all rhetoric is deliberative. Hence, poetry too will use the means of rhetorical argumentation.

It is true that Scaliger, as soon as he comes to the small (that is, rhetorical) genres themselves, refers to the 'magis-i dicendi' for more detailed information on his point. Nevertheless, he himself occasionally considers their *dispositio* in rhetorical terms also. For instance, in his discussion of the *epithalamium*, the very first of his catalogue of small poems, he considers the successive parts with their specific functions before entering into the more specific details of the con-

tenr.!' Most explicitly, however, he does so in the chapter on the *panegyricon*, stating that this may serve as a model for all subsequent laudatory genres. Here, he discusses rather extensively the disposition as we all know it, from *exordium* to *peroratio*.^w

All this, of course, is not very spectacular in itself. But I think it does give a clear indication that, as soon as the level of the fictional sequence of events is abandoned, references to the norms of the audience are constituted by the prescriptions of the art of rhetoric. These rules define the structure of all shorter poems, with the exception of lyrical poems, since the lyric is the pole on the other end of the scale.

By way of conclusion, I would argue that Scaliger's poetics should be regarded as an alternative to Aristotle's poetics, rather than an elaboration of them. Quoting Wemberg for the last time, it really is 'completely and well conceived'. It also takes the most advanced poetical practice of his time into account, in an admirable way, including all sorts of occasional poetry and especially extensive argumentative hymns, such as those of Marullus or Ronsard, which enjoyed a growing popularity.^v

4 Scaliger in Holland'

In 1593, Josephus Justus Scaliger was appointed to the University of Leyden. It was Janus Doussac, the governor of the university, who achieved this triumph.' (Dousa had been a student in Paris in his youth, during which period he had not only made the acquaintance of Ronsard but also of this giant of classical philology.) For it was indeed a triumph. Scaliger was honoured to be asked to succeed Lipsius. However, he was not all that thrilled to join a young university of very little reputation in a Nordic country, which was no doubt cold, lacking in culture, and inhabited by people who were as chilly as the climate itself. It took the influence of Prince Maurice of Orange, the widow of William of Orange, Princess Louise de Coligny, and in particular the French ambassador in Holland, Paul de Buzanval, to move Josephus Justus to accept the position. He was offered a salary four times that of an ordinary professor. He was not required to teach courses. Actually, he was not named professor but 'treasurer' of the university and asked only to consent to live in Leyden, receive scholars, and lead the annual procession of professors. Nonetheless, he made a number of conditions for his acceptance. He wanted an armed escort to cross France, which was in the middle of civil war. And he wanted portraits of himself and his father - Julius Caesar Scaliger - to be engraved and distributed.²

This was the beginning of what I would like to call the organized promotion of the fame of Julius Caesar Scaliger in Holland. Needless to say, before the arrival of Josephus Justus Scaliger, his father was not a complete unknown in Holland. A certain number of Dutch intellectuals had done their academic studies in France, particularly before the foundation of the University of Leyden. Hadrianus Junius, the author of the celebrated multi-lingual *Nomendator*, refers to him as one of his sources.' And in 1585, in a volume of poetry by a certain Ioannes Fungerus, published by Planin in Leyden, a dedication *Ad Iulium Caesarem Scaligerum* is found in which the author asks which of his qualities he would praise the most.⁴ Moreover, the *Exercitationes illi Cardanum* appear, in the opinion of Paul Dibon, to have been considered the apex of natural philosophy.'

But it was only after Josephus Justus had moved to Leyden that the propagation of his father's reputation took on a more or less systematic character. None other than Henricus Goltzius, one of the most famous engravers in Holland, had made the portrait of his father which was accompanied by a poem by

* In: J. Cubelier de Beignac et M. Magnien (red.), *Acta Scaligeriana. Actes du Collège International organisé pour le cinquantième centenaire de la naissance de Jules-César Scaliger (Agen, 14-16 septembre 1984)*.

the rhetorical notions of [Julius Caesar. Heinsius preferred the liberty of the poet in the tradition of the young Ronsard of the *Amuurs* or the *Odes*. Poetry was divine inspiration for him, musicality, fantasy. It was only after 1610 in his *In Horatium notae*, followed by his *De tragoediae constitutione* (1611), that he speaks of Scagliaer Sr. with respect. He too refers to him as the 'summus criticorum' and the 'criticus divinus'. In the opinion of Meter, who has written a far-reaching study on the literary theories of Heinsius, this somewhat tardy esteem stemmed from an evolution in Heinsius's ideas toward more rhetorical literary conceptions.¹²

Given the neo-Latin literary situation, it is somewhat surprising that the name of Julius Caesar Scaliger comes up only occasionally in Dutch literary history of the first half of the seventeenth century. Daniel Heinsius, in this case in his role as Dutch language poet, refers to him in 1614 in his *Hymn to Bacchus* as one of the writers who had written on the same subject; he places him alongside Ronsard and calls Scaliger the 'prince and king of scholars'. After him, Samuel Coster, tragedian and theatre director in Amsterdam, made reference to Scaliger in J6(9): 'Aristotelem, Horatium, Schaligerem (*sic*), Dauielem Heynsium', « an enumeration that would suggest he had read Heinsius rather than the other three. The same year, his fervent rival, Theodore Rodenburgh, mentioned Scaliger four times in his 'defence of poetry'. But the passages in question are found in the first part of his work, which is a literal translation of the *Defence of Poesie* of Sir Philip Sydney.; In a poem of Conrartijn Huygens - who was a close friend of Heinsius in his youth - we find a quotation denouncing the obscure poet 'who even though he wants us to read what he has written does not want us to understand what we have read'. « We also find a reference to him in a letter of Huygens to the poet and novelist Johan van Heemskerck, who had also studied at Leyden."¹³

The previous citations are all I have found up until 1654, at which time the name of Julius Caesar Scaliger began to appear with a certain regularity in the prefaces to the tragedies of Vondel, the greatest Dutch writer of the seventeenth century.¹⁴ At that moment, Vondel was studying the *De tragoediae constitutione* of Heinsius and, in particular, the recent theoretical works of Vossius, the *De artis poeticae natura ac constitutione libri* and the *Poeticarum institutionum, librum tres*, both from 1647. His conception of tragedy is Aristotelian in the Vossius sense - certainly not in the Scaliger sense.¹⁵ Here again, knowledge of the works of Scaliger seems to have been second hand, an impression which is confirmed by the fact that in citing the *In obitu Scailigeri oratio* of Heinsius, Vondel confuses Julius Caesar and Josephus Justus.¹⁶

The references from Dutch writers do not indicate a great familiarity with the critical works of Scaliger Sr.. Nevertheless, there are reasons to suppose that the influence of his *Poeticæ libri septem* was greater than such a statement would imply. The question is not without importance. Was there really such a gap between neo-Latin literature and Dutch literature that the admiration of the Leyden humanists for the works of Julius Caesar Scaliger would not have elicited any response from our national writers, aside from a few isolated intellectuals? The 'grand old man' of Dutch literary history, W.A.P. Smit, has argued that the

internal structure of serious Dutch theatre at the beginning of the seventeenth century was seriously influenced by Scaligerian ideas.²¹ I have directed my attention to other genres, in particular rhetorical and lyric poems, and I would now like to present a hypothesis: the contents and in particular the arrangement of volumes of poetry written in the national language underwent a decisive change with the appearance in 1644 of the volume of poetry by Vondel. This change can only be understood in the light of the influence of the *Poetices libri septem*,

Even a superficial analysis of the poetry volumes that were published in Holland before 1644 reveals a few clear tendencies. Alongside the purely religious volumes and the rhetorical volumes, there are three or four predominant types. In fact, there were popular, commercial volumes. These were published by a publisher/bookseller and consisted primarily of songs, but sometimes also sonnets, elegies, and epithalamia, or poems in outmoded forms, such as rondeau or ballads. These are works from various authors but dedicated completely, or almost completely, to love.²² Their interrelationship seems only to be the principle of the greatest amount of variation possible. Secondly, there were volumes of poetry by a single author.²³ These fall into two types: first of all, volumes arranged more or less according to the old manner of the rhetoricians whose poems were either comical, amorous, or prudent. The love poetry, moral poetry, or religious poetry of these volumes were intended, in my opinion, to meet the pedagogic notions of spiritual development.²⁴ The second type consisted of volumes in which there were amorous emblems and all sorts of other poems jumbled together."

Up until the appearance of the Dutch poems of Heinsius in 1616, who belonged to the second of these two groups, almost all poetry was written under the influence of Petrarch and the lyrical Ptolemy.²⁵ We discern in Heinsius for the first time a more direct influence of humanism, which we see in his lyrical poems, but particularly in a few poems that are more objective and rhetorical such as the *Hymn to Bacchus*: which we referred to above, or in a few poems on national subjects: the death of a famous admiral, the siege of Ostend. These poems are written in heroic verse and follow rhetorical rules both in terms of content and structure. They are poems of a type that had been found in neo-Latin poetry and in the erudite poetry of the French. From this point on, we find this type of poetry, which we will call 'rhetorical', derived directly from various classical forms of occasional oratory; it found its way into the volumes and, in some cases, was the only type, as in the work of the poet and pastor Ruysser, whose volume was dedicated to Heinsius.²⁶

All of these tendencies come together in the definitive volume of Hooft, published by a friend of the poet and considered to be the high point of literary achievement in the first half of the century. Putting aside his plays, the primary type of work we find is emblems, followed by songs and love sonnets, then a section of miscellany in which there were eclogues and more love poems, but also occasional pieces: epithalamia, epitaphs, dedications, laudatory poems, etc.. A few adaptations of psalms are included at the end, which allowed the publisher to refer in his preface to the traditional tripartite division of love poetry, moral poetry, and religious poetry.²⁷ This was not the last time that such a pedagogic

conception played a role in the arrangement of poems in a volume.¹ Nonetheless, other principles, which were more in agreement with the rhetorical tendency we have mentioned, were to dictate increasingly the composition of these volumes.

Needless to say, there are exceptions to the outline we have drawn. The most significant is the volume of the Amsterdam wheatseller, Roemer Visscher, who was more renowned for his two charming daughters and his well known hospitality than for his poetry. In his volume, published in 1614, we discover an arrangement according to literary genre: there are separate sections for epigrams, enigmas, sonnets, elegies, moral poems, and desultory verse.² These genres are defined sometimes according to a formal principle and sometimes according to a principle of content, but in any case, not according to rhetorical principles in which the social function is the most important element. They are genres that we find used by the Pleiade poets and French theoreticians such as Sébillet, Du Bellay, and Peletier du Mans.³ These are genres that we also find used by other Dutch poets of the period: the only difference in the poetry of Visscher from that of his contemporaries is its arrangement.⁴

Another exception is the multi-lingual volume of poetry by Huygens, who was a friend of Heinsius. An intellectual and a diplomat, Huygens wrote with equal ease in Latin, French, and Italian as in Dutch. The humanist and rhetorical tendency that I have pointed out is clear in his volume, although Huygens was far too original not to diverge when he felt the need. The arrangement of this volume, which was the careful work of the poet himself, followed the guiding principle - putting aside the division into languages - of topic and variation.⁵

What we do not find in any of this poetry - and this is important when it comes to the question of the influence of Scaliger - is an arrangement according to types of rhetoric. As far as I can ascertain, it is in Vondel's edition of poems (T644) that we find rhetorical sections for the first time in Dutch poetry. These sections do not stem from literary genres of the Pleiade and Visscher but according to the social function of the poems, whose content and structure correspond to the rules of rhetoric concerning 'loci' and 'argumentation': triumphant hymns, laudatory poems, epirhalamia, and epitaphs. Needless to say, there are also literary genre sections, sonnets, epigrams, and songs. But the most important arrangement is rhetorical.⁶

From this point on, neither the formal nor moral principles will dictate the arrangement of volumes. There will be either a differentiation according to subjects, following the example of Huygens and Ruvius, or there will be a differentiation according to rhetorical genres in combination with the principle of subject matter.⁷

It is clear that the change we have noted emerged from the influence of neo-Latin poetry, but we cannot say that it was Scaliger's *Poetics* that was the origin of this change. Neo-Latin poets had been composing this type of poetry for years. And if more people became educated and occasional poetry was written in the national language during the seventeenth century and very little love or moral poetry was being produced, it is a phenomenon that has much more to do with the social and educational emancipation of the Dutch middle class in gener-

al.³ However, the form in which this process takes place shows a number of signs that indicate the influence of the *Poetics libri septem*. Let us take a closer look at them.

For some time now we have been informed of the rhetorical nature of the minor genres in the *Poetics libri septem*, as a result of the studies of DeNeef, Hatdison, and Vickers.³⁹ The only remark I would like to add to this subject is that alongside of the epideictic we also find deliberative genres. Scaliger himself considered all kinds of congratulatory and laudatory forms which were traditionally considered to be part of the demonstrative genre, to be essentially deliberative.⁴⁰ This is quite important because this opinion places a certain emphasis on the principles of argumentation as opposed to the principles of ornament, on rules more than on association, which underlines the rhetorical quality of his work.

Of the twenty-seven chapters that he devotes to minor genres in his third book, Scaliger consigns no fewer than twenty-two to rhetorical types that are derived directly from occasional orations codified by the classical rhetoricians: from congratulations on the birth of a baby to condolences for a death, all human events, as well as divine, are accompanied by a poem, or rather a speech (because Scaliger often seems to forget that he is writing a poetics).⁴¹ I do not agree with DeNeef's contention that these chapters are lacking any prescriptions concerning structure because the poet needs freedom of association and no regulation.⁴² It is true that Scaliger refers to rhetorical works for more detailed information on the topic.⁴³ However, leaving aside the fact that the information of the subject matter of a genre often implies the definition of a certain structure, Scaliger provides from time to time explicit instructions about structure.⁴⁴

All of these types are subordinated to the collective genre of 'silvae', the term borrowed from Quintilian.⁴⁵ After these numerous chapters, Scaliger devotes yet three more to the 'poetic inventions' in which he uses the terms: 'lyric' pieces, 'elegies', and 'epigrams' (including echos);⁴⁶ As we know, these are completely different genres that are not defined by their rhetorical qualities, but by their poetic forms. As far as subject matter is concerned, these three genres can include almost any sort of topic.⁴⁷ And I would even go so far as to say that they represent poetic forms in which different types of rhetoric can be placed. We are left with one last 'poetic invention' which is the most important one: the epic, which Scaliger treated at the beginning of his consideration of genres, even before tragedy and comedy. It would appear that the epic finds its most complete form in the epic poem in the strict sense of the word, but its principles can and should be considered 'mutatis mutandis' as directional in all other genres.⁴⁸

If I am not mistaken, Scaliger was making use of two interfering principles to define the genres: form and content. For minor genres this comes down to a definition according to the form of the verses and strophes, on the one hand, and their contents and rhetorical structure, on the other. Of these two principles, the rhetorical principle was perhaps not the more important to him, still, it takes on an extraordinary importance, nonetheless, because of its extensive treatment. It is, moreover, this element that constitutes the greatest difference between his work and other theoretical works of the time.

Let us take as an example the *Poeticarum institutionum libri tres* of the German Jesuit Jacobus Pontanus, who was probably quite well known in Holland.» After the epic poem, comedy, and tragedy, Pontanus studied the following genres: the elegy, lyric poetry, the hymn, iambic poetry, satire, the epigram, the echo, and the epitaph. He used the criteria of form and of matter to define the various genres but, with the exception of the hymn and the epitaph, not rhetorical criteria. That was the most common approach and it can be found in French theoreticians of the sixteenth century. Pontanus evokes, when necessary, various rhetorical types that could be treated in such a manner, in particular in the chapters devoted to the elegy and the epigram; but he does not go into a detailed analysis in the way Scaliger does.v'

In his *Poetics*, which was published in 1647,⁵¹ VOSSIUS also distinguishes poetic forms, in the following categories: dramatic, heroic, elegiac, lyrical, dithyrambic, iambic, and epigrammatic. The only genre he adds he defines by a rhetorical criterion: the epitaph. He also refers to rhetorical categories for both contents and structure of all of these genres.⁵² Still, these categories do not constitute genres for him as they do for Pontanus: he does not devote a single line to their treatment, but rather refers the reader to his own *Oramrarium institutio*.

Thus, we could have the impression that the difference between the *Poetics* of Scaliger and that of his contemporaries consists only of his principle of organization. Paul Sellin put forth this thesis for Vossius' *Poetics*.⁵³ But at any rate, as far as the definition of genres is concerned, the difference is perhaps even more radical. According to Scaliger, poetry existed before rhetoric. It was rhetoric that allowed poetry to rise above its primitive origins and acquire a more serious level. For him, rhetoric was an essential aspect of poetry, which allowed it to achieve 'adult' status. Clearly, this conception is linked to his moral perception of poetry.v VOSSIUS in his *De artis poeticae natura ac constitutione libri* rejects this Scaligerian concept. For him, poetry is not only the earlier of the two disciplines, it also has a more specific perspective; it turns to fiction and the poetic spirit which allow it to transcend its rhetorical aspect. \ This takes us far from the ideas defended by VOSSIUS half a century earlier; he no longer speaks of Scaliger with the enthusiasm that he did in his *Gratcriamni institutio*.

Long before Vossius wrote his major works, the specifically rhetorical prescription of the minor genres in Scaliger's *Poetics* had some repercussions on the neo-Latin poetry stemming from the academic circles of Leyden. I examined about a dozen volumes published between 1570 and 1603 in which I found internal divisions conforming exclusively to the *Poetics* of Pontanus. That is to say, elegies, odes, epigrams, iambic poems, hendecasyllabic poems, the only exceptions being the hymn and funeral poetry. Alongside of these groups, we sometimes find sections defined by their subject matter, 'Urbcs' for example. But what we do not find are arrangements according to rhetorical types, aside from the two exceptions mentioned above."

Then, all of a sudden, there are four volumes in which we can quite clearly discern the influence of the *Poetics libri septem*. These are the *Poemata omnia* of Josephus JUSTUS himself and three volumes of authors who in their student days were intimates of Scaliger Jr., namely: the posthumous *Poeniata* of Janus

Douca jr., the *Poemata* of Heinsius, and the *Poemata* of Crocius.^v There are 110 rhetorical sections in those volumes either. But what we do find are the great rhetorical occasional poems, written in heroic verse that is both elegiac and lyrical and arranged under the collective title of 'sylva'. In the volume of Douca jr., this section is very short and is followed by more traditional sections. In the three other volumes, however, we find all sorts of rhetorical poems as described by Scaliger, followed by a few of the other categories that he treats only after the 'sylva': elegies and epigrams, and in the volume of Heinsius, lyric love poems." We note here, the principle of the Scaligerian rhetorical dominance which represents a brief lapse in the history of neo-Latin poetry. Poets would continue to write this type of poetry but the internal organization of the volumes would, henceforth, follow the principle of the type of verse form.^v

It is only in Dutch literature that the rhetorical principle really determined the arrangement of volumes into various sections. Although this new arrangement appeared for the first time in the volume of Vondel's poetry, it was none of his doing. The volume was already being printed when he was informed of the fact. A young man of the time, Gerard Brandt, was the publisher of the volume and it was he who introduced this novelty in which we recognize the influence of Scaliger on Dutch poetry. From then on, the rhetorical principle was to be followed in many volumes of poetry.

5

Developments in Sixteenth-Century Dutch Poetics: from 'Rhetoric' to 'Renaissance'

J Introduction

Few treatises on the art of rhetoric and poetry are found in sixteenth-century Dutch literature. One 'An of Rheroricin the tradition of the French *arts de seconde rhetorique* and two small introductions to Ciceronian rhetoric are known. But that is all there is. However, several texts do exist in which rheroric and poetics are dealt with less formally, and which concentrate on a few basic principles. These include laudatory or defensor)' poems, a number of plays, a handful of introductory remarks 'to the reader' in certain publications, and one speech. These sources differ greatly in scope, nevertheless, they do form a corpus which may reveal much about the nature and aims of rhetoric and poetry, and the relation between these two arts. My analysis will trace some of the ideas underlying sixteenth-century Dutch literature and especially the way in which it evolved and changed; developments, indeed, which mark the transition from 'rhetoric' toRenaissance'.

The material analyzed may be divided into four parts. Firstly, a number of texts in praise of or in defence of rhetoric from the last quarter of the fifteenth and first half of the sixteenth century. Secondly, two formal treatises, published in the 1550s, one on Ciceronian rhetoric and the other on the poetical *seconde rhetorique* of the so-called rhetoricians, marking the high point in this literary stream. However, shortly after, in the 1560s when the rhetoricians' poetry was still blossoming everywhere - and would continue to do so for at least another fifty years - the first signs of what we know as the 'Renaissance conception of literature' appeared. Two collections of poems written under the influence of Marot, Sebillet, and the authors of the Pleiade were published in this period. In the introduction to one of these, some theoretical remarks are made on the relation between poetry and rheroric, too.

All this took place in the southern Netherlands. The last section will concentrate on the northern provinces, which lagged behind until the 1580s, when military, economic, and political developments resulted in the gradual displacement

* In: Heinrich F. Plett (ed.), *Renaissance-Poetik/Renaissance Poetics*. Berlin/New York, Walter de Gruyter, 1994 (p. 71-91)-1

of the cultural centre. As early as the 1560s, members of the Amsterdam chamber of rhetoric took a different stand from their southern colleagues in the field of literature. Their position eventually resulted in a two-way antagonism towards the traditional rhetoricians, but soon also towards the Renaissance conception of poetry epitomized by some poets connected to the new university in Leyden.

Of course, this is not the place to deal with all the details of these texts. Nor will I be able to compare their theoretical and critical remarks with actual examples from literature, other than incidentally. What follows is, however, a broad outline of what one might call the self-consciousness of Dutch vernacular literature in the period covered. This self-consciousness may be regarded as one of the major sources for information on the development of literature.



Albrecht Dürer, Portrait of Erasmus of Rotterdam (1526).

2 Poems in Praise and in Defence of Rhetoric, c. 1480 - c. 1530

There are five known poems written before the 1530s in praise or in defence of rhetoric. The oldest is by Anthonis de Roovere and is dated before 1482, the year of the author's death. The most recent is by Anna Bijns, dated 1528.⁴ They are all generally similar: all are written in the popular form of a 'refrain', four of them directed explicitly and one implicitly against the ignorant abusers of rhetoric, and all five expressing the same general ideas about what rhetoric is. Rhetoric, one of the seven liberal arts, is a gift from the Holy Ghost, and as such is learned, but cannot *be* learned.

This conception seems to me to be fundamentally Augustinian and must have come down by way of the *artes praedicandi* and the sermons of the Middle Ages, on which the famous fourth book of Saint Augustine's *De doctrina christiana* exercised such a profound influence.⁵ The theme does not seem to appear in secular medieval rhetorical texts.⁶ On the other hand, the similarities between De Roovere's poem and a fifteenth-century Dutch vernacular sermon on the Pentecost miracle supports the conclusion.⁷

This indication of religious influence is seen in other texts too. In fact, it appears to turn up in all texts on rhetoric up to 1550. But we also find it in the names and arms of the organizations from which these texts emerge, i.e. the chambers of rhetoric. The Bruges chamber was called the *Heillghe Gheest* (Holy Ghost), as were the chambers of Nieuwkerke and Audenaerde. Besides these three, no less than seven other chambers of the nineteen which attended a festival in Ghent in 1539 bore the sign of the Holy Ghost on their arms.⁸ Apparently the chambers of rhetoric of the Netherlands may have been connected with the spiritual revival of the fifteenth century. As with the *artes praedicandi*, the effects of this holy gift of eloquence are emotional as well as religious in character. Rhetoric offers peace and harmony. As for the religious side, apart from De Roovere, who cites the Pentecost miracle, one of the other texts cites Genesis, David, and Solomon, and also the annunciation, the transubstantiation, and the seven sacraments.⁹

This last poem, however, also offers us a taste of Ciceronian and Quintilian rhetoric as it was known in the Middle Ages.¹⁰ Man is superior to animals because of his rationality, which is expressed in language. Indeed, society, marriage, justice, and even virtue all owe their existence to eloquence, a sentiment which is found in Quintilian's *Institutio oratorio* (11.16) and Cicero's *De oratore* (1.11).¹¹

One of the other poems, that written by Anna Bijns, makes a connection with the art of music rather than with Ciceronian rhetoric.¹² So, despite their general similarity, these texts illustrate the two different tendencies which were already manifest in the medieval tradition,¹³ and which continued to direct the development of literature: a more rational, Ciceronian tendency; and a more emotional one, characterized by the so-called musical aspects of eloquence, such as rhyme and other sound-effects.



Blason of the Brugge chamber.

3 Mid-sixteenth Century, Jan van Mussem (1553) and Matthijs de Castelcin (1555)

The first book of Cicero's rhetoric to be published in the Dutch language was Jan van Mussem's *Rhetorica*. It was a small book, printed in Antwerp in 1553 and probably intended for the classroom.¹² As Jan F. Vanderheyden has amply demonstrated, Van Mussem's rhetoric is an amalgamation of passages taken from *Ad Herennium*, Cicero's *De oratore* and Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria*, interspersed with examples from Erasmus's *De conscribendis epistolis* and *De conia rerum ac verborum*.¹³ This is certainly a typically humanist school textbook, familiar, for instance, to Thomas Wilson's *The Arte of Rhetorique*. Not that it uses texts that were unknown in the Middle Ages - on the contrary, all of these texts were well known. But it does use the texts themselves and that is something of a difference. Indeed, it is hard to imagine the poem mentioned above, in which Cicero and Quintilian are paraphrased, not having had some humanist antecedent.

Be that as it may, with Van Mussem's booklet we have a first example of a classical rhetorical textbook in the vernacular, advertised on the title page as 'a must for all young rhetoricians, poets, advocates, secretaries, notaries, orators and others.' In the introduction Van Mussem inveighs against ignorant poets, who think rhetoric is just rhyme and whose texts demonstrate a lack of well-ordered content. '« The obscure verbiage makes it hard to work out exactly what the writer means. As we have seen, invectives against the ignorant abusers of rhetoric had by then also become a stock in trade with the 'rhetoricians' - as I will continue to call the members of the chambers of rhetoric. Given the character of the book, however, it seems probable that the author directed his polemic

against these rhetoricians, who, indeed, more often than not indulged in beautiful rhymes at the cost of clarity.

To be sure, rhyme and ornate elocution were the most distinctive features of those poets who considered themselves to be 'rhetoricians'. In French literature, the art of versification had split away from the medieval *arts poeticae* and *ucrsificandi* at the end of the fourteenth century. Questions regarding content - disposition, invention, and even most aspects of elocution - came under *premiere rhétorique*. The techniques of rhyme and rhythm were discussed in tracts known as *arts de seconde rhetorique*.» According to Jacques Legrand, author of one such tract published in 1405, rhyme is one of the rhetorical *colores*, but because of its diversity deserves separate treatment. 1.

In the majority of these tracts, verbal versification is considered a 'natural' form of music." 'Natural' because, according to Eusrache Descamps in his *Art de diaier* (1392), it requires a natural disposition. But being music, it is also an 'art', a Science, and subject to principles and rules." A century later, the same idea is still found in Jean Mofiner's *Art de rhetorique vulgaire* (1493):

Rethorique vulgaire est une espece de musique appelee richmique, laquele conrict certain nombre de sillabes avc uucune suavire de equisonance, et ne se peut faire sans diction, ne diction sans sillabes, ne sillabe sans lettres.'1

This is precisely what the *arts de seconde rberonque* were about. They all contain more or less similar material, concerning vocals and elision, the number of syllables allowed in a verse, acceptable and inadmissible rhymes, and the different forms of verse and strophes.

It is clear from an examination of the versification of the Dutch poems mentioned above that, despite the quotations from Cicero, this was the sort of 'rhetoric' with which these authors were concerned in the first place. The whole structure depends on subtleties of rhyme and elocution to such an extent that sometimes the meaning is lost, as Van Mussen suggests. However, the first to introduce the theory of the *seconde rhetorique* into Dutch vernacular literature was Matthijs de Casrelein, whose *Const van rheticlu:n* (Art of Rhetoric) was written in 1548 and published in 1555.10

The title pages themselves indicate how different Jan van Mussem's rhetoric was from that of Matthijs de Casrelein. While Van Mussem announces his intention to discuss how to treat a particular subject in an orderly and eloquent way, Casrelein promises 'all sorts and forms of verses, as well as everything else regarding the art of poetry'. He was obviously inspired by the French rhetoricians. Indeed, he names Molinet as one of his influences," and as far as his technical instructions are concerned, the same topics are discussed as appear in the *arts de seconde rhetorique*. Here, too, we find the principles of rhyme, all sorts of rhyming schemes and different forms of strophes and lyrical genres. Moreover, allusions to opinions of Molinet and his colleagues are constantly made;1-

But the differences between the French tracts and Castelein's impressive study are striking. Not only is his discussion of these subjects more elaborate than Moliner's and often more critical, but more topical questions, as for instance on pur-



Rhetunca.

ism, are dealt with, too. Moreover, a far greater quantity of examples is given to illustrate the various forms of strophes. As a result, about three-quarters of the book can be regarded as a collection of verses. For the most part, the subject matter is biblical, mythological, and historical, i.e. 'fiction', or, as it was known at the time, *poetrie*. Jacques Legrand writes in 1405: 'Poëtie est science qui n'apour a faire et a faire ficcions'.²³ And, like everybody else, Casrelein is of the same opinion: 'Rhetoricians', he says, 'are called "poets" when they invent something'. « Indeed, *poetrie* comes under invention and is part of the *première rhétorique*. To quote again from Legrand:

L'art est ceste science moult necessaire a ceulx qui veulent beau parler, et pour rante poërie, a mon advis, est subalterne de rethorique.²⁴

But independent collections of fiction, mostly mythological, called *ahsdaries* or *poetrie*, also existed.

In French humanist and rhetorician circles of around 1400, a poet who used this sort of subject matter was known as *ruruellus poeta*, *poete moderne*. Casrelein presents himself, or is presented by his editor, as an 'excellent modern poet', and this was what was meant by the information on the title page: 'every-

thing regarding the art of poetry'. His art of rhetoric contains not only an *ars versificatoria*, but also a *poetric*, i.e. everything a rhetorician would need to know from the *premiere* and *seconde rhetorique*, for, as he writes further on in his work, 'rhymesters, that is rhetoricians, are musicians and poets.:'"

Still more important, however, is the way Casrelein links this to classical rhetoric. The *CO/1st van rhetoriken* contains 239 theoretical strophes. Of these, 139 are devoted to technical matters of the sort referred to in the *arts de seconde rhétorique* and it is in these strophes that references to *MoJinet cum suis occur*." Incidentally, there are also references to Cicero's *De oratore*, Quinilius's *Institutio oratoria* and Horace's *Ars poetica*.^w Of the remaining 100 strophes, the first 28 and the last 7 offer a rather extensive poetical introduction and a short peroration to the work. But nearly all the others - no less than 65, that is between a third and a quarter of the theoretical part of the book - are formed by way of quotations from *De oratore*, the *Institutio oratorio* and the *Ars poetica*, which are to their turn interwoven with references to the *art de seconde rhetorique*.³⁰

Together, these strophes form three uninterrupted passages. The first, immediately after the introduction, deals with what I call the 'general philosophy' of elocution: the existence of different styles (sweet, subtle, sharp, strong, difficult, dear), the labour involved, and so on. Then, after a long series of technical questions, a second, rather short passage follows about pronunciation. And towards the end, after another series of technicalities, there is a third, even shorter passage with some final remarks.

Castelein obviously knew his classics. However, this is not a manual of classical rhetoric. What he offers the reader here is a handbook for the modern poet to the context of classical theories about elocution. For this, he has selected passages from classical texts according to their relevance to his literary conceptions. This can be seen from the choices he makes. The passages from Quintilian are taken from book VIII on elocution, book XI on pronunciation, and books I, II and XII on the education and personality of the orator, and the passages from Cicero's *De oratore* from books II and III on the same subjects. This also applies to Horace's *Ars poetica*, from which passages are taken mainly on the labour the poet puts into his work and a few thoughts on the question of decorum. Virtually nothing on disposition, invention, or argument, nothing also on technical aspects of elocution. As a matter of fact, Castelein says as much when he writes:

Here you will find no exordiums, positions, divisions, narrations, argumentations, egressions, signs, partitions, ornations, examples, amplificacions, sententiae, conclusions or imitations;'

Even the classical precepts concerning elocution are not found here, because as soon as it comes to technique, Castelein turns to the principles of the *seconde rhetorique*, of versification.

These principles traditionally embrace all sorts of genres, including tragedies, comedies, and epic poems.^v These are also discussed from the point of view of style and versification, or otherwise as *poetrie*, that is fiction, the only really structural remark being that the grammarians traditionally held that comedies

should have a happy ending and tragedies should be about disasters.¹³ Nowhere does Castelein's intention to place his art of versification within the classical tradition achieve more startling results than in his discussion of the minor genres. According to him, ballads should be equated with the epigrams of Martial, Virgil's eighth eclogue is an example of a refrain, and the odes of Horace offer a model for the madel.¹⁴

All of this shows that Castelein calls upon the classical tradition to shore up the status of modern poetry, but not in order to find out what modern poetry should be. Things change, he says several times, and something new is invented each day.¹⁵ As a modern poet, he feels that the essence of poetry - which he calls rhetoric - lies in an eloquence which may be defined in classical Ciceronian terms, but in fact exists by the grace of the 'musical' strength of versification.

In my opinion, this point, which is stressed in the introduction, is the essence of the whole work. Castelein opens with a story about Mercury, who appears to him in a dream and urges him to write his book. Mercury, however, besides being the god of eloquence is also the messenger of the gods. He comes, not on his own behalf, but is sent by Apollo, who presides over the Muses and lives on Mount Parnassus.¹⁷ Further on, this theme is taken up as Castelein exclaims 'O joyful rhetoric, descended from heaven', and again when he writes 'God sends the Ghost for all our sakes'. In between, he specifies the philosophical content of this 'rhetoric' as, in Cicero's words, an all-pervading virtue holding everything together.¹⁸

From the above, one would be forgiven for thinking that Castelein based his ideas on the Platonic theory of inspiration. This is far from unlikely, since traces of this theory can also be found in the French humanist and rhetoric circles.¹⁹ Castelein, however, links this theory to the traditional idea of the Holy Ghost as the inspirer of rhetoric. The influence of Erasmus, who was one of the first to equate the two forms of inspiration, may be detected here.²⁰ Castelein makes this combination only once. I think that, for him, Apollo was a more suitable foster-parent of poetry than the Holy Ghost.

Matthijs de Casrelein's hook is certainly impressive and unique. His conception of poetry is not new, it is the well known recipe of versification and fiction, flavoured with a dash of inspiration, that is, the latest fashion in *seconde rhetorique*. What is new is the way in which he conceives the 'art' of poetry. He joins the principles of the *arts de seconde rhetorique* and the fictional material of the *poetries* with the classical philosophy of eloquence in an all-embracing handbook for the modern poet. Castelein himself was deeply aware of this uniqueness. 'It is all mine,' he writes towards the end of his work, 'I have not stolen anything. Like Hercules I play with my own stick.'" And in doing so, he clearly filled a need, for up to 1616 no fewer than six editions of his work were published, the two last editions (1612 and 1616) in the northern Netherlands.²¹ Nevertheless, his influence was limited to the lesser reaches of literature. For, again and again, new developments eclipsed the sort of poetry he dealt with. It is ironic that as early as the first - posthumous - edition of his work, the editor introduces the book listing the famous French rhetoricians, including Du Bellay and Ronsard.²²

4 The 1560s: Eduard de Dene (up to 1561), the Antwerp Plays (1562), and Lucas D'Heere (1565)

During the first decade following the publication of Castelein's book little seemed to change. Poems and plays in praise and in defence of rhetoric continued to be written. For example, in Eduard de Dene's *Testament rhetoricael*, a huge work completed in 1561, we find some long and short poems on rhetoricians, rhetoric, and the like. In some of these the influence of Castelein is clearly traceable, despite a somewhat stronger emphasis on 'poetry' and Ciceronian rhetoric, and a somewhat lesser on versification. The texts are not explicit enough, however, to allow many conclusions to be made.⁴⁴ The poems themselves are typical of the *art de seconde rhétorique*,

In 1561, fifteen chambers of rhetoric met in Antwerp. However, few new ideas came of this. The chambers had been invited to give in their plays an answer to the question, 'What is it that most arouses man to the arts?' All of the plays were published the following year by the Antwerp bookseller Willem Sylvius.

Of the fourteen plays submitted - the organizing chamber did not compete - no less than ten were quite conventional: God, by way of the Holy Ghost, had created the seven liberal arts, incorporating rhetoric, which included medieval Christian rhetoric as well as poetry;" This was the medieval conception, dating from before the time that the poets of the *seconde rhétorique* so closely linked poetry and music." Of these ten plays, only the chamber the *Christlinsghell* (Eyes of Christ) of Dierik made any acknowledgement to more recent developments by ascribing the opinion about the Holy Ghost to Erasmus and Plinro.:" But, on the whole, even the references to Ciceronian rhetoric are often so general that one hesitates to ascribe them to first readings. The influence of the *artes praedicandi* still seems to dominate. An only slightly divergent opinion is formulated by the chamber of Zout-Leeuwen. This play defines poetry as the practical realization of rhetorical speculation, an idea that goes back to the Aristotelian philosophical terminology of the Middle Ages.«

Only three plays might be called modern. The *Lischbloeme* (Water flag) of Mechelen also saw poetry as the practical result of rhetorical theory, but it combined this idea with a quite modern Platonic theory of inspiration, in which the passionate love of beauty and truth induces man to poetry, while poetry itself is seen as the art which embraces all other arts.:" Plato and Lucian are mentioned. Here, also, one would expect to find the source material in the works of Erasmus.

A similar although less elaborate conception of inspiration was formulated in the play by another Antwerp chamber, the *Gcubluceme* (Marigold), written by Cornelis van Ghistelc.:" This play is the only one of the whole collection which includes a theory of poetry as *seconde rhétorique*, together with one of rhetoric as Ciceronian rhetoric. The two are sharply distinguished. Van Ghistelc's description of rhetoric as the faculty by which rationality and virtue are realized on earth, as well as his conception of the *rhetor doctus*, are *expressis oerbis* derived from *De oratore*.v Poetry, on the other hand, is defined as a form of music, aroused by divine inspiration. Here, Philo and Ovid are referred to.⁵¹ Finally, the Herebults chamber bluntly stated that rhetoric and poetry were two completely

different things and that success in either form was a question of natural talent. Cicero was never successful in poetry, nor Virgil in rhetoric.v

In the event, the theme of the competition failed to produce any exciting new opinions, and being the centre point of a gigantic public festival, it was probably never meant to do so. The fact that the *Rome* (Rose) of Louvain won the first prize with a highly conventional solution, supports the theory that other qualities were decisive.⁵⁵

The plays written to welcome and to bid the guests farewell by Willem van Haecht of the organizing chamber, the *Violetten* (Violets), do not do much to change this impression. They are less formal in their argumentation, but they seem to represent an opposite dose to Casrelein's, in which rhetoric, *poetrie*, and music are fused.

Thus far, nothing more modern than a slight tendency towards the emancipation of poetry and the citing of Platonic inspiration as its prime cause has been found. Even Van Chisrele, known for his translations of several classical plays, does not much more than defend the position taken by Casreleiu, although he does separate rhetoric and poetry more rigorously. There is, however, one text yet to be discussed. This has a more progressive appearance. It is the so-called description of the grand entrance of the chambers into Antwerp featured in the edition of 1562. The text is anonymous and may have been written by Wdlem van Haecht, or, perhaps, by the publisher himself, "Xlillem Sylvius." It is not so much a description as a manifesto, proclaiming the excellence and prosperity of Dutch poetry on the Parnassus of Antwerp, where now the Casralian fountain plays and the Muses live. Moreover, it expresses the hope that soon we too will have our Perrarch and Ariosto, Marot and Ronsard.v It is not so much the Apollininn metaphors, as the names of the famous Italian and French Renaissance authors which may have served here as a clarion call for a new era. If, indeed, it was ever intended and recognized as such. After all, that remains the problem, nothing is explained, and how are we to know which associations were attached to these names?

However, three years later, the new French literary fashion, not of Ronsard, but of Marot and Scillet, was well known to Lucas D'Heere. In the preface to his collection of poems *Den Imf en boecngaerd der poesien* (Garden and Orchard of Poetry, 1565) D'Heere cites Cicero's *De Arctna* on divine inspiration.⁵⁶ He claims to imitate Latin, French, and German authors and stresses that poetry should be separate from rhetoric. He then continues with a passage in defence, not of rhetoric, but of the chambers of rhetoric, which he sees as institutions for the encouragement of the use of the vernacular. But this is quite a different point.v-

5 The Northern Netherlands: Amsterdam Versus Leyden

The relation between poetry and rhetoric is subject to two parallel, yet connected, developments: poetry emancipating from rhetoric and rhetoric reassuming its original Ciceronian content. It is remarkable that the more poetry was

conceived of as an independent entity, the more it made use of the insights of this classical, highly argumentative form of rhetoric."

The paradox is only superficial, for there are of course two, or even three versions of rhetoric here: first, the art of versification as a part of medieval rhetoric; second, its offshoot, the *art de seconde rhctorique*; and third, the Ciceronian rhetoric of the humanists. This distinction is not always sufficiently realized. For example, when Sebillet or Du Bellay says that rhetoric pervades a poem as it does an oration, this cannot be said to indicate that the old fashioned rhetoric was still alive." The contrary is true. But then, there is a difference between using rhetorical techniques and proclaiming rhetoric to be the essence of poetry. This is what happened in the northern Netherlands, where some authors renounced the growing independence of literature in the name of the new Christian-Ciceronian rhetoric as developed by humanists such as Agricola, Erasmus, and Melanchthon.^o In the vernacular, one of the first, if not the first, was D.V. Coornhert.^v

As early as 1550, in the Introduction to his first play, the *Comedie van de rijkseman* (Comedy about the Rich Man), Coornhert put forward his own intention to teach nothing but the truth against the 'poetic' (i.e. mythological) fabrications of the rhetoricians, or rhymesters, as he calls them.^v Much later on, probably in the 1580s, he was to formulate his opinion in an even more antagonistic way. Again, he refused to use mythology, 'the pomp of today's rhymesters' as he called it, but now he rejected all the rules of the *seconde rhctorique* on rhyme and rhythm, the fixed number of syllables, the verbiage, and the artful forms of strophes. The real skill is to use words that fit that which they are meant to represent, and to teach virtue in doing so. This is the only way in which to be a sincere rhymester, for there is no reason to disapprove of rhyme as such.^o Elsewhere, he says that rhetoric is about how to express oneself as succinctly, clearly, and truthfully as possible, and does not consist in useless ostentatious verbosity."

Coornhert was the first Dutch writer to promote the use of humanist rhetoric in poetry, and by actually doing so himself he had a profound influence on the poets of the Amsterdam chamber, the *Eglentier* (Eglennrinel." Contacts between Coornhert - who was born in Amsterdam, but had always lived elsewhere from the age of seventeen - and the Amsterdam poets were only established after the 1580s. Long before that, however, sometime in the 1500s, the new, Christian-Ciceronian conception of rhetoric seems already to have been expressed by the chamber's leading poet at the time, Egbert Meynerrsz.^v It appeared in a refrain in defence of rhetoric, which should be placed in the same tradition as the poems of De Roovere and others, discussed earlier. Meynerrsz's text even bears a close resemblance to the one I mentioned in that context. Here, too, a paraphrase is given of what Quintilian said on the emancipating role of rhetoric in the social development of mankind in his *Institutio oratorio* II.16. And here, too, this classical conception is combined with a Christian one, visualizing rhetoric as a gift of God which enflames the heart. The difference lies in a somewhat more argumentative explanation of the way in which this divine rhetoric works. It informs people and in doing so leads them to regret their sins and to atone for them.

Moreover, it teaches us about the rationality that underlies most of God's commandments. Meynerrsz also makes an allusion to theatre plays when he says that rhetoric moves the heart by actually showing living persons.

All things together give one tile impression rhar Meynertsz' poem is to be placed in tile movement of Christian rhetoric as propagated by Emsrus - and *a fortiori* by 'vclanchrhon, who also placed comedy in a rhetorical perspective - rnrher than in the tradition of the medieval sermons and *artes praedicandi*. As Dcbora Shugcr has shown, in this movement the Ciceronian conception was combined with the Augustinian idea of rhetoric as a ray of the Holy Ghost which inflames the heart.:" In the southern provinces we saw traces of this idea in Casrelcin's work and in the play by the chamber of Diest at the festival in Antwerp. But In the poem by 'vleynertsz - a pious Protestant who eventually died in prison for his convictions - this position seems to be held more as a principle. We know that this new rhetoric was highly regarded in Dutch humanist Circles, especially in the northern provinces and more especially in Amsterdam, where, by the 1530S, close contacts already existed with the Erasmian movement, as well as with the Protestant school of Germany.⁷¹

Be that as it may, in the 1580S the influence of this Christian rhetoric on the poets of the Amsterdam chamber is evident. In 1578, Amsterdam finally took sides with the Prince of Orange in the insurrection against the Spanish king, and soon the city also made a definitive choice for Protestantism. The local chamber of rhetoric, which had been proscribed since 1567, was reopened. From then on, it assigned itself the role of providing humanist education for those who had no Latin. Taking up Lucas D'Heere's cue, it described itself as 'a public school for vernacular reaching', and in a short time it published a grammar (1584), a dialectic (1585) and a rhetoric (1587) in Dutch.^v All these testify to the pammony of northern European Christian humanism, tile hook on rhetoric being a short bur truly Cicconian rhetoric.'

The specific sources of this second Dutch rhetorical textbook are not at issue here. More Important in the context of my research is its connection to poetry. This connection is explicitly stated in a small verse on the verso side of the title page: 'You rhemricians, if you want to rhcorise, buy me and be artful, for mstead of shooting without a target, you'll find here the kernel of the art'.^v These are virtually the same words as those used by jan van Mvsem in 1553 in his Dutch rhetoric. Apparently, during the high tide of the *art de secnde rhattwique* there had been an uudercurrnr of truly rhetorical literature, of which Van Mussem and Coornhert are representatives. And Coornhert, in his turn, was also deeply committed to this undertaking of the *t.glcntier*.»

At that time, the figurehead of the Amsterdam chamber, Hendrik Laurensz. Spicgel - a close friend of Coornhert and the presumed author of the chamber's rrvnvn publications" - also wrote a refrain in the now well-known tradition of poems in defence of rhetonc. It is the chamber's New-year song for the year 1cxo.:" All the same pcmts are repeated again: rhetonc is a divine gift and a ray of the Holy Chest, it combines wisdom and eloquence, was known by Moses and David as well as the other pillars of the church, the Romans erected theatres in its honour, it is a torch of truth, a living picture, and it encourages virtue. As

with Meynertsa's text, this poem should also be placed in the humanist Christian tradition. But a far more explicit allusion to Erasmus seems to be made than in the earlier poem, when Spiege! identifies rhetoric as the kind of wisdom which has the appearance of foolishness.

It is this statement which forms the gist of a one-line poetical treatise, *rio! van rethorica* (In Praise of Rhetoric) by Spiege!'s friend and fellow chamber member Roemer Visscher." Visscher's aim is to argue that poetry and rhetoric are one and the same, and, on the whole, he builds his argument on the same themes contained in Spiege!'s New-year song. The traditional ones, already known from the beginning of the century, are: rhetoric is the root of all other arts, is of divine origin, was known to Moses, Isaiah, Solomon, Job, David, and others, as well as to the classical authors; it is the light of truth; and it teaches virtue. But there are also the Erasmian themes: it unmasks hypocrisy and speaks up against tyrants; and rhetoric is to be compared to Jesus Christ, for just as Jesus died to save us - which certainly was the wisest instance of foolishness that ever took place - rhetoric has to become a fool to make us wise."

The most remarkable aspect of this poem is the way Visscher connects rhetoric to this Pauline and Erasmian foolishness. He introduces the personage of Momus, the diminutive, irritating critic of the gods, here, however, not presented in his negative role, but as the personification of critical rationality, who unveils deceit and serves truth. Visscher took this Momus from Pandolfo Collenuccio's fable *Alitheia*; which he himself translated and published in Dutch." But the connection with rhetoric is Visscher's own, and nothing perhaps indicates more clearly the Ciceronian, or even Agricolian, quality of this Christian rhetoric as favoured by the Amsterdam chamber.

Visscher may have written this text to provide an alternative to what was traditionally looked upon as rhetorical poetry, that is the poetry of the rhetoricians. And he might have done this in defence of his chamber's position, for a few years earlier, an attack had been launched against the rhetoricians by one of his friends, the city-secretary of Leyden, Jan van Hour. In a satirical text written around 1578 and mainly directed against a popular Roman Catholic priest, Van Hour had argued that poetry and rhetoric were two different things, and with heavy irony he had mocked the rhetoricians' way of rhyming complicated, incomprehensible and often scandalous verses.* Some time later, he repeated his opinion in a speech directed to what he referred to as 'the supporters of Latin and Dutch poetry at the new Leyden university.' This second text contains an elaborate historical argumentation concerning the difference between the two disciplines, and it concludes with a declaration that he himself would go on writing psalms, odes, sonnets, epitaphs, epigrams, and love-poems as he had been doing now for two years. Indeed, Van Hour was one of the first Dutch admirers of the new Renaissance poetry, as was D'Heere in the southern provinces, whose work he claimed to know. In one of the few poems of his hand left to us, he invokes the complete Renaissance canon: Petrarch, Boccaccio, Dante, Ariosto, Bembo, Cavalcanti, Sannazaro, as well as Ronsard, De Baif, Des Autels, Desportes, Peletier du Mans, Jodelle, and Garnier.*

These attacks were most probably not directed against the humanist conception of poetry so favoured by the Amsterdam poets. For instance, in the poem mentioned above, van Hour names southerners such as Peter Heyns, Willem van Hacht, and Lucas D'Heere, but is also positive about Coornhert. However, to Visscher; being a member of the *Eglentier*, Van Hour's opinions may well have represented a challenge. Up till then, the rhetorico-poetical ideas of the *Eglentier* had not been formulated as such. Perhaps it was thought time to express them in a more explicit way.

6

The Amsterdam Chamber De Eglentier and the Ideals of Erasmian Humanism"

In the development of Dutch Renaissance literature, the Amsterdam 'chamber of rhetoric' De Eglenner (The Eglantine) played a leading part. However, the extent of De Eglentier's achievements has scarcely been analyzed. Only the chamber's publications in the field of popular education - a grammar, an introduction to dialectics and an introduction to rhetoric, all in the vernacular - have attracted learned attention. But even these educational efforts have not, in my opinion, been sufficiently recognized as moments in a wider, ideologically defined programme. In this essay I will try to give an impression of what this ideology may have been, restricting myself to a small number of texts and to a comparatively short, but crucial period of the chamber's existence, approximately the first decade after its reopening in 1578. First, however, I shall briefly outline the political situation in Amsterdam around that time and the years immediately before, because it is there that we have to look for the causes that gave rise to this ideology.

In 1567, after years of political as well as religious disturbances, Amsterdam was put under the direct control of the Roman Catholic government in Brussels. Thousands of inhabitants, including some of the most prosperous, were exiled or left the country of their own accord. Often, their possessions were confiscated. The local chamber of rhetoric, De Eglentier, was closed down, and one of its most prominent members, the merchant Egberr Meynersz., was condemned to death on account of his Protestant convictions. He died in prison the day before he was due to be executed. Until early in 1578, the town was politically and culturally dominated by a pro-Spanish, strictly Roman Catholic magistracy.

Under these circumstances one would expect a strong reaction when in 1578 things at last changed and the refugees returned. Instead, as far as De Eglentier is concerned at any rate, we get a message of reconciliation, of mutual peace, tolerance, and freedom of conviction. I will now take a closer look at this ideology, and at the means by which the leading members of De Eglentier intended to put it into practice.

From the very first days of the re-established Eglenner, Hendrik Laurensz, Spiegel must have been one of its most influential members. Among his papers a series of the chamber's New Year's songs have survived, of which the first -

²² In: Theo Henuans and Reinier Salverda (eds.), *From Revolt to Riches. Culture and History of the Low Countries 1500-1700. International and Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, London, Centre for Low Countries Studies, 1993 (p. 108-118).

dated 1578, but, for reasons I cannot enter into at this moment, goes back to 1579 - gives voice to the ideals mentioned above, but on the same breath deplores their absence. The New Year will bring peace and happiness after so much sadness, it says, and peace will bring commerce and prosperity back to the town. But while conflict and strife seem to be leaving the country, hatred and envy are still burning. Revenge and hatred will bring war once again. Alas, those who have been striving to live in freedom now refuse to grant freedom to others.¹

Exactly the same points were elaborated by Spiegel's fellow member Laurens Reael in a lengthy ballad on the treaty by which Amsterdam in 1578 went over to the side of the Prince of Orange, the so-called Satisfaction. Here too - and this time formulated in a positive way - the central issues are peace, which will bring back trade and prosperity, concord and friendship, freedom of conscience and religion, and the rejection of feelings of hatred and revenge.² Of course, these points are in accordance with the spirit of the treaty, but nevertheless, the insistence on concord and on the need to rise above hatred and revenge are revealing. This is even more striking in Reael's case than in Spiegel's, because Reael had been one of the exiled Protestant leaders; he was also a brother-in-law of the unfortunate Egbert Meynertsz., on whose death he had written a bitter poem in which one finds no feelings of tolerance at all.³

Reael's ballad on the 'Satisfaction' bears no reference to De Eggenriem, but in several other poems of his the chamber does appear. They were written around the same time, with peace and love as a dominant theme, just as in Spiegel's New Year's songs for the chamber. I believe that here we touch upon a central point in the chamber's ideology. All of these poems and songs have a distinctly religious content, stressing the adoration of the Child and the imitation of Christ; this is, of course, due primarily to the fact that they were written for Christmas and New Year, but, as we shall see, it also reflects the specific views of the chamber.

There are two poems that offer further information about what the chamber thought and felt during these years. The first is another long poem by Reael, written in answer to the question 'What folly man clings to most persistently'. It was read in the chamber's gathering on 26 December 1580. Apparently, the chamber had organized a competition on this theme, and Reael's answer declares that self-conceit is man's most persistent folly because it stays with him until the hour of his death, while all other follies will disappear in due course because of their own disagreeable consequences. All supposedly wise, intelligent, and learned people have been suffering from this folly, and so they violate the honour of God, upon which everything depends.⁴ A rather Paulinian, if not Erasmusian, statement.

The other poem is the chamber's New Year's song for 1580 by Spiegel. It is a song in praise of rhetoric. This discipline is described as the fountain of all other arts, a gift from the Holy Ghost in which wisdom and eloquence are conjoined, known to Moses, David, and other pillars of the church and honoured by the Ancients, a beacon of truth and an incitement to virtue. The song ends with an appeal to De Eggenriem to turn to this art.⁵

At this point, the two poems certainly do not seem to have much in common. The only correspondence occurs when Spiegel says that rhetoric, however wise,

is seemingly foolish and, therefore, subject to mockery. This wise foolishness is the counterpart of the foolish wisdom mentioned by Reael. Here, we find the gist of the chamber's opinions, as I will demonstrate below. But first, I should like to focus on the kind of rhetoric promoted by Spiegel.

At first sight, Spiegel's poem stands in a century-old tradition. From the fifteenth century, so-called rhetoricians in the southern Netherlands had been writing poems in praise of what they called 'rhetoric'. This 'rhetoric' was defined as eloquence and rhyme and characterized by a predilection for complicated lyrical forms and for sophisticated stylistic devices and sound effects. In short, it was what the *artes versificatoriae* of the Middle Ages called 'poetry' and it certainly had nothing whatsoever to do with classical - Ciceronian, argumentative - rhetoric. From Medieval poetry it had also assumed the qualifications of being of divine origin and of speaking the truth, qualities that were now linked with the Pentecost miracle, in which the Holy Ghost had descended upon the apostles and inspired them to speak in many tongues. The only possible link with classical rhetoric is that in this period it also assumed the qualification of being the root of all other arts, a position which in Middle Ages has been assigned to philosophy. Here we find, perhaps, a reflection of the Humanist Ciceronian revaluation of rhetoric to the level of philosophy. But even in those scarce instances in the second half of the century where there are references to Cicero and Quintilian and where a distinction is made between poetry and rhetoric, there is nothing to indicate any knowledge of what rhetoric is really about." In Spiegel's case, things would be very different a few years later, and I have no doubt that already at this time his traditional words had a true Ciceronian meaning.

In 1584, De Eglentier started the important undertaking of publishing a grammar (1584), a handbook on dialectic (1585), and one on rhetoric (1587) in Dutch. There is no doubt that Spiegel acted as principal initiator and author of this most probably collective project." The rhetoric is a short but truly humanistic, Ciceronian rhetoric, in which argumentation plays as important a role as eloquence and in which the art of dialectic is argumentation's backbone. Rhetoric and dialectic together form a unity of a kind, as initiated by Rodolphus Agricola and made popular by Melanchthon. There is no room and no need here to enter into the specific relations between these publications of the Amsterdam chamber and their possible sources. Suffice it to say that the chamber was in line with modern North European Christian Humanism. More important to my argument are the objectives which led to this position being taken. The publications themselves are quite explicit about this. As stated in the introduction to the Art of Rhetoric, chambers of rhetoric are vernacular schools for grown-ups to study all sciences and arts. Rhetoric itself is the art of speaking both eloquently and with good sense, in accordance with whatever arguments are available. Dialectic is proclaimed on the title-page to be an instrument to tell truth from falsehood, most useful and necessary in all discussions. And in an introductory letter to the project as a whole, Coornhert emphasizes its importance by stating that most troubles, conflicts, and disturbances originate from an unclear or faulty way of expressing one's meaning. « I think we may conclude that in these publications, the Amsterdam chamber insisted on argumentation and eloquence as vehicles of

knowledge, reason, and truth, these being the best means to further concord and peace in the community.

The reason why Spiegel in his New Year's song praised rhetoric in traditional terms is that he too felt that poetry should include not only the objectives, but also - and this we do not find among any of the older 'rhetoricians' - the techniques of classical rhetoric. In his treatise on rhetoric he says as much: on the title-page he recommends his book to all 'rhymesters', and in the preface he refers to the traditional task of the chambers as being that of 'rhyming'. This view is confirmed by a second poem in praise of rhetoric by another member of De Eglentier, Roemer Visscher; It is also in Roemer Visscher's poem that we will find the solution to the 'wise foolishness' Spiegel ascribed rather enigmatically to rhetoric.

Roemer Visscher was not only a fellow member of De Eglentier, but also a close friend to Spiegel, as is testified by the poems they wrote back and forth. Besides, his name is used as that of one of the instructors in the chamber's grammar, which was written in the form of a dialogue. His 'Praise of Rhetoric' is an elaborate, zoa-line poetical treatise, divided into 34 strophes of 6 lines each.¹ Basically, it voices the same ideas as Spiegel's New year's song (which has only eight seven-line strophes), namely: rhetoric is the root of all other arts, it is of divine origin, known to Moses, Isaiah, Salomon, Job, David, and others as well as to the Classics, it is the light of truth and teaches virtue, it is the Christian fool that makes us wise.

But Visscher does a few other things in addition. First of all, he states, at the very beginning of his text, that poetry and rhetoric are one and the same. What he means by this is obvious when one remembers the influence exercised on this and many of Visscher's other poems by one of the favourite textbooks for teaching classical rhetoric, the famous Agricola-Lorichius edition of the *Progymnas-mata* by Aphrodisias. Secondly, he explains that rhetoric serves truth and virtue through critical rationality, this last notion personified by the little god Momus, who was constantly criticizing everybody, even Eve.

In recent years, much work has been done, especially by Lisa Jardine, on the development of dialectical rhetoric as inaugurated by Agricola and made popular by Hegius, Erasmus, Melanchton, and by the commentaries on Agricola's texts by Alardus Aemstelredanus. In this type of rhetoric, the logical way of thinking of scholasticism was put aside and replaced with a more dialectical, as it were probabilistic method, which was not based on certainties but tried to reach the truth by way of critical reasoning, by *rationes contra rationes*.² To me this seems to come very close to what Visscher proclaims in his poem to be the gist of rhetoric. Alardus fully deserved to be called Aemstelredanus: he stayed in close contact with his birthplace throughout his life. It was there, of all places, that he got hold of the collection of Agricola's papers that was in the possession of the Amsterdam merchant Pompeius Occo. And his pupil and friend Cornelius Crocus was a teacher at one of the two Amsterdam Latin schools for more than twenty years. So it may not be too far fetched to say that Visscher indeed knew about this method of Agricola, which Erasmus had fostered as the way to revive the *Philosophia Christi*.³

To support my proposition, I will now give a global analysis of Visscher's poem. This may help in understanding the structure as well as the substance of its argument. I hope it will make quite clear how rhetorical Visscher's poetry is, how humanistic his rhetoric and, above all, how Erasmian his purpose.

The structure of Visscher's 'Praise of Rhetoric' is the normal one for a rhetorically constructed *laus* of an art. The *exordium* (str. 1-5) gives arguments to stir the listeners' attention and benevolence, and raises the question whether the subject is to be called poetry or rhetoric. The author declares that this makes no difference and that he will praise his 'rhetoric' in a rhetorical way. After an 'invocation' of Mnemosyne and the Muses (str. 6), he offers a carefully constructed argumentation in the best rhetorical tradition. First, he formulates the *propositum* which is to be proved, split into its different components (str. 7-11). These strophes define the general characteristics that constitute the laudability of this art, that is the by now well-known statements that rhetoric is the root of all other arts and a spark of God's truth. After this, the arguments for these statements are presented. In doing so, Visscher sticks to the normal order for the praising of an art, dealing with its inventors (str. 12-15), its usefulness (str. 16-24), and its honourableness; he counters the possible objection that rhetoricians (rather poets) occupy themselves with poetic dreams, farces, and fables (str. 25-26). Rounding off with a peroration, or epilogue, in which the decisive points are summed up and a final emotional appeal to the listener is made, the poem comes to all end with the stereotyped ropes that 'It is too late' (str. 31-34).

In comparing this structure with the example of an *Eloquentiae encomion* in the Agricola-Lorichius edition of Aphthonius, we find some striking similarities: the exordium, the two statements which constitute the proposition itself, the objection and its refutation, as well as the epilogue, are all there. Of course, Lorichius's example is much shorter and more global, and it lacks most of the arguments that are used to prove the given proposition and constitute the bulk of Visscher's text. But this fact is outweighed by some similarities in content: the argument used in the exordium to induce benevolence, namely 'To praise a great thing up to the level of its greatness is virtually impossible', is the same as that used by Reinhard Lorichius for the epilogue; the statements that make up the proposition are the same; and both texts refer to the same mythical instance of Orpheus bringing harmony among men - a myth used in Antiquity (for example by Horace) to defend poetry.¹⁴

As for the arguments themselves, the identification of poetry with rhetoric becomes apparent in the way Visscher presents the *locus* of the inventors. The biblical instances he mentions (Moses, Isaiah, etc.) are taken from the famous *De inventotibus rerum* by Pulydore Virgil, where they are named as the inventors of poetry.¹⁵ The fact that to Visscher rhetorical eloquence is indeed the crowning quarry of poetry appears most clearly in the refutation. The objection that rhetoricians supposedly occupy themselves with poetical dreams, farces, and fables, is refuted in two ways: firstly, by pointing out that Christ did the same thing when he spoke in parables, and secondly, by postulating a kind of development: rhetoricians do write love poems when they are just beginning to write, then

they turn to philosophy, and finally, it is rhetoric that shows them the right way, which is the way of the Scripture.

This last statement brings us to the argument Visscher uses to prove the usefulness of his subject: rhetoric conquers all tyranny, injustice, and deceit. The argument that rhetoric sets free, because it teaches how to speak up against tyranny, was taken from Erasmus' *Apophthegmata*, which, in its turn, quoted Demosthenes." With regard to the conquest of all forms of injustice and deceit Visscher calls rhetoric the caretaker on earth of Momus, the critic of the Gods. In most sixteenth and seventeenth century poetry, the little god Momus is vilified because of his everlasting urge to criticize. However, some authors regard him as the protagonist of truth. This view originated in Lucian and was developed by Leonhard Alberti in his satire *Momus o'f principe* and continued by others, including Pandolfo Collenuccio whose tale *Alitbeia* was translated into Dutch by Roemer Visscher himself. Here, Momus is portrayed as the personification of critical rationality, defending truth and unmasking hypocrisy and deceit. By linking Rhetoric with this 'vornuv, Visscher affirms its argumentative aspects in a way that ties it closely to the method of Agricola as explained by Alardus.

All this leaves one final connection to be established. It is not only critical rhetoric which is related to truth. Parallel to it, Visscher names the child Jesus. At a later stage, just after the refutation, and when he is on the verge of proving the honourableness of his subject, Visscher again mentions Jesus, this time in terms of Paulinian foolishness. Just as Jesus died to save us, which was the wisest instance of foolishness that ever took place, rhetoric has to become foolish to make us wise. Apparently taken from Erasmus' *Moriae encomium*; this statement may also be linked to views held by Melancthon and his pupil Matthias Dclius, who published a poem *De arte iocandi* in 1555. Heinz-Cunrer Schmirz has shown how important this conception of 'arguing in a childlike way' is to Humanist educational philosophy." It is through the Christian parable that Visscher in his refutation links this foolish rhetoric to the fiction of farces and fables. (The 'poetic dreams' he mentions refer, I believe, to the love poems he says rhetoricians often write when they are young.) At the same time, he establishes in this paradoxical way the honourableness of rhetoric, which makes us wise by reaching virtue and paving our way to heaven.

We are back with Spiegel. Critical rationality and Paulinian foolishness as apogees of wisdom appear to form the essence not only of Visscher's rhetorical conception of poetry, but also of Spiegel's. If this is true, Visscher's poem may be seen as formulating the Amsterdam chamber's literary programme. Its striking similarity with the chamber's New Year's song as written by Spiegel justifies this conclusion, since New Year's songs, we may assume, had a programmatic function. Looking at Spiegel's preceding New Year's song and at Rucel's entry for the chamber's 1580 competition, it is not difficult to see the link between this programme and the city's political situation at that time, which called for a plea for Christian foolishness in terms of the abandonment of all self-conceit.

7

Rhetoric and Civic Harmony in the Dutch Republic of the Late Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Century"

A good four hundred years ago, the Netherlands underwent a period of drastic social and political change. Because sovereignty was at that time in the hands of a foreigner, the king of Spain, the emerging rebellion soon took on the character of a national struggle against a foreign aggressor, a struggle which would evolve into a war lasting eighty years. But during the first several years, operations were divided on the home front, and there was a very real chance of civil war.

This was certainly true of Amsterdam, which at that time was already not only the richest city of the Netherlands, but also the city where a small governing elite remained stubbornly loyal to the king and the Roman Catholic faith. Only after its harbor had been blockaded for several years, and virtually all its trade had been lost to other ports, did Amsterdam in 1578 join the side of the Prince of Orange: of the rebellion and the reformation. It was the last city of Holland to do so.

Precisely in this Amsterdam claims were made for the importance of rhetoric in the process of reconciliation, a course actively pursued immediately after these decisive events. Playing an important, if not key role in this process, were a number of prominent writers who together formed the local chamber of rhetoric, "De Eglentier" (The Sweet-brier, or Eglantine).'

To elucidate the position of De Eglentier at that moment it is necessary to give a short overview of the literary and cultural situation in the Netherlands - both in the south (present-day Flanders) and in the north (the Netherlands of today) - in the second half of the sixteenth century.

From the end of the fifteenth century this scene was dominated by organizations known as 'chambers of rhetoric', which provided citizens who loved literature with a forum for writing and reading their poetry, and especially for creating and producing plays and tableaux vivants. As such, they fulfilled a function of considerable social importance on festive occasions, such as religious processions, triumphal entries of royal persons, the public announcement of treaties, etc.

Classical rhetoric, as practiced by the humanists writing in Latin, exerted little influence on these vernacular poets, their name notwithstanding. The poetry

they wrote was not built so much on argumentative and stylistic means of persuasion as on sound effects produced by rhythm, rhyme, and stanzaic forms based on rhyme; on 'beautiful', resonant words, and on an abundance of Biblical, mythological, and historical allusions, often vested with allegorical interpretations. Their art, in other words, represented everything that the French poets called the "seconde rhetorique" - the second rhetoric - to distinguish it from the classical, or first rhetoric. Quite probably, then, the 'chambers of rhetoric' found throughout the southern and northern Netherlands owed their name to this idea of a 'second rhetoric'.

What should also be noted, however, is that the Netherlandish 'rhetoricians' - as I shall refer to them - very likely drew their ideas not only from the French "rhetoriqueurs", but also from the late medieval 'artes praedicandi', the arts of preaching. One indication of this indebtedness is that they viewed their rhetoric as a gift of the Holy Spirit, frequently alluding to the miracle of Pentecost when the apostles were endowed with gifts of language.

As is commonly known, the classical - Ciceronian, Quintilian - art of rhetoric, with its pronounced argumentative thrust, found its way to the Latin schools of the sixteenth century. And from there its influence radiated out into Neo-Latin poetry. But the sphere of vernacular literature proved much more resistant to such influences. There, the poetics of the 'seconde rhetorique' very likely functioned as a strong barrier.

This is not to say that in the circles of the so-called rhetoricians no references were ever made to writings such as Cicero's *De inventione* and Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria*, works which were well known in the Middle Ages. On the contrary, but such allusions rarely involved more than a general statement maintaining, for example, that human beings are superior to animals thanks to rationality which expresses itself in language; or that institutions such as marriage, law, or even society as a whole and all forms of virtue owe their existence to rhetoric. They did not, however; look to these authorities for concrete ideas on how to organize and write their literary works.

Even the author of the most important handbook of the movement, Matthijs de Castelein, who in his *Art of Rhetoric (Collst van rhetorik)* of 1555 makes extensive reference to Cicero's *De inventione* and to Quintilian, limits himself to what I would call the general philosophy of rhetoric and the training of the orator. In his work, too, the factual and technical remarks always concern such matters as choice of words, rhythm, rhyme, and construction of stanzas, which he presents - and this is really unique to Castelein - as the contemporary alternatives for such classical poetic qualities as genre and meter. But more substantive aspects of classical rhetoric Castelein mentions only in order to stare with so many words that they will not come up for discussion in the *Art of Rhetoric*.

Gradually, however; more interest developed. In Antwerp in 1553, Jan van Musschen published the first Dutch-language rhetoric 'taken from the ancient, renowned rhetoricians and orators, such as Cicero, Quintilian and others'. Recommending his work not only to persons such as clerks, lawyers, and secretaries, but also to 'rhetoricians and poets', he lashes out against 'the unlearned poets who shamefully abuse rhetoric and think that their unintelligible attempts

at rhyme are rhetoric.' In Chent, a short time later, the poet/painter Lucas d'Heere published a volume in which he included a poem constructed as a 'paradox', one of the favorite rhetorical exercises assigned in schools.' And in the northern Netherlands at about the same time, the leader of the Amsterdam chamber of rhetoric, Egben Meynertsz., wrote a poem in praise of rhetoric. His allusions to the classical humanistic aspects seem to go further than the usual generalities, and are reminiscent of statements by Melancthon and Erasmus: rhetoric moves people to feel sorry for their sins; it sparks feelings of remorse in the heart; it restructures princes and quells rebellion.'

But the first writer who went beyond an incidental application of the argumentative rhetoric of the humanists, and who in fact made it the foundation of his Dutch-written literature was the Amsterdam born poet Dirck Volckervz. Coornhert.

As early as 1550, when Coornhert was in his late twenties, he had made ironic remarks about the versifying and the allegorical constructions of the rhetoricians, and with an appeal to Cicero he had articulated his own poetic goal as 'docere cum delectatione' for the sake of 'netherlandic truth'. Years later, in 1582, he explained that 'beautiful words, artificial stanzaic forms and rhymes, metrical constraints and ostentatious use of mythology' did not interest him, and that his only concern in writing poetry was 'to rhetoricize artfully', in the sense of rendering the subject adequately - the beautiful as beautiful and the ugly as ugly - and in a realistic way, for the advancement of truth and virtue.'

The context in which he mentions Cicero and uses the term 'to rhetoricize' already indicates that the method he had in mind was that of humanist rhetoric as revived by humanists as Rudolph Agricola, Philip Melancthon, and Desiderius Erasmus. In this perspective, it is perhaps not wholly coincidental, then, that the definitive 1539 edition of Agricola's *De institutione dialectica* had been published thanks to the mediation of the Amsterdam millionaire merchant Pornpejus Occo by the scholar Alardus of Amsterdam, a native of the northern Dutch city who was at the time residing in Louvain.'

In any case, an analysis of Coornhert's works supports the conclusion that his rhetoric has a distinctive 'Agricolan' character, with its argumentations based on statement and rebuttal, on pro and contra reasoning, in which probability arguments and refutation strategies play a significant role.⁹ One of the most telling examples is his use of the genre of the paradox, mentioned earlier.

The paradox - that is to say, the proof of a true thesis which is, nevertheless, at odds with generally accepted opinion, the *communis opinio* - had long been popular as a rhetorical exercise in schools, as a scholarly joke, and also as a manner of giving vent to certain truths in an apparently innocuous way. In ancient times, to mention only some of the best known examples, Polycrates had written a work 'In Praise of the Mouse' and Lucianus one 'In Praise of the Fly', and in the fifth century A.D. Bishop Synesius of Cyrene did not consider it beneath him to produce an 'In Praise of Baldness'.¹⁰ But Cicero had upgraded the genre. In his *Paradoxa stoicorum* he had used it as a vehicle to articulate philosophical and ethical insights of stoicism. His theses were, for example: 'that vir-

is enough to make one happy', 'that only the wise person is truly free and the foolish person is a slave', and 'that only a wise man is rich'. According to Cicero, the paradox was the best means for achieving insight into truth, because it was the most Socratic way of argumentation." His own paradoxes are accordingly masterpieces of argumentative discourse.

Later, humanists produced works of this type as well. The most famous examples, of course, Erasmus' *Truse of Folly*. But the genre was particularly valued as a school exercise which would, at the same time, yield a moral lesson." An example can be found in the volume *Paradoesi* published in 1543 by the Italian Ortensio Lando, a work which the well-known French publisher and humanist Charles Estienne translated and printed ten years later as *Paradoxes. ce sent propos contra fa commune* (Julliol: *debatiz. en [cmne de declamations* (Orsins: *pour exerciter les ieunes escripts, en causes difficiles*. In close imitation of Cicero's paradoxes, Lando dealt with issues such as 'it is better to be poor than rich', but also more topical questions, such as 'women are more excellent than men' and 'prison is a salutary thing'."

This last topic was also given paradoxical treatment by Coornhert in his *Praise of Prison* written between September and December of 1567, when, as an assistant to the leader of the rebellion, the Prince of Orange, he was himself in prison in The Hague. The poem argues in exemplary fashion that if ethical principles are taken as the point of departure, imprisonment is in every case - whether for capital crimes or for debts, whether the prisoner is guilty or innocent - 'desirable and pleasant'. This wise insight, however, in no way prevented the author from submitting a request in December 1567 for freedom of movement within The Hague, or from using that freedom to flee to Germany in April of 1568 when his prospects were looking bleak.

A decade later, Coornhert would find himself in a position to exert a great deal of influence on the Amsterdam chamber De Eglentier. Then, it would also become clear that his 'wonderspracck' ('wonder statement' or 'strange saying') - as he called his paradox - was not an incidental work, as it was for Lucas d'Heere, but that it marked the beginning of something resembling a program.¹⁴

In the meantime, a great deal had been taking place on the political front. Already in 1567, the same year that found Coornhert in prison, Amsterdam, in the wake of reformist unrest, was placed under the direct authority of the Catholic government in Brussels, which was in turn controlled by the Spanish king. Thousands of citizens began to flee the city, leaving all their possessions to be confiscated.¹⁵

But one of the persons who did not flee, despite his reputation as a top figure of the 'new religion', was the leader of De Eglentier, Eghert Meynertszoon. On the second of March the following year - even before the armies of the Prince of Orange invaded the Netherlands in April, making the Revolt a reality - before Coornhert made his escape to Germany from The Hague - Meynertszoon was arrested. He was interrogated again and again, tortured, and finally condemned to death. The night before his execution, he died. That was on 8 October, seven months after he was taken prisoner.¹⁶ His brother-in-law Laurens Re-

ael, who had left the country much earlier, wrote a long poem on the subject in which he did not hesitate to name two of the most prominent mayors (Amsterdam had four at the time) as personally responsible for Meynertszoon's death:

There's nothing wrong with naming
 these traitors of the town,
 Joost Buijck and Siruon Cops
 played false and brought him down.
 They're the ones who ordered
 that this poor lamb be caught,
 driven by their cruel thirst,
 they wanted only blood."

De Eglentier; which despite the Roman Catholic inquisition had been for years a bulwark of the Reformation, was also banned. For a period of eleven years, the literary life of Amsterdam was dominated by products, impeccable from a religious point of view, written in Latin by the rectors of the Latin schools of the city. Even the lecture, of more free-thinking Catholic authors, such as Erasmus, were forbidden. This situation lasted until 1578, the year in which Amsterdam finally took the side of the rebels;"

It is known that De Eglentier was re-established fairly soon after the tumult of 1578. Leadership then fell into the hands of the merchant Hendrik Laurensz. Spiegel. This may, at first, seem strange, considering that Spiegel, as far as we know, never broke with the Catholic Church. It is in fact most significant, and in keeping with the ideals professed by the newly organized chamber: reconciliation and harmony, tolerance and friendship. Spiegel himself had composed a Song for the New Year 1578 which included the following wish:

In this new year
 May God grant us his peace,
 And may we all together
 Promote tranquillity.'>

And his fellow chamber member, the Calvinist Laurens Read, brother-in-law of Egbert Meynertszoon, who in 1574 had still burst out with lines like the following:

O murderous Amsterdam, full of blood-thirsty hounds,
 Aldermen, bailiffs, mayors and councils,
 Papists hungry for blood, have you not devoured enough,
 Is your belly not yet full with widows and orphans
 {...}]²

– now Read challenged the citizens returning from exile as follows:

Bring love with **you**, the force that can bind all,
Discord **will** be smothered and vanish by itself,
Harmony will grow despite the hounds of hell,
As we love one another [...]²¹

Since quite a few members of the new city government joined the chamber, it seems likely that this was a matter of deliberate cultural politics, intended to elurunnrc the differences which had evolved, and to propagate harmony and solidarity among the citizens. This in itself was not unique to Amsterdam. A similar course was followed in other cities.²² For protestantism may have won out in name with the success of the revolt, but thur is not to say that one religious group could now dictate how things should be run. More and less strict Calvinists, Mennonires, but also Catholics and people like Coornherr who no longer wished to affiliate themselves with any organized church, all had to find ways of getting along together.

In the years 1580-1590, the ideological backdrop for this cultural policy was formed by a general, evangelical Christianity reinforced by the ethical and educational concepts prevalent in humanism. Ideas about social ethics developed by Cicero and Senccu, which had been studied in the Latin schools of the humanists for more than a century, were now made accessible to everyone in Dutch translations.²³ And the same was true of techniques developed by the humanists, again on the basis of the classics, to promote communication among citizens and the dissemination of ideas. Within the shortest time there appeared, under the auspices of De Eglentier and probably written by Spiegel, a Dutch grammar (1584), a Dutch dialectics (1585) and a short Dutch rhetoric handbook composed in rhyme (1587).²⁴

All this was standard humanist fare. But the revolutionary thing was that it was now offered in Dutch and was, therefore, available to everyone who could read. According to De Eglentier, the traditional chambers of rhetoric had to reorganize themselves as 'general vernacular schools'. Schools, that is, for the general education of the people. The people? Well, at least the established middle class of merchantx, businessmen, shopkeepers and skilled craftsmen - people who did not attend Latin schools, but received their professional training in the 'French' or 'commercial' schools, or in practical apprenticeships - were now seen as requiring an education aimed at cultivating an awareness of social responsibility as well as communicative skills. In other words, an education which was traditionally provided by the Latin schools for members of the ruling class. And all that in the service of civic harmony. It was no mere window dressing when Coornherr wrote in the preface to the Eglentier's grammar book that 'most discord, conflicts, and confusion are caused by speaking in a poor or obscure manner': Just as it was not for nothing that the book on dialectics is described on its title page as 'a guideline for distinguishing truth from falsehood, being exceptionally useful and necessary in all disputes'.²⁵

The influence of Coornherr on the program launched by his younger friend Spiegel was considerable. This is evident not only from the preface to the gram-

mar book, which includes an appeal for continuing the entire trivium project, but also from the follow-up to his paradoxical poem in praise of prison.

The Eglantine circle is known to have produced six such paradoxical poems besides that of Coornhert. Spiegel himself wrote one on dancing (a form of amusement violently condemned by some Calvinist ministers of his time). Another member of De Eglentier, Roemer Visscher, addressed the topics of being in love and of getting Jilted, and a generation later the young poet Gerbrand Adriaenszoon Bredero wrote one poem in praise of riches and one in praise of poverty.²⁶ That some of these came in pairs indicates that they are poetic and paradoxical variants of the broader genre of the *declamatic*. This genre, which had been cultivated since antiquity, was aimed at teaching students how to employ arguments pro and contra; in the case of the humanists, this often resulted in the writing of two separate arguments, one for and one against the same proposition.²⁷ But the most important paradoxical poem was the one composed by Roemer Visscher, *In Praise of Rhetoric*, a work I shall discuss shortly.

All these poems are made up of 25 to 30 six-line stanzas with the same rhyme scheme, aabccb, and all of them allude to each other. Reason enough to view them as related. Visscher's poem constitutes an exception in so far as it does not deal with a concrete moral question such as dancing, love, or greed for money, but moves instead on a meta-level. It sets forth the philosophy underlying the other poems. One might ask whether it really should be called 'paradoxical' in the sense that the word was understood in rhetorical theory, namely presenting arguments for a true thesis which is at odds with general opinion. For who would not consider rhetoric, the showpiece of elite humanist education, as something praiseworthy?

The first sign that rhetoric could have been viewed as something paradoxical by the poets of De Eglentier is found in the New Year's song for the year 1580, written by Spiegel in his capacity as head of the newly organized chamber. On the surface the song presents little more than traditional statements made by rhetoricians all through the sixteenth century, ideas derived at least in part from the 'artes practicandi' of the late Middle Ages: rhetoric is a gift of God, radiating out from the Holy Spirit; Moses and David were practitioners; it is a torch of truth; a spur to virtue.²⁸ But one sentence deviates from the standard list and suggests that everything should perhaps be interpreted in terms of a new context. The sentence reads as follows:

Being wise you seem foolish,
that is why you are mocked by many.>

In other words: you are something paradoxical. But how so? The solution to this riddle is found in Visscher's *In Praise of Rhetoric*, and it is precisely this paradoxical quality which informs the entire program of De Eglentier.

Visscher begins his poem with an exordium in which he makes the customary remarks about the praiseworthy nature of his subject and insignificance of his

own capacities. He then, in equally conventional fashion, tells what his poem is about: poetry or, as the case may be, rhetoric. For – and this is his point – they are one and the same thing.¹⁴ Coornhert had made a similar statement in *passuu*; around this same theme. But in Visscher's poem the statement not only appears in explicit form, it is itself the subject of the poetic argument which follows. The entire poem is devoted to confirming that the two are in fact identical. Visscher consistently talks about poetry, but at every point it is clear that he understands poetry in a humanistic/rhetorical sense.

Thus, at the end of his exordium he appeals to *Mencmosyne* and the Muses for help, indicating that poetry is indeed his main concern. Also, in the subsequent argument – organized, incidentally, along strictly rhetorical lines – he repeatedly mentions verses and singing, and the strings of Orpheus that brought the community together. What is more, he further elaborates his first point, which concerns the *honor* due to this art and for which he cites the familiar thesis that rhetoric is a gift of God, with the examples of Moses, David, and the prophets – names which in this case, however, are drawn directly from the passage about the inventors of poetry found in Polydorus Vergilius' *De rerum inventoriis*.¹⁵

But his second point, concerning *usefulness*, makes it clear that the divine art in the last analysis owes its honorable status to its argumentative nature. Its most essential significance lies in its function as mouthpiece for the truth, which it openly declares in the face of any and all suppression by tyrants. The argument is drawn from a statement by Demosthenes, cited in Erasmus' *Afwpthegeyllata*; there, however, the word used is not 'declare' but 'convince' – a difference which, given Visscher's further development of this thesis, could well be significant. Rhetoric makes truth visible, according to Visscher; by means of criticism. – This seems to me to be a prime example of an argumentative function.

In making this point, Visscher alludes to the minor deity *Momus*, god of criticism. In most sixteenth and seventeenth-century authors, *Momus* appears only in a negative light, as a criticaster. But a few writers, following the example of Lucianus, view him as the champion of truth. This idea was worked out in the fifteenth century by Leonbartsra Alherti in his satire *Moflus o' if prinape*, a work which was banned at the time, and by Pandolfo Collenuccio in his fable *Alitheia* (Truth), which was adapted by Visscher himself in his poem *Baltic between Truth and Appearance*.¹⁴ Erasmus also has something to say on the topic in one of his 'adagia', where he writes that there is no more useful a god than *Momus*, although at present earthly jupiters have expelled him and listen only to *Eurpoc* (the Muse of music).¹⁵

It seems to me that these words, more than any others, show the extent to which Visscher's use of the *Momus* theme gives expression to Coornhert's idea that poetry, too, should not be focussed on musicality, as it was in the rhythm and rhyme based lyrics of the so-called rhetoricians, as well as in the Neo-Platonic Renaissance poetry just becoming popular at the newly founded Leiden University. According to Coornhert, 'true' poetry should foster truth and, in its wake, virtue and should, therefore, be founded on realistic representation and rhetorical argumentation.¹⁶

Rhetoric and Civic Harmony in the Dutch Republic

Since Momus, Visscher writes, was too busy settling quarrels in the heaven of the classical gods, he appointed rhetoric as his representative on earth, for the purpose of exposing all faults and wrong behavior. tyrants who violate Justice, biased Judges, heretical preachers, corrupt money lenders, false witnesses, soldiers guilty of crimes, usurers, unreliable merchants, matchmakers, pimps, bankrupt persons - they all are unmasked. In short, rhetoric is the binding force of the social order,

Teaching what life's rewards consist of,
Namely in ruling one's own family with reason,
In living together peacefully with strangers and neighbors,
And judging everything with understanding and wisdom.

Notable here is that this is not being said about moral philosophy but about rhetoric.

But the poet goes even further. In the last part of his argument, Visscher presents rhetoric as the earthly equivalent of Christ himself:

As the only son of the eternal Father
Died for all of us together
To free us from eternal death,
So she [rhetoric] is patient though despised,
She dons the [fool's] cap and plays the fool,
To make the whole world wise.

An odd pronouncement, this seems, in fact, a paradox. The first thing we can note is that Spiegel's words about rhetoric come to mind here:

Being wise you seem foolish,
That is why you are mocked by many.

And if we look a little further we also find that Erasmus, near the end of his *Praise of Folly*, repeatedly makes allusions to Christ by citing Paul's epistles to the Corinthians. The point made is that Christ,

although he participated in the wisdom of his Father, in a certain sense himself became foolish by taking human form, so that, as someone equal to men, he could meet them in their foolishness, just as he himself became sin in order to save us from sin. He did not, however, wish to save the world in any other way than through the foolishness of the Cross and through the mediation of the Apostles, who were uneducated, simple people.¹⁷

Erasmus' words here recall the Socratic-Pauline teaching of the *docta ignorantia* propagated by Nicholas of Cusa in the fifteenth century.^v

Another sixteenth century adherent of this teaching besides Erasmus was Sebastian Franck, the German translator of *Praise of Folly*. He had in 1534 put together a book with paradoxes from the Bible which, as the title page announces,

are unbelievable and untrue for all flesh, yet contrary to the opinion and estimation of the whole world are certain and true.

He had previously, he reports, himself coined the term 'Wunderred' or 'wunderwon'. The Dutch translation, which appeared around 1565, renders this as 'wonderrede' or 'wonderwoord', and it seems quite likely to me that this was the direct source of Coornhert's 'wondersprook'/'wonderspraak' of 1568, especially since we know that he was well acquainted with Prunck's works in general.>

But neither Erasmus nor Prunck mentions a connection between paradoxical religious teachings and rhetoric. How, then, should we understand the link which Visscher makes between the two? I believe that the answer can be found in the work of another adherent of the *docta ignorantia* doctrine, the most sceptical of them all, Heinrich Comelius Agrippa van Nettesheim, whose declamations form the subject of a recent book in English by Marc van der Poel.«

In 1530, Agrippa had published in Antwerp a work entitled *De incertitudine et imitate sciendarum et artium, atque excellentia uerbi Dei declamatio* (111 *the uncertainty and Futility Of the sciences and arts, and the excellency of Gods Word*). Its subtitle reads as follows: 'teaching with good and firm evidence how to reason against the common opinion on many matters'. This is, therefore, also a collection of paradoxes, paradoxes in the humanist ciceronian sense of true propositions, be it that they run against the - generally false - common opinion.

At the beginning of this book, Agrippa links the simplicity of the gospel to a type of reasoning which follows naturally from the subjects themselves, and, in doing so, takes a stand against elaborate elocutionary skills. He writes that he shall undertake to argue his cause

r...not with clichéd arguments drawn from a superficial consideration of the facts, but with very forceful reasons deduced from their essence, and not with the cunning eloquence of a Demosthenes or a Chrysippus. Such eloquence would turn out to be a cause of disgrace for me as an exponent of Holy Scripture, if I, like a man who fancies flattery, were to pursue false eloquence. For it is fitting for one who professes Holy Scripture to express himself in the real sense of the word, not to ornate, and to aim at the truth of things, nor at the embellishment of style.+

Further on, Agrippa emphasizes again that this reasoning of truth is simple and needs no ornament or finery:

For it has often been observed (as Cicero says in his speech for Arclua) that nature has a greater capacity for praise and virtue without learning than learning has without nature.«

Strikingly here is the similarity with Coornhert's idea that 'artful rhetoricizing' consists of representing things as they are, for the sake of truth and virtue. But Agrippa gives that function the extra dimension of a Socratic-Pauline *imitatio Christi*. The Apostles are still, as in the Middle Ages, the ones who displayed the

most exemplary combination of truth and rhetoric. But instead of being depicted as persons inspired by the fire of Pentecost to express the harmony of heavens in the harmony of rhythm and rhyme, as the second rhetoric taught, they are now simple people who say plainly, as 'fools', what has to be said. In this sense, Visscher's *Praise of Rhetoric* can indeed be interpreted as a 'paradox', a 'wonder-spraak'.

Conceived in terms of the Paulinan fool, Visscher's rhetorical poetry serves the same goals as Coornhert professes, and does so in a similar way: it is a mirror for lay persons, a reprimanding voice, a bridle for heresy, a sermon, spectacles for the prince, and a spur to virtue and honor. He closes with the following lines - an adoption, incidentally, of a passage in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (1.127-145):

Loyalty has been dead now many a year,
Honor has departed, and is far from here,
Justice has fled from violence and force,
Faith is a prisoner of Hypocrisy,
Love lies on both cheeks, sleeping soundly,
But Rhetoric alone is standing its ground.

Only rhetoric manages to hold its own in the present state of turbulence and strife.

Yet there is one point on which Coornhert and Visscher seem to differ, namely, their interpretation of the concept of 'the light of reason'. For Coornhert, as for Agrippa, this was the light of correct insight - or even of conscience - given by God to every human being. Coornhert distinguished the seat of this insight, 'higher reason', from natural or 'lower' reason. Agrippa made a similar distinction between reason and heart. But Visscher very likely shared the ideas of Coornhert's younger friend, Hendrik Laurenszoon Spiegel, leader of De Eglentier.

Spiegel did not make any such distinctions between different types of rationality. For him, the 'light of reason' was nothing other than natural human reason, which by reflecting on cause and effect can achieve insight into truth and falsehood, good and evil. He and Coornhert corresponded extensively on this matter, mincing no words about their respective positions. As Spiegel represents it, rhetoric - conceived in the sense ascribed to it in Agricola's *De inuentione dialectica*, namely as dialectical argumentation applied to concrete issues - takes on even clearer contours as God's critical representative on earth.⁴⁴

The rhetoric manual Spiegel wrote for De Eglentier in 1587 seems to confirm this interpretation. It is a highly argumentative rhetoric, in which the discussion of elocution accounts for only six of the total 24 pages. Even more telling, perhaps, is the striking absence of allusions to classical authors. All the examples of stylistic figures and metaphors are taken from everyday speech and Dutch life.

What he and Visscher were propagating was no small thing; rhetoric, the discipline of 'unlearned' critical rationality based on the light of reason given to

every human being, was conceived as the sole foundation of truth and morality, and, therefore, of a peaceful society, in view of the social turbulence in the young Republic of the Seven United Provinces of the Netherlands at the end of the sixteenth and into the first decades of the seventeenth century, the importance of this ideal can hardly be overestimated.

8

Helicon and Hills of Sand: Pagan Gods in Early Modern Dutch and European Poetry'

In 1663, when Holland's greatest poet, JOOS! van den Vondel, published one of his few tragedies on mythological subject matter, *Faeton*, he added a preliminary Justification:

Nobody will think that I will reinstate pagamsm. My only purpose is the furtherance of morality by presenting this beautiful fable un the stage as a mirror of pride. For the old Egyptian and Greek mythological stories cover a threefold knowledge, of history, of nature and of human morals... I remember the late professor Vossius saying, that if he should write a commentary on Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, it would prove tu be the most learned book ever wntten.'

will not enter into Vondel's exact sources for this opinion.' Suffice it to say it might have sounded a bit old-fashioned. More important to my argument is that it was also an antagonistic opnuou. Vondcl's statement, introduced by historical reference to the Christianization of the Low Countries and backed up, not only by a reference to the learned Vossius, but also by a quotation from the fourth century Christian apologist Lacranrius, must be regarded as a rather militantly formulated choice of sides in a literary conflict that had already divided the Dutch literary world for over a hundred years. It was a conflict between classical and Christian humanism, and III that perspective it is most telling that Vondel, the most biblical of all Dutch playwrights, spoke up in support of mythology with all the authority of his – by then - unsurpassed prestige. But it was also a conflict between realism and idealism, nationalism and internationalism, umversalism and historical thinking. All these aspects were interwoven, and changed positions with regard to each other in the course of time. If not an interplay, there certainly was an internal *struggle* going on in this regard between the sacred and the profane III DUTCh literature.

As far as I know, it started with Dirck Volkertsz. Ccornhert.³ Coornherr had formulated his objections to the mythological 'fabrications', as he called them, of the rhetoricians by around r55o. Because his objective was to teach, he had no use for them, only for truth as learned by biblical parables.» His opinion is

* In: Helen Wilcox e.a. (eds.), *Sacred and Profane: Secular ,,,,I Devotional Interplay i" Early Modern British Literature*. Amscrdrnm, VU University Press, 1996 (fl. 225-236).

reminiscent of Erasmus, who in *Ciccranionus* (1528) had underlined the inappropriateness of classical examples and images for modern, Christian purposes:

Wherever I turn I see everything changed, I stand on a different stage, I see a different theatre, a different world. What am I to do? I am a Christian and I must talk of the Christian religion before Christians. If I am going to do so in a manner befitting my subject, surely I am not to imagine that I am living in the age of Cicero, ... and scrounge a few poor words, figures and rhythms from speeches which he delivered in the senate?

And somewhat further on:

What shall our meticulous Ciceronian do? ... Shall he for the Father of Christ say 'Jupiter Optimus Maximus', for the Son, 'Apollo' ...? Shall he for the Queen of Virgins say 'Diana'.. ?

That would be most unlike Cicero. Instead, one should speak as Cicero would have done if he had lived today 'as a Christian among Christians'. The comparison with Erasmus' dialogue is the more apt because in his text, Coornhert had mentioned Cicero as the master of all eloquence.

Many years later, in 1582, Coornhert broached the question once more. Referring to the words of Virgil:

Me, too, the Pienan maids have made a poet: I, too, have songs; me also the shepherds call a hard, but I trust them not,"

he declares himself alien to the Pyreidic family of the Muses and his poetical work alien to the elevated language of Mount Parnassus. He will not use such pompous adornments as provided by the names of Ceres, Bacchus, and Venus, but speak in his own Dutch language about real, truthful issues. True artfulness lies in an adequate verbal representation of reality, visualizing things as they are.

Coornhert's moralistic aim is as outspoken as ever. Nevertheless, one has the impression that this time, the general purport of his remarks is secularized. It seems to be the Dutch language that, more than Christian belief, is incomparable with the use of pagan deities. Coornhert's younger friend Hendrick Laurensz. Spiegel is still more explicit on this point. In his extensive didactic poem 'Mirror of the heart' *thert-spiegels*, written around the turn of the century, he proclaims the 'Durchness' of Dutch literature. 'Should a Dutch poet be acquainted with Greek and Latin, while it was here the first pastors lived?' he asks his readers, pastors being traditionally considered the inventors of poetry.⁸ And he continues: "Mount Parnassus is too far away. There is no Helicon over here, only dunes, woods and brooks'. In his choice of words explicitly referring to Coornhert, he too advocates writing in Dutch about truthful issues. He does not strive for exotic pomp either, nor after the favour of the Muses, living high up Mount Parnassus.'

Especially interesting is Spiegel's further explication in the fourth book of his work. There, Apollo tells how he and the Muses have transported truth, originally hidden under the cover of fable stones, from Mount Aratar, *vra* Brahmans, Egyptians, Jews, Greeks, and Romans, to Italy and France. But these days, authors such as Coornhert have made them desire to settle in Holland, the conclusion being that everybody should write in their own language because the Muses have no preference on that point.> For Spiegel, the time for mythology had gone, not so much because the relevance of the pagan gods had been surpassed by Christian truth, but first and foremost because of the rise of a national Dutch culture. In the centuries to come, these two arguments continued to alternate with the larger argument against mythology. But before we enter more into that, we must first direct our attention to the defenders.

Dutch rhetoricians, especially those in the southern provinces, had derived their predilection for mythological examples, for 'poetry' as they called it, from the French 'grands rhéororiqueurs'. Soon afterwards, the new Renaissance mode, as realized in France by poets such as Sebillet, Ronsard and Du Bellay, had been introduced in Ghent and in Antwerp by Lucas D'Heere and Jan van der Noot respectively. Like their French forbears, they justified the use of classical mythology with a neo-platonic theory of inspiration and harmony in which the image of Mount Helicon, inhabited by Apollo and the Muses, played a central role."

Antwerp had already been proclaimed as the seat of Parnassus in the 1562 edition of the plays that had been performed a year earlier at the famous festival of rhetoricians at that city. Three years later, D'Heere claimed the same honor for Ghent. With the great emigration stream to the northern Netherlands from about 1580 on, these notions were introduced into Holland too. Their most important champion was D'Heere's former pupil, Karel van Mander.

Van Mander expanded the neo-platonic conception of mythology with a threefold - historical, natural, and ethical - significance as formulated by the Italian mythographer Natalis Comes and the French translator of Ovid, Barthélemy Aneau. « In the introduction to his own explication of the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid, published in his *Schilder-boeck* in 1604, Van Mander spoke of:

Important knowledge, of natural as well as of heavenly things, and usefulnesses, hidden under the cover of these inventions by learned and able poets, who, inspired by a secret force, as enraged and beyond themselves, write their verses and poems."

So, in the chapter on Bacchus, he not only relates everything about the invention of wine and the moral effects of its consumption, but also supplies the information that Bacchus had been a king in Arabia, who commanded a great army of men and women, thanks to which he conquered all Asia and India."

It is not astonishing that in the same text he rather bitterly speaks of those who 'despise all mythology, saying that it is all lies not worth reading.'" And there are good reasons to believe that in saying so he had Spiegel in mind."

Karel van Mander's Ovid Interpretations had great influence on painters as well as poets. A painter by profession himself, he was one of the leading figures

of the so-called Haarlem maunensr school.„) As a poet, his influence was at first limited to the group of poets, nearly all of them refugees from the south, who were united in the 'Helicon' project. In their collectively conceived anthology of poems, 'The Dutch Helicon' (Dell *Nederdnytschen Helicon*), Van Mander's explicarions are used over and over ag.un." But soon his influence reached further than this rather close-knit group he himself had organized. One of those who profited almost from the beginning of his poetic career, was Joost vnn den Volldel, who, as we saw, in 1663 still adhered to the same threefold method of interpretation.²

In the meantime, other discussions had taken place. In March 1619, Constanrijn Huygens wrote a sonnet addressed to Arma Roomers Visscher, whom he had met a month earlier. It was a reaction to a sonnet from her, in which she had asked him for news from the Helicon. He lets the Muses answer her: she had better come herself to see, because Constannjn is unknown over there and does not know anything about what is going on. At the other side of the autograph, Huygens had scribbled the verses of Virgil: 'Me, too, the Picrian maids have made a poet, [etcetera], but I trust them not'.²²

The incident would not have merited any attention if two years later Huygens had not entered into a sort of poetical discussion with Pierer Cornelisz Hooft. In January and February 1621, both poets exchanged sonnets on the occasion of Huygens' departure to England. Elsewhere, I have argued that in these poems Hooft formulates a nee-platonic conception of poetry, illustrated this time by the mythical figures of Orpheus and Arion, and that Huygens rejects this conception as far as his own poetry is concerned, with an appeal to his 'Dutch-ess'.» Even if in this case there was no question of anything aside from playful irony, it seems sure that Huygens did not envisage a neeplaronic background for his own poetry, nor any of the mythological imagery that was connected to it. But there is more.

In 1603, one year before Karel van Manlier published his Ovid inrerperanon. the newly appointed professor at Leyden University, Daniel Heinsius, had delivered his inaugural lecture *De poctis et connn interpretatcribus* (On poets and their interpreters). There, as well as in the dedication of his *Elegiae*, published earlier that year, the neoplaronic conception of poetry as a heavenly inspired force that gave expression to cosmic harmony and sympathy in its images, was formulated in a much more learned and philosophical way than Van Mander had done. But above all, Heinsius' conception was much more poetical, laying full emphasis on the beauty of rhythm, sound, and images, and rejecting all far-fetched allegorical interpretations. The same year, in his study of the *Erga kai Hemera* ('Works and Days') of Hesiod, Heinsius underlined once more the beauty and wisdom hidden in the images of gods, demigods, mythical poets, and heroes of the ancient world.«

These same ideas lay behind the poetic correspondence carried on in 1615 between Heinsius, his cousin Jacob van Zevccore and Anna Roemers. Here, the Helicon myth of Apollo and the Muses, about which Huygens was so romc,

Helicon and Hills of Sand

played a central role. And a few years later, these same ideas once again inspired Hoofr in his exchange of poems with Huygens.²⁵

In the meantime, Heinsius had seen his own Dutch poetry published by his friend Pen-us Scriverius in 1616, including his famous 'Bacchus hymn' (*HYIIIllus oft lof-sanck van Bacchusi*). This very extensive poem testifies to his great knowledge of classical mythology. Scriverius had added a still more extensive and learned commentary, in which all available knowledge was presented, sometimes even combined with traditional allegorical interpretations. More important to my argument, however, is Heinsius' own prologue to the poem, in which he explains why a Christian poet should use the pagan lies no one believes in any longer.

Referring to the Christian fathers and doctors of the church as well as to classical authors and philosophers, he argues that mythological fictions are nothing but names for natural entities and forces, like 'wine' and 'love', and their good and bad qualities. According to this philosophical view, all Greek wisdom was contained in these stories. Therefore there was no question of adoration of pagan gods, and no reason for any Christian poet to avoid using their names.²⁷

Heinsius, as was to be expected, does not speak of any allegorical meanings, but limits his commentaries on the story to the qualities and effects of wine. His verses on the newborn Bacchus, for instance, run like this:

Why are you naked, o Evan, and pictured without any clothes? Because you hate lies and do not love double meanings. Truth lies hidden in your sweet drink. For when we are drunk our tongues are loosened and all that is buried in our hearts comes to life in our mouths.

The poem abounds with mythological stories and learned details, but the interpretations never exceed the physiological and, mostly, psychological level. It must have been this combination of erudition and very direct individual expression that made the poem so unique at the time:

... the tongue sticks to the mouth. Babacta, what is this? Give me your drink, and cure my illness. Chase away those water goddesses and pour me out abundantly, that I conquer my sorrows and cares. Why are you following me all the time, why do you make me roam about? What wrong did I do towards you? ... Where do you want me to go? In the water, as they say? Who should save me?²⁸

The publication of Heinsius' collected Dutch poetry (*Nederduytsche poemata*) was something of an event, to be judged by the subsequent publication of six editions in the following six years.²⁹ It was perhaps no wonder that a reaction ensued. Dirck Rafaelsz Camphuysen, a dissident and, therefore, dismissed parson, continued the tradition started by Coornhert and tackled the question.

Two factors may have augmented Camphuysen's indignation. First, in the 1618 edition of his poetry, Heinsius had published after his Bacchus hymn a parallel 'Hymn of Jesus Christ' (*tlot-sanck van Jesus Chr;stills*). Secondly, Camp-

huysen's attack would have been fuelled by the fact that, since his marriage in 1617, Heinsius had become closely related to the so-called gomarist faction of the public church and was even appointed secretary to the synod of Dordrecht.¹¹

In a poem addressed to his friend and co-dissident Joannes Geesterbus, Camphuysen rebuked Heinsius for his hypocrisy, writing as he did of Bacchus as well as of Christ, of worldly love as well as of eternal bliss. In another poem, entitled 'Law of good poetry' (*Wel-rYllens wet*), he launches a severe attack on all Greek and Latin learning and mythology. And given the literary situation of the moment it seems more than likely that here, too, he had Heinsius in mind.

It is striking how much this last poem makes one think of Coornhert, who was much admired in the dissident circles Camphuysen belonged to. Camphuysen uses the same arguments, sometimes almost the same words as Coornhert had done. For Camphuysen, too, in a good poem the words should be adequate representations of the issues at stake, and nothing else. All pompous learning and pagan mythology, and everything that is not in accordance with the Dutch language, is to be avoided. The catchwords are nature and simplicity, the objectives are virtue and wisdom, which are beautiful enough in themselves and do not need any external adornments.¹²

Did his remarks reach Heinsius? We should not forget that Camphuysen and Heinsius wrote for different publics. Besides, since his marriage Heinsius had not written such poetry and even the publication of his juvenile verse had (at least formally) taken place without his consent.¹³ In return, he had published his religious-didactic poem *De contemptu mortis*, but after that his poetical creativity seems to have dried up.¹⁴ Nevertheless, he must have known about Camphuysen's views, Camphuysen being the most frequently read of all Dutch poets. So, when he came forward with a new publication eleven years later, it must have come as a shock to him that the discussion started again.

In 1632, Heinsius published his religious tragedy *Heredes intuncidus* with a dedication to Constantijn Huygens. A few months later, a young French man of letters, Jean Louis Cuez de Balzac, to whom Huygens had sent a copy, entered into a correspondence with him on the subject, forwarding some critical notes. Elaborated into a full treatise, these were eventually published under the title *Discours sur une tragedie de Monsieur Heinsius intitulée Herodes Infanticide*. Heinsius, who was furious, reacted in the same year with a *Epistola qua dissertationi D. Balzaci ad Herodem infanticidam respondetur*. As the question became linked to other quarrels in which Heinsius was involved, it developed into a 'cause célèbre' in the European literary world.¹⁵

Balzac's objections centre on two points: belief and appropriateness. He concedes that Herod, being a Romanized Jew and an idolater at that, might have used the names of pagan gods. But introducing an Angel as well as a Roman Fury on the stage in a single play is not acceptable. The pagan gods and demons died with the coming of the Christian God. The intermingling of the two will not result in their restoration, but it will certainly undermine the truthfulness of Christianity. Besides, it is inappropriate - even blasphemous - for a Christian writing from a Christian public to adorn his language in this way.

This last argument is Erasmian, but the first, about the undermining of truth, is not, as far as I can see. Heinsius' defense, partly the same as that brought forward in 16J 6, does not impress him. Furies such as Tisiphone cannot be regarded as merely visualized passions, virtues, and vices. They were gods to the Romans. Their functions - religious and not psychological - were those of gods, and Heinsius, too, had depicted them as gods.³⁵

In my opinion, here is the gist of the question, at least as regards the Dutch public. Until then all emphasis had been on stylistic qualities: using the names of pagan gods was considered pedantic and pompous. Instead, one should use one's own language, and in a simple and straightforward way. With an outspoken religious author such as Camphuysen, this pompous antique imagery assumes an extra moral connotation of vicious sensuality, and, in a religious context, of blasphemy.³⁶

But Balzac's objections go further. In my opinion, they imply a fundamentally historical view of religious and cultural development. What makes the mythological gods really dangerous is not the exotic quality of their names, not even the sinfulness of the passions they are said to signify, but the fact that once they had indeed been considered gods. As such, and because they are no longer believed in, they represent a real threat to the credibility of the Christian God.

I do not think the importance of Balzac's criticism was fully understood by most Dutch poets - if they knew about it at all. Opinions mainly continued to develop along the lines drawn by Coornhert and Camphuysen on one side and Heinsius on the other, albeit that both sides seemed to withdraw more and more into their own, respectively religious and profane, domain. Thus in the so-called urgent warming preceding Willem Sluijter's collection of 'Psalms, spiritual hymns and songs' (*Psa/men, lo(-sangen, ende gceestclike liedckens, 1661*), we read that he had followed the style of the Bible, and avoided the 'alien and false adornments of the antique fables and the names of pagan gods, trying to speak with simple edifying words".»

There was, however, at least some receptivity. Perhaps the intensive reworking by Daniel Mostaert of Heinsius' challenged tragedy is one example. Besides reorganizing the whole structure, Mostaert removed all references to pagan deities and replaced the major objective of Balzac's scorn, Tisiphone, with the ghost of Herod's brother-in-law.³⁸ A clear echo of Balzac's opinions on a more abstract level can be found in the arguments against mythology advanced by Joachim Oudaan. At [he same time, Oudaan, a great admirer of Coornhert as well as of Camphuysen;v again extended his objections to the use of mythology to *all* poetry, secular and profane.

The first of Oudaan's anti-mythological writings was a wedding poem, written in 1662 and directed to his friend Joan Blasius, who had published a small mythological reference book. Here he wishes all pagan gods back to hell, which is generally reminiscent of Balzac's argument. In addition, he sneers at those who applied such poetical ornaments, that they were beggars' finery, good for unspiced poets only. Fifteen years later, he elaborated these arguments in a long poem, especially dedicated to this issue. But there are reasons enough to assume

that in the meanwhile he did not keep them to himself, one of them being the reaction on Vondel's pupil Joannes Antonides van der Goes.

In 1671, Antonides published his extensive epic-didactic poem on the river Y, *Ystrnom*. Among the prelinmura figured a laudatory poem by Oudaan, full of such praise as such poems ought to give, but ending with some critical remarks: 'What a pity that a false varnish is splashed over such a beautiful piece of work' and 'I do not value adornments in need of justification'. The justification was given in the same work, in a small treatise preceding the poem itself, reason enough, I think, to consider it the result of previous discussions.

Antonides begins by repeating Vondel's proposition, formulated in his defence of *Faeton*; and which we may now consider a reply to Balzac: nobody would think he was trying to reinstate paganism. Next, he turns to Heinsius. He quotes Heinsius in the 1616 edition of his Dutch poetry, that mythological fictions were only names for natural phenomena and human passions. But then he continues with the argument Heinsius had advanced in his reply to Balzac-' that, as such, they constituted the major adornment of all poetic language.

As one of the famous instances to illustrate this second point, Antonides refers *inter alia* to Sannazzaro, who in a poem on the Virgin had attributed prophecy of the birth of the Saviour to Proteus.¹ If anything, this example makes clear how principled, and how antagonistic, was the stand that he took: the same poem had been used by Erasmus in his *Ciceronianus* as a negative example, a passage that, in its turn, was quoted by Balzac. But there is yet more to it, for the mere fact that he appeals to this poem to justify his own secular *Ystrnom* implies that to him too the problem was not confined to religious poetry only.

Six years later, in 1677, Oudaan eventually came up with a fully-fledged argumentation of his position in a poem entitled 'Religion and idolatry disclosed: to present day poets' (*Godsdienst en het godendcm ontdekt: aan de hedendaagsche dichterss*). Here, at last, he elaborates the two points already present in his epigram for Blasius. Firstly, that the mythological gods had indeed been gods to the Greeks and the Romans, and that therefore their poetical renaissance was a flirtation with devilish forces and, as such, an insult as well as a threat to the Christian creed. And secondly, that their so-called poetical beauty was nothing but idleness and lewdness.!

Before the Balzac-Heinsius discussion took place, nobody had ever taken pagan gods so seriously, nor judged Parnassian style so negatively. The difference is striking: no more allegorical interpretations à la van Maander, nor the more symbolic interpretations advocated by Heinsius. The time for neo-platonic conceptions of poetry had passed. Instead, an acute awareness of historical development had grown, in the light of which the pagan gods could only be conceived as idols. Idols that had been overcome: the use or non-use of mythology was no longer a question of genre or style, but one of time. As modern times were Christian, no poet should use pagan imagery anymore, whether in religious or in profane poetry.

It would be another hundred years before the consequences of these new conceptions were fully drawn, at least in the Netherlands. In 1765, the young Rijk-

lof Michael van Goens published a treatise on the 'use of fables in modern poetry' (*Uitweiding over het gebruite der oude fabel-historie in de dichtstukken der bedendaegscheni*, in which he opposed the use of mythology on historical grounds.:" His arguments were essentially the same as Oudaan's. The difference of period was mainly reflected by the fact that what in 1677 could be expressed in a seven-page poem was, in 1765, given in a forty-three page scholarly essay (complete with quotations and references). The pagan gods had indeed been argued off the poetic stage.

9

Amsterdam School-Orations from the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century*

In September 1625, the government of the province of Holland took the important decision to publish a general 'rule' for the Latin schools in its jurisdiction. The ordinance was never accepted in the other provinces, and even in Holland itself it met with some reluctance from the part of the teachers in the field, undoubtedly due to its too exacting contents.' Nevertheless, it remained the only formal regulation for this type of school till 1715, and if only for that reason it seems reasonable to assume that it must have responded at least to a certain extent to the actual situation.'

The 'school-order', as it was called, was an idealistic and ambitious attempt to reform the programme of the Latin schools to the highest possible humanist standard. Initiated by the rector and senate of the Leyden university, it was composed by a committee of Leyden professors, which included part the theologians Antonius Walaeus and Anronius Thysius, the 'professor politicae and head of the so-called collegium oratorium Petrus Cunaeus, the famous classicists Daniel Heinsius and Gerardus Johannes Vossius, and the logician Franco Burgersdijk. Together with the new ordinance went the publication of a host of officially prescribed books, most of which were written especially for the occasion by some of the afore-mentioned scholars.'

The programme as a whole took six years, the first three of which were wholly devoted to religion, Latin grammar, syntax and prosody, and some elementary Greek. In the third, second, and first classes the main emphasis was on rhetoric and logic.⁴

In the third class, elocution was most important. Lessons in style were scheduled for four days a week, at 10 o'clock in the morning and at 2 in the afternoon. The book used was VOSSIIUS' *Elementa Rhetorica*, a small booklet of about 40 pages. But already at that point, the foundations of argumentation - "sine quibus non est ut Rhetoric intellegi possit" - were also to be taught. For the two other days (Wednesday and Saturday), practical exercises were provided: a letter of some sort, as a first preparation for more advanced rhetoric, and in the field of logic, a disputation.

In the second class, fully-fledged rhetoric and logic were prevalent: Vossius' *Methodica contraeta* being a complete 450 page handbook on rhetoric, abstract-

Ill: iias. Sources and Documents relating to the Early Modern History of Ideas; vol. 22 (1995), p. 99-115.

ed from his famous *Institutio oratoria*. Besides, Cicero's orations were to be read and, as we may induce, analysed. Even the *ACllcis* had to be studied from a rhetorical point of view: 'In his orationum praecepta capita arque argumenta observentur'. The exercises on the Wednesdays and Saturdays were to be directed by Heinsius' translations of Aphrodisius and Thcon's *progymnasmata*. Besides rhetoric, logic had to be continued in theory and practice, while an exercise in poetry is mentioned also.

In the last - 'first' - class, two possibilities were offered a more logical-rhetorical one, and one of a more 'mathematical' literature. For 1-0th groups, however, the exercises focused on poetry and rhetoric. The poetry was the type of rhetorically organized epideictical and deliberative social poetry Senliger had described in his *Poetics*.⁵ It became highly fashionable in the Netherlands around the 1630-40s, when the first school-order generation had left school. And the orations had to be elaborated to the point of real *declamationes* 'auribus digna pulvinorum aurlirorum'.

This last exercise represented the apogee of a humanist education, as Marc van der Poel has shown in his beautiful study on the humanist *declamatio*. As such, it had been subjected to a lot of criticism, even in the sixteenth century. According to Van der Poel, the *declamatio* often proved too difficult for the pupils, and tended to become a mere tissue of tropes and citations from classical authors.:

So much for a background sketch to a collection of seventeen orations, written and pronounced by different pupils of the Amsterdam Latin school on the occasion of the vernal and autumnal exams of the years 1(,72. till 1(,77. These orations are bound together in one convolute, but they were printed separately by different Amsterdam firms, although in the same format and lay-out.⁶ One may venture the supposition that proud parents paid for the costs. Seven of them are orations, the other ten *carmina*, and all bear the annotation that they were respectively spoken and 'sung' in public. This performance took place, as is written in some of them, 'in bruceurcio Novi Templi': in the choir of the New Church, the main church of Amsterdam, situated next to the Town Hall on Dam-square.

That this custom was to be continued for a long time to come - albeit, perhaps with some interruption - is proved by another collection of comparable oration, and *carmina*, dating from 1752 up to 1759. Here even most invitation leaflets for the event are preserved with the corresponding texts:

As in the sixteenth century, the pupils - and presumably the teachers as well - must have been confronted with some difficulties in fulfilling their final task. That this was indeed the case may be deduced from the existence of supporting textbooks. These books did not present much theory, but contained concrete examples, models and citations to be used when writing an oration. Looking into the production of the main Amsterdam publishing houses, one is struck by the quantity of publications of this sort around the middle of the seventeenth century.

Of course, Vossius' *Hennumta* [Leyden 1(,2(,), officially prescribed as it was, did go into reprint regularly (Leyden 1(,34, Amsterdam 1635, Middelburg 1(,40, Amsterdam 1646 and 1(,55), although the 1655 edition, issued by the Amster-

dam firm of Joannes Janssonius was the last until a new one was published by the same company (now going under the name of janssonius-Wacsborgius) in 1720.¹⁹ His much more extensive *Rhetorica contractu* (Leyden 1621), prescribed for the second class, was more successful. After four Leyden-reprints (1622, 1627, 1640, and 1650) the publication was taken over by the Amsterdam firms of respectively Paulus Marthias (1653), Joannes Janssonius (1655), Joannes Ravesteynius (1666), and Henricus et Vidua Theodori Boon (1685).²⁰ The 1666 and 1685 editions, and possibly also that of 1655, were reprints of the official edition 'ex decreto Ill. ac Pot. Hollandiae et West-Frisiae D. D. Ordinum in usum scholarum ejusdem provinciae excus!'. But more interesting is the edition issued by Paulus Matthias 'Additis magis necessariis praeceptis et exemplis, ex Parnionibus CJUS, nee non Institutionibus oratorii. In usum urriusque scholae Amsrelodamensis'. The addition of practice instructions and examples met with an apparent need in the classroom.

We see the same thing happen to the *progymnasmata*, likewise prescribed for the second class. The translations that Aphthonius and Theon Heinsius had made in 1626 on behalf of the school-order programme never had second editions. On the contrary, the sixteenth century Aphthonius translation by Agricola and Cranacus was, with the annotations by Lorichius, reissued at least eight times in Amsterdam between 1642 and 1665 by the firms of Louis and Daniel Elzevier (1655), Johannes Janssonius (1657, 1659) and Johannes à Maanen (1665).²¹ The difference between the two was that Heinsius presented nothing but the bare texts and that the Agricola-Cranacus-Lorichius edition was literally stowed with more or less elaborate examples.

The very year Elzevier came out with his first Aphthonius edition, the rival firm of Henricus Laurentius published a reprint of a voluminous handbook, originally written in 1612 by the Roman-catholic German priest Matthaeus Timpius: *Dormi secure: vel Cynosura praecursorum ac studiosorum*, 'sleep safely', or the 'Little Bear' (that is the constellation on which seamen used to project their course) for professors and students.²² It contained 110 fewer than 200 setups for orations, some schematic, others more elaborate.

In the following years, Elzevier as well as Janssonius came out with other helpful books. In 1648, Janssonius entered the market with a reprint of Thomas Farnabius' *Index theoricus et oratorius*, first printed in London in 1625.²³ This was a very handy introduction, with references and examples of mainly cloutinary devices. Most valued by students and professors must have been the extensive chapter with *formulae*: expressions and formulations taken from classical and modern authors, to be used in different places in one's oration. One can imagine that these 'formulae oriendi, petendi attentionem, uarrundi, proponendi et partiendi' etc., must have come as a godsend. The book also contains references for different subjects to classical and modern authors, so that when writing for example on "avaritia", you found a catalogue of 19 places you might use, ranging from Lucretius to pope Urbanus.

The *formulae* especially must have filled a need, for eight years later, in 1656, Elzevier came out with a booklet, dealing exclusively with them. It was written by a Norwegian resident of Leyden, Ivar Pert Adolphus, and was appropriately

titled: *Medulla oratoria*, the marrow of oratory.¹⁵ It was even easier to use than Farnaby's hook, the *formulae* not being taken from existing texts, but consisting of rather short, ready-made passages you could put into your composition just as they were. Most attention was paid to the *formulae exoriciendi*, which occupied more than half of the pages available.

Two years later, in 1658, Jansonius struck back with the reprint of a *Fliwil-giulll* of sayings and anecdotes on all sorts of ethical and educational topics. Originally written in 1650 by a professor of the Alkmaar Latin school, Renerus Neuhusius, it was explicitly meant to support his pupils in the composition of their declamations."

In the meantime, Elzevier had published in 1650 an oratorical guide that, more than Aptonius' or Tirupius introductions, was devoted to the more socially orientated rhetorical and poetical genres that were at length compulsory for the final class since the school-order. While Timpius, for instance, nearly exclusively tackles moral questions, (icorgius Beckherius in his *Orator extemporaneus* gives theory and models for all sorts of natal, nuptial, funeral, congratulatory, etc. orations and poems." This book was possibly commissioned by the Elzevier press and may have been intended for the German market, which was expanding rapidly after 1648. Humanist literacy was now becoming a middle class bourgeois feature in Germany too. Attributed to a certain Michael Rndau, it went into a third, revised edition in 1673 this time published by the firm of Van Waesberghe.

of the same kind was a somewhat elder book with which yet another publisher, Johan van Rvesreyn, made his mark on the rhetorical market in 1654: Conradus Dictericus' *Institutiones oratoriae*, 'sive de conscribendis orationibus, è veterum ac recentiorum oratorum praeceptis, methodicae introductio; in USIII juvenutis scholasticae illustratae', originally written in 1630.'

Four years later, the same Van Ravesreyn came out with a reprint of the *Eloquentia bipartita* by Famianus Strada, in which theoretical observations on political, moral and stylistic questions were illustrated with examples from a host of classical and modern authors.' Although far more learned and far less handy for immediate application than the publications mentioned before, this book too would serve the goal it proposed, the 'irnitatio ad dicendam quocunq; de re scenennrn'.

Apart from all this the Delft schoolmaster Jacobus Crucius had 45 orations held by his pupils published by Johannes Jansonius in 1650 as a 'rudiosae juvenutis rnanuductio ad artem orateu-riam', a collection of inspiring examples for other youngsters, as it were.²⁰

This survey of school-books is not the result of any systematic bibliographical research, but originates from what has been only a quick look into the collection of the Amsterdam university library. Nevertheless, the concentration of these publications between 1642 and 1658, with only a minor continuation into the mid-1670s, is striking.

There is some evidence that after 1677, the public pronunciation of orations by the pupils might have come to a temporary end. Perhaps this had to do with

the merger of the two former Amsterdam Latin schools.²¹ In written programmes dating from 1677 and 1682, only Vossius' small *Elementa* and the gymnastic exercises were retained, and no mention whatsoever is made of any public performances. The amount of copies of the books discussed above, printed in the 1650s, would have lasted as long as that. Afterwards, it would take until the second quarter of the eighteenth century before a new wave of Latin rhetorical schoolbooks hit the Dutch market.

In the 1650s the production of these books was very much in hands of the three biggest publishing firms of schoolbooks and university textbooks in the Netherlands: Elzevier, Janssonius and Van Ravesreyn. Of course, these firms did not only sell their books on the local market, but they must have been the major providers of that local market too.

The question that presents itself at this point is whether the pupils of the Amsterdam Latin school did indeed profit from these publications in composing the orations and poems they were supposed to pronounce publicly for their final exams.

When looking into the collection of orations at hand; the first thing to be noted is that, with two exceptions, they do not conform to the more personal and social epideictic genres the pupils should have been trained in in their final year in school. Moral and, to a certain extent, religious topics abound. In this respect, their subjects are more in agreement with those to be found in the Aphthonius editions and still more with those in the book by Timpius, rather than the ones discussed by Beckherus and Dierericus. Of the sixteen topics treated by the Amsterdam schoolboys eight occur in Timpius' book, which is not a very impressive score, but in any case a higher one than in any other of the publications mentioned. The other topics dealt with are very much in the same line, with the (notable) exception of two patriotic orations: in 1673, there is a poem dedicated to the prosperity of the house of Orange which had reestablished its official position the previous year (nr. 15), and in 1676 an elegy on the death of Holland's most famous admiral, Michiel de Ruyter (nr. 13).

This nearly exclusive predilection for moral and religious themes, shared by Timpius and the Amsterdam pupils, and for that matter, professors, was perhaps not so much in accordance with sixteenth century humanist ideas on education, as with later, post-rridentine, developments.²² We see the same tendency in the orations held at the Delft Latin school as published by Crucius. Here fifteen orations out of 45 have the same subjects as may be found in Timpius. The others are in the same line, with the exception of two written in praise of classical heroes, and two others on a national topic - both on the death of Maurice, prince of Orange.

To get a somewhat more acute insight into the way these orations were composed and, if possible, into their relation with the instruction-books mentioned, I have compared some models and orations written on the same subject: *Avaritia*. Two Amsterdam schoolboys chose this theme for their compositions. For the autumnal exams of 1674, Henricus Tubclius composed a *carmen* on the subject

(nr. 8) and for the autumnal exams of 1676, Theodorus Silvius wrote an oration (nr. 1).

Huricus Tubelius came up with a fairly ambitious poem, full of stylistic devices. He starts with a rather impressive invocation to God:

Cardine pande fores, biprentia tecta resolve
Rex Superurn, coeli cardine pande fores.
Mellifluam Pater alme, milu da ex acthre vocem, I..J (r. 1-3)
(Open the doors of the skies, king of heaven; Father,
give me from the beneficent ether a voice sweet as honey)

Compared to this, the following address to the public is rather stereotypical and may have been directly inspired by Ivar Petr Alphonsus' *formulae exorandi*:

vos quoque m'ignifici Procercs, Dominique Scholarchac
Annuire, & capctis ore favere meis. (r.7-8)

(And you too, officials and teachers, approve and favour my endeavours)

The main embellishments of this poem are the *figurae dicendi*, of which he makes ample use. In the following opening lines of his *argumentatio*; I have printed thru III italics:

Maxima pars hominum morbo j.ictarur habendi,
Et vcluti ralphac viscera rudir humi.
Hen: quantum caecae mortalia pectora nocris:
Heu! quts rerrigenas impius error habet?
Negligitur probiras, miscntur sacra protanis,
Regnat avaririac luxuriacqr<: malum.
Pro psetata dolus, pro relligione libido,
Sancniquc vix usquam mansir III orbe fides.
NOII SUIImUTIIIOvere honum, quo fluxIt ah uno,
Quicquid mesr pulcn, quicquid in orbe)UIII.
Eccsed hie stygiis admoras effodit umhris
Conditque effossns insariatus apes.
Quae rogo, cum bruns h0H111111 commercia terns?
Cm coelum Patna est, cui Pater Ipse Deus .
... (r. 11-24)

The whole poem is literally crammed with exclamations, rhetorical questions, puns, parallels, etc., proving that its author had obediently studied his stylistics, whether or not derived from Vossius' *Elementa*. Besides this, one now and then comes across an expression that could have been taken from Nahu- sius' *Florilegium*. Compare:

Regnat nvarinae [uxuriaequc malum (r. 6)

with the sentence given by Neuhusius:

Duae res sum, quae maxima homines ad maleficium impellunt (two things by which men are mostly driven towards crime) Luxuries et Avaritia.

And Tubelius:

Semper avarus eget, sitis insatiabilis nun,
Mendicum medias efficit inter opes.
Esurir et struens patitur jejunia mensis,
Haud secus ac plena Tanralus ore sitit
(...) (r.67-70)

with Neuhusius:

Omnia possideat solus, furir nrdor habendi,
Nee minus ac plena Tanralus amne sitir
[...]
Semper avarus eget, situ insatiabilis aun:
Mendicum medias susrinet inter opes
[...]²⁴

The oration by Theodorus Silvius is not only more modest than the one his colleague provided two years earlier, but it also employs quite different techniques.

Instead of an emotional appeal to God, it opens with a simple statement of the arguments to be defended: because of their greed, people neglect the poor, and if they think they may obtain eternal bliss in that way they are fundamentally wrong, for wealth drives most people to hell. Here follows a *formula exorandi* taken nearly literally from Adolphus:

precor [...] ut mihi de avaritiae vituperio orationem habiruro arumum benevololum & arrentas aures adhibeatis, bonaque cum venia verba mea audiat. [p. A 2^{recto-verso}]

Compare Adolphus:

peto, [...] ut eandem avaritiae henevolentiae et arrentiones vestrae promovere.

and

ut! [...] bonaque cum venia me audiat, majorem in modum vos oro et orator.²⁵

The greatest difference, however, is to be found in the argumentation. Silvius accentuates the points he wants to make not by means of *figurae dicendi*, but in quite other ways. First, he gives an anecdote: the story of the miser who, looking

all the time after his gold, shows its hiding place to a thief, taken from Plautus' *Aulularia*: a play by the way which in 1616 had been very successfully adapted by one of the greatest Dutch poets of that time, P. Hooft. And secondly he quotes a twenty-line poem by some, as he says, 'egregie Poeta', whom I have not yet been able to identify. By inserting these passages, occupying about one-third of his text, he has made it rather easy for himself. His achievement certainly ranks far behind Tubclius'.

But different as they may be in form, after their respective *exordia* the line of argument in both orations is very much the same. In both, the *conclutivatio*, drawing upon the *loci* of nature and effects, argues that greed is an illness and a sin. A symptom of the illness is its insatiability, being a hydropic of the soul, and as a sin it is the root of all evil and leads inevitably to hell. In both, this *confirmatio* is also followed by a *retractio* which is built upon the word of the Bible: do not put your faith in temporal riches, but gather your treasures in heaven. And both actualize this dictum in the *peroratio*, making all appeal for charity, although Silvius does this in a rather concise way and Tubclius in a very elaborate one.

This moral and religious line of argument is completely in accordance with the model for an oration on 'Avaritia' as given in Timpius' *Dormi secure and though this might be more or less conclusive - is not to be found in any of the other instruction-books I looked into.*" In Aphronius' *Progymnasmata* for instance the emphasis is nearly exclusively on the negative consequences for society and sr. uc."

The same is the case for the arguments used. Nearly all of them are to be found in Timpius' very extensive treatment of the topic: being an illness and a sin, avarity dominates its possessor, instead of being dominated by him, who in the midst of all his riches is poor and will have to leave his possessions at the time of his death; the worship of money is inspired by Satan, and a form of idolatry, gold having become God; one should gather one's riches in heaven, etc.

Incidentally, an argument, especially on the worldly consequences of greed, might have been taken from another source, Aphronius, Strada, or some of the passages in classical or modern literature Farnabius points to. But the overall conclusion to be drawn seems clear: *Dormi secure* 'or the Little Bear had indeed served as the helpful compass on which the Amsterdam schoolboys navigated.

Yet, Timpius' *Dormi secure* has a distinct Roman-Catholic content, with models for orations on topics as [*Defensio religionie Catholicae* and *Lincomnnae Theologiae Scholasticae*, to name only a few. Amsterdam was a tolerant city and a great part of its population, up to a quarter, had remained with the Roman-Catholic Church. But even so, I doubt if it is conceivable that an outspokenly Roman-Catholic schoolbook could have been used in what was, after all, a public Latin school. Some of the school-orations, Silvius for instance, are outspokenly anti-Catholic. I think I will have to continue my search for other books that could have helped young Henricus Tubclius and Theodorus Silvius to pass their final exams,

Appendix I

Amsterdam school-orations

University library Amsterdam: 1930 G 50

- 1 Theodorus Silvius, *Oratio in ai-aritiac uituperiunr*. Dixi publico. Examine Aurumnali 14 Cal. Octob. A. 1676. Amsterdam: F. Lamningn & P. Warnaer.
- 2 Phiuppus la Crue, *Oratio de uariis humanae vitae calamitatibus*. Dixi publicè. Promorione Autumnali, in Brabeurcno NOVI Ternpli. 1677. Amsterdam: Viduam Petri Bocrcman, in fossa Regia vulgo de *Cingel* prope Scholas Latinas.
- 3 Nicolaus de la Bassccour, *Carmen quo [channis Baptistae mors ab Herode cncdeliter occisi deplcratur*, Cecini publice. Examine autumnali. 1677. Am-srerdam: Ahrahamuru Wulfgangh.
- 4 joannes Schrick, *Carmen de vitae aeternae gluria*. Cecini publice. Promcnone auctumuali, In Brabeurerio Novi Ternpli. 1676. Amsterdam: Petrum Boereman, in fossa Regia vuIgo de *Cingel* prope Scholas Latinas.
- 5 Wilhelmus van Ham, *Carmen de ui et efficacia rcginac pecuniac*. Cccini publicè. Examine aururnnali, In Brabeutetio Novi Templi. 1676. Amsterdam: Perrus Boeteman.
- 6 Willehrordus Noortdyck, *Gratio in laudem dearinae*, Dixi publice. Ex. autumnali. 1677. Amsterdam: Petrus Messchaart.
- 7 Antonius du Cam, (*rratio metrica de constantia sapicntis*. Cecini publice. Ex. verno. 3 Non Aprilis 1676. Amsterdam: joachimum a Dyck.
- 8 Henricus Tubclius, *Carmen in aoaritiac oituperuon*, Cecini publice. Ex. all-tumnali 1674. Amsterdam: Danie!um Bakkamunde.
- 9) joannes Oosrerlmg, *Oratio in laudem pacie*. Dixi publice. Ex. verno 1672. Amsterdam: Cuiljamus Engelgravus.
- 10 Petrus Noordyck, *Carmen de meditatione mortis*. Cccini publice. Ex. autumn. 1676. Amsterdam: Danielum Bakkamunde.
- 11 joannes a Weert, *Enccnniunc prudentiae*. Cccini publice. Ex. autumn. 1675. Amsterdam: Danielum Bakkamunde.
12. Wilhelmus Buys, *Oratio de conscientia*, Dixi pubhce. Prom. vernali 1677. Amsterdam: Pert. Boereman.
- 13 Nicolaus Deyman, *Elegia in mnrtem strenui et nobilis uiri D. Michaëlis RI-ren Belgicae Tbalassiarcliae*, Cecini publicc. Ex. autumn 1676. Amsterdam: Danielum Bakk amunde.
- 14 David Doomick jr., *Cratio in laudem Iatinitaus*. Dixi publicc. Ex. verno 1675. Amsterdam: Hier. Swecns.
- 15 Horcentius Croon, *Carmen uotiuum de Auriacae domus prosperitate et [eder-atae Belgicae oprata instaurationc*, Cecini publice. Ex. aurumnali 1673. Am-srerdam: Paulus Marthias.
- 16 jacobus de la Mine, *De uana deornm cultic carmen*. Cecini publiice. Ex. verno 1676. Amsterdam: Hem. et Theod. Boom.

17 Nicolaus van loosdrecht, *Carmen in vituperium tristinae*. Cccini publicè.
Ex. verno 1673. Amsterdam: Eg. j. Zaagman.

Appendix II

Henricus Tubelius, *Carmen ill Aoaritiac vitupeman*. [Wapen van Amsterdam]
Amsterdam: Apud Daniclcsm Bakkurnunde 1674.
p. A 2^{recto}-A 4^{verso}:

Carmen in Avaririae Vituperium

Cardine pande forcs, bipnrentia tecta resolve
Rcx supcrum, cocli ea-dine paude forcs.
Mellitluam Pater alme, mihi da ex aethere vocern,
Nostniquc propitio Iimina visc gradu.
Da Deus, ut valida possim proscribere menre
Quo non est toto, raetnus orbe malum.
Vos quoque maguifici Troceres, Dominique Scholarchae
Annuite, & cacpris ore lavere mers.
Hinc procul hinc Iugiat, nosrnsque recedar ab oris
10 Noxia perniciēs, turpis avariria.
Maxima pars hominum morbo [acnrntur habendi,
Et veluri talpae viscera rndir humi.
Hcu: quantum cuccuc mortalia pectora noctis:
Hcu! qurs terrigenas impins error habet?
15 Negligitur probitav, rniscenrur sacra profanis,
Regnar nvarjtiae iuxuriacque malum.
Pro pietate dolus, pro religione libido,
Sanctaque vix usquam mansir in orbe fides.
Non summum noverc bonum, quo Huxir ab uno,
20 Quicquid illest pulcri, quicquid in orbe boni.
Eccc sed hie stygus admotas effodir umbns
Condirque effossas insanarus opes.
Quae rogo, cum bruns hOlllllll commerca terris?
Cui coelum Parria est, cui Pater ipse Deus.
25 Turpis avarc, bonum nequicquam carpis ab illis
Rechus, ubi dolor est, nil nisi pl.merus adest.
Quid procul aequoreis vulucres sccta ns III undis,
Quidve agitas leporem per freta vasa vngum?
Insano, demens, haec, quae, secr.uis amore
30 (Crede mihi) verae nil bouirutis hahent:
Narn tacit argenri dira & mnlesana libido
Spurnunrur surnnu ut cura dccusque Dei.
Illa Pan-em, rcneros earn cum conjuge natos
Opprimit, & viduas saeviter, .ibsque metu.

- 35 Illrique divinis sua scrinin compler inermis
Pupilli, & falsas undique rudit opes.
Bella cruenra ciet, perjuria, srupra, rapmas,
Lenoneru illa facit, prosribulumque erear.
Exitium stygiis non unquurn prodiit ndis,
40 Saevius, argcnei quam malesuada sitis.
Est scclerum fons arque caput, non una vorago
Criminis, infer-m [anun, mortis iter.
Haec primum documenra dedit bona tollere furro,
Sanguine cognati cornmaculare manus.
45 Dic mihi, Pygmalion voluit em cuede Sichueum
Sternere, nummorum nonne cupido fuit?
Haec pestis scelcrata duces animosque patentes
Sub juga misir, eos vulnere srravir humi:
Turpis avarirics homines in dcvia raptat,
50 Amhitioque patens pectora caeca regir.
Vnus Pellaeo juveni non sufficit orbis,
Et doluir plures non potuisse rapi.
Ipsa salutiferum suspendit in aere Christurn
Et dirac imposuit membra verenda cruci.
55 Omnia quid referam, quid nun mortalia cogir
Pectora! quae nullis est srrianda bonis.
Quid repetam infandas ducroris Vespasiani
Arres, qucuis nummos congerir innurneros.
Millia sunr exempla mihi, si cunra rderrem
60 Ante dies fugeret, nox rueretque mari,
Vina quidem nimium sum pemiciosa bibenti:
Scilicet ebrietas noxia ruulta pant.
At sitis argent! multo damnosior illfi est,
Majus & exirium fen, gravius »occr.
65 Et veluri pmguls flammis alimonia pascir.
Noxia sic uvide crcscic edendo famcs.
Semper avarus eget, sins insuriabilis nuri,
Mendicum medias efficit inter opes.
Esurit & structis pantur jcxunia mensrs,
70 Hand secus ac pleno Tantalus ore sitit
Semper & alterius macrcscir rebus opimus
Invidiae paritur tela cruenra suae.
Custos, non Dominus: nee habes, quod babes set & ipsas
Pauper opes inter vivis avare, tuas.
75 O caecus hominum mentes! ô plena renebris
Pectora! cur vobis ranra libido mali?
Quid re aurum multo partum sudore juvahit,
Corpus ubi rapier pareo inopina tuum?
An vitare putas re fata novissima posse

- 80 Morris, & extremum lege rrahenre diem?
 Fnlcris uh miser & demens: uhi tempera quemquam
 Invenics opibus percpctuasse suis!
 Quid nisi pU!VIS eris, fulvum qui colligis aurum
 Et qui divitias nocte dicque paras!
- 85 .Alors sua sceprra tenet rot corumurua mundo,
 Omnia sub leges mors vocat atra suas.
 Pauperis haec auquo pulsar pede Baucidis aedes,
 Purpurcisque perir, tecta habitata Diis.
 Mancipium Satanae tandem desisre rupacis,
- 90 Desine Suprcmi spernere jussa Dei.
 Infandis cooperre mnlis urgebctis ornni
 Tempure! finis er-itnulla futuru mali!
 Terra rcrngcms age linque, caduca caducis,
 Tu pete perpetuas non morirurus opcs.
- 95 Sider.r scnnde magis fulgcna, quaere superna
 A qucis dependet maxima nostra salus.
 Exsultabis ibi (morbo cunique relict)
 Lacririi, illic absque Iabore qurcs.
 Non illic helli Portae referantur accrbi,
- 100 Semper ihi placid.i vivere pace licet.
 Illic invenics aurum, diadematu, Scepra,
 Ignibus astrigeri splendidiora polio
 Sic potes acternam cum Chnsto degere vitam,
 Sic pores exceisi Filius esse Dei.
- 105 Quod si nulla mover ranrru'um gloric rerum,
 Nee cupiunt amnum praemia rauta tuum,
 Vmdicis exstimulentr snltcm rormenra Cehennue;
 Salreru tartareue resptcc regna srvgis.
 Vos ergo Amsrcelli colitis qui mocni.i Cives,
- 110 Hanc procul e vestro pellite corde luem.
 Vobis Omniporens opibus bncdixir opirnis,
 Occaniquc dedit Scepra potente manu.
 Hunc tandem celebrate Pan-em fontemque bonorum,
 Nee premite ingrato tot sua dona smu.
- t t; Non opus est patula HUITmos distendier [sic]Iarcâ
 Mareries manibus jam dnur ampla piis.
 Tendire munificas tot egems rendere de xtrns,
 Paupcriem alterius sublevet alter ope.
- Tot profugos specrare vuos, rnptosque penates,
 120 Quneque doler rUSIS plnrma nupta corms.
 Hospiribus quoque Jura pus dare, recta luresque.,
 Et pupillaris sit tibi cura rei.

Sic caram cinget Pan-iam pax aurea rerram,
Sic vestns ceder mocnibus omne malum.
125 Sic toto emporium Felix celebrabere mundo,
Crandiaque implehit scrmia merce Deus.

Cecini publice
Henricus Tubelius.
Examine autumnali.
Anni 1674.

Mennonites and Literature in the Seventeenth Century*

Introduction

The participation of Mennonites in Dutch seventeenth-century literature has certainly been as great as that of members of other denominations. This is true not only for the more popular forms of devotional literature such as hymns or texts used to elucidate Biblical illustrations; Mennonite writers have also contributed to the most sophisticated Renaissance and Classicist genres. Some of these belong to the top, or at least to the second, rank of Dutch literature. On this elevated level, however, it seems sensible to distinguish between literature written by Mennonites and explicitly Mennonite literature, for in the non-devotional field, texts written by Mennonite authors are often hardly distinguishable from those written by non-Mennonites.

In this paper, I will concentrate on texts of a distinctive Mennonite character, and, as even this field is far too extensive, specifically on the more sophisticated ones. Nor will I enter into the dramatic production of Mennonite writers, which was also quite extensive. This leaves us a corpus of partly lyrical, partly narrative and discursive religious texts, which, in my opinion, forms an interesting and until now unduly neglected branch of Dutch Renaissance and classical literature. It is this poetry, written all the tangent of elitist poetical ability and Mennonite didactics and devotion, of which I hope to give you some impression.

Karel van Mander (1548-1606)

The Mennonites loved to sing. Religious song - Biblical or devotional - played an important role in Mennonite religious life. This phenomenon - as Piet Vissers has argued in his fine book on the Scabaelje brothers - is closely related to the specific Mennonite brand of devotion, with its great emphasis on the active relationship between Old Testament, New Testament, and the individual believer. Spiritual songs were, so to speak, 'new psalms', direct intermediaries between the believer and God, inspired by the Holy Ghost. Since the middle of the six-

* In: Alisrair Hamilton (ed.), *From Martyr to Merchant (Mennonite Urban Professionals). A Historical Introduction to Cultural Assimilation Processes of a Religious Minority in the Netherlands; the Mennonites*. Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press, 1994. pp. 83-98).

teenth century, innumerable hymnbooks were produced, the authors of which were mostly anonymous. In some cases we know the names, because they died as martyrs to their creed, or because they were well-known ministers, or, in a few cases, because they were or became well-known poets, such as the Schabaelje brothers just mentioned. One of these poets around the turn of the century was Van Mander,

Karel van Mander, born in Flanders in 1548, settled in Haarlem in 1583. He belonged to the Old Flemish denomination and as a Mennonite he wrote a vast number of songs which were collected in 1605 and published under the title *De Gulden Harpe* [The Golden Harp]. This songbook combined a devotional content with a recognized literary quality, and exercised a great influence upon the development of Mennonite hymnody in the seventeenth century.



Karel van Mander (1548-1606), famous painter, poet, and a church member of the orthodox Old Flemish Mennonites in Haarlem. The circumscription has his motto 'Een is noodich' (Only One is necessary). Engraving by J. Sucredarn after a painted design by H. Coltzius.

But Van Mander was also, by profession, a painter. As a painter, he was interested in the Renaissance conceptions of art and learning which he knew from his time as an apprentice in the Southern Netherlands, and had met with again during a stay in Italy in the 1570s – conceptions, for instance, about classical mythology being in accordance with Old Testament history and covering evangelical truths and lessons. Thus, the myth of the Titans assaulting Jupiter's throne was to be explained as an image of the dictum that pride is the cause of all evil. In this tradition he wrote an allegorized interpretation of the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid which also had notable influence. Furthermore, he was, from his earlier years on, acquainted with contemporary French Renaissance literature, as exemplified by Ronsard. But, although not in contradiction with his Mennonite creed, this was not religious literature. For that he had to turn to the works of Guillaume du Bartas.

Du Barras was the man who, in his collection of large epic poems on the Creation and Old Testament history *Les Septmaines* [the weeks] (1578-84), had applied the techniques of Renaissance classicist poetry to religious literature. These techniques consisted mainly of compositional and argumentative devices (that is how to construct a convincing argumentation), stylistic artifices (figures of speech, comparisons, etc.), and fictional representations (narrations, vivid descriptions, directly speaking personages). Nothing differs more from the direct and simple expression of the devotional song than this highly artificial poetry which is thoroughly classicist, except for the fact that the use of classical mythology, regarded as incompatible with a religious subject, is reduced to the level of mere metaphor, for example, using Venus to represent love.

Du Bartas's work had a tremendous impact on Dutch seventeenth century religious poetry, especially that written by Calvinist authors. His works had been translated into Dutch since the end of the sixteenth century. But one of the first authors to experience his influence in his own creative work was Van Mander; most notably in his long discursive didactic poem *Olijf-Bergh ofte Poema van den taetuen Dagh* [Mount of Olives, or Poem on the Last Day], published in 1609, three years after his death.

In no less than 4,250 lines, the *Olijf-Bergh* evokes Jesus' prophecies on his last day, interwoven with a variety of other Biblical information. The style, and sometimes even whole passages, are inspired by Du Bartas, but at the same time the structure of the poem is not, as with Du Barras, epic, or, for that matter, fictional, but purely didactic and discursive. Stories are not told as in Du Bartas's masterpiece; instead a broad spectrum of moments and data are adduced from everywhere – biblical and pagan history, natural science, classical philosophy and evangelical revelation – and placed in a discursive sequence.

In the introductory chapter, the majesty and power of the Christian God is opposed to that of all pagan gods, the prophecy of the Last Judgement is referred to, and a birds-eye view is given of the world's history starting from Adam and continuing through Noah up to Jesus Christ himself. Then, in the nine following chapters, the different tokens of doom and salvation are discussed: war and peace, treason and fidelity, greed and charity, justice and injustice, lust and love, belief and unbelief, all illustrated by innumerable examples. From Chapter 11 to

Chapter 13 the history of Jerusalem is related, ending in the town's destruction, and, in strophes 14 and 15, the lesson to be deduced from it is explicated: every sin has to be paid for and in the end man's only hope is in God's grace. Then follows, in Chapters 16 to 20, the description of the Last Day: the prophecies preceding it, the destruction of the world, the punishment of the doomed and the redemption by Jesus Christ of those who by their obedience, love, charity, and good works have earned eternal life. The last chapter concludes with the admonition to follow Jesus Christ and an evocation of the heavenly Jerusalem.

It is clear that in this poem Van Mander wanted to instruct, not by way of a narration or by that of a logical, discursive argument, but by imprinting in his reader's heart the metaphysical truth on which all history and knowledge converge. Perhaps it was this quality of spiritual rather than rational didactics that brought him to the idea of combining the argumentative composition of the didactic poem with the far more direct and emotional expression of the devotional song so much loved by the Mennonites. For there, too, as we saw, the living truth is the force that constitutes the unity of Old Testament, New Testament, and believing soul.

Van Mander did just this in a publication called *Bethlehem. Dit is het Broodhuys inhoudende dell Kerstmarbt* [Bethlehem, the House of Bread containing Christmas Eve], which was also published years after his death, in 1613. The title-page explains:

to know spiritual songs, sung by the shepherds at night watching over their flocks and longing for the Christ to come, also including the lamentations of Jeremiah.

All the songs bear the number of the psalm to whose melody they can be sung, so the inference seems reasonable that they were indeed meant to be sung. At the same time, however, they form a more or less coherent line of argumentation that continues for 68 pages. Each song is sung by two or three, at most four, shepherds, alternating strophe after strophe, one sometimes taking the lead for a longer sequence and then the others catching up again. As the fifteen songs and five lamentations are sung by no more than eleven shepherds in all, three of whom moreover are clearly pre-eminent, the whole assumes the character of a sort of primitive oratorio.

The line of argumentation starts with an evocation, in the first eight songs, of the principal events of Old Testament history from Adam and his sons, through Noah, Lot, Jacob, Joseph, and Moses, to David and Solomon, repeatedly interrupted by complaints about man's sinfulness, nearly all of them ending with a reference to the coming Messiah. The ninth through twelfth songs alternate with the five lamentations of Jeremiah. The songs express the hope of God's mercy and the liberation from sin, while Jeremiah laments the destruction of Jerusalem. In songs 13 to 15, the shepherds are informed by an angel of the birth of Christ. They pay their visit to the stable and sing the praise of God. The piece ends with an admonition to the reader in the form of an ABe: to follow Christ in his own life.

I hope this summary makes clear how similar the overall composition of *Bethlehem* is to that of the *Olijf-Bergh*, both interweaving Biblical history and evangelical truth in one vision continuously directed towards the reader. Yet, at the same time, the form is quite different, the one being cast in broad descriptions and arguments and the other in a panorama of hymns.

Joost van den Vondel (1587-1679)

Throughout the seventeenth century, Dutch Mennonite poetry moves between the two extremes of devotional song and didactic argumentation. I say 'moves between', because some hymns contain quite extended and learned arguments and some didactic poems are cast in lyrical or at least semi-lyrical forms.

Dierick Schabaelje, for instance, the author of two biblical plays and a moral comedy, in addition to a number of songs, published a treatise on the question of predestination in no less than 31 'refrains' in 1614. At that time, the 'refrain' was a semi-lyrical form, a hit old-fashioned but still commonly used for the treatment of religious issues. However, to force a complete treatise into such a mould must be regarded as quite exceptional.

Of course, it would be simplistic to reduce all Mennonite poetry to the two forms mentioned. Mennonites, like other poets, took part in all aspects of literary life. But as regards Mennonite literature in its strictest sense, I think we can say that the two pillars of Mennonite religious didactics, biblical instruction and personal appeal, found their most genuine expression in these forms.

The torch of classicist religious literature, lit by van Mander, was taken over after his death by Joost van den Vondel, who eventually was to become the greatest author Holland has ever had. Vondel was born in a family of the Old Flemish denomination and must have been acquainted from childhood on with at least the spiritual songs written by Van Mander. In any case, the influence of that poet on his earliest works, religious as well as non-religious, was extensive. This influence waned somewhat around 1610, some years after Vondel had joined with the more liberal Waterlanders. However, the influence of Du Bartas was still increasing at that time. It can be said without exaggeration that Du Bartas's poetry was the driving force behind Vondel's development up until 1621-23, when, after a profound spiritual and emotional crisis, he turned to a more secular world-view.

In these years he translated two of Du Bartas's great epic works: *Les Peres* into *De vaderen* [The Fathers] in 1616, and *La Magnificence* into *De Heerlycheheid van Salomon* [The Magnificence of Solomon] in 1620. He translated very carefully, without changing a word, so there is no question of special Mennonite accents here. The primary function of these translations was to master the techniques of classicist argumentative and epic poetry. But at the same time, by the very fact of doing so, he placed himself on the side of religious-didactic poetry as then produced by quite a few, mostly Calvinist, writers.

The specifically religious content of Vondel's own works in these years is somewhat problematic. For, while it is true that nearly all the poetry from his



Joost van den Vondel (1587-1679), the most celebrated 17th-century author of the Netherlands, who was a church member and a deacon of the Waterlander Mennonites at Amsterdam until ca. 1625. Later, in the early 1640s, he converted to the Roman Catholic Church. Engraving by Th. Marthens after a drawing by J. Sandaert and published by C. Danckersz (ca. 1641).

Waterlander period is religious or at least moral in scope, most of this work was written under the supervision of a publisher. It is, therefore, rather precarious to take it as evidence of Vondel's own opinions. More often than not it reflects a general, morally orientated Christianity that must have been acceptable to most people at that time. Only incidentally do we see him using the discursive and narrative techniques of the classicist tradition for a didactic end that is unquestionably Mennonite. This is most clearly the case in his first play, *Pascha* [Passover] (1610-12), and in two argumentative poems, each probably referring to a separately issued prim (see ill.): *Hymnus ofte Lof-Gesangh over de eend-becromde scheeps-uaert der Yereenigde Nederlanden* [Hymn on the Famous Shipping of the Confederate Dutch Provinces] (ca. 1613), and *Hymnus Of lofsangh van de Christelick Ridder* [Hymn on the Christian Knight] (ca. 1614).

The hymn on the Christian Knight is a good example of the way Vondel used different traditions for his own ends. The theme of the Christian knight, who, armed allegorically, fights against Satan and his minions, can be traced back directly to the Bible (Paul to the Ephesians 6:10-20) and was often used in literature. But Vondel derived the composition from another text, the *Psychomachia* by the fourth-century Latin author Prudencius, an extremely influential poem often read in school. The classicist style was Du Banes's and the piece is a model of poetic argumentation. But as far as the content is concerned, it also has a distinct, if not prominent, Mennonite character with its emphasis on abstinence from all worldly blessings, on penance and repentance and on God's love and mercy.

The same is true to a far greater degree of the hymn on Dutch seafaring. This poem presents itself as secular and sketches a vivid picture of the nautical force of the Dutch Republic, in times of war as well as in peace. But at the end, the glorious depiction of military power and commercial success suddenly gives way to a most emphatic appeal: beware, throw away your crowns, tear off your purple veils, repent, and open your heart to the lamentations of the poor, practise charity and, in so doing, buy yourself a place in the New Jerusalem.

In passages such as these - dispersed between the different parts of the traditional theme in the Hymn on the Christian Knight, and presented separately at the end of the Hymn on Dutch Seafaring - we recognize the spiritual didactics I mentioned before. Here again, it is the very personal metaphysical appeal to which, in the last instance, all arguments and descriptions are subordinated.

Vondel's classicist ambitions and humanist learning - for which he trained himself very eagerly in these years and to which both hymns bear testimony - may have been the reason why this metaphysical appeal does not pervade his works so completely as in the case of Van Mander. But it is certainly present. It is, however, much more directly apparent in his songs. Unlike Van Mander, Vondel saw the argumentative and the emotional as, to a certain extent, two different realms. Anyone who doubts the intensity of his Mennonite belief should read, or for that matter sing, his songs. For Vondel, too, wrote some typically Mennonite devotional songs in these same years. Four of them were anonymously published in the well-known *Boeck der Gesangen* [Book of Hymns] of 1618. They do not distinguish themselves in any way from the huge corpus of Mennonite songs. With their simple wording and evangelical content directly related to the spiritual life of the individual, they fulfil in every respect the function of the 'new psalms' in mediating between God and the believer.

Thus, in a New Year's song Christ's circumcision is presented as an image of spiritual rebirth: do not circumcise your flesh but your heart, and choose the spirit above the dead letter. The same is true of a lengthy elaboration on the 108th psalm. But in this last case, we also see the tendency to present, even in such a lyrical form, an extended didactic argument.

Another, more convincing specimen of this didacticism is Vondel's elaboration on Psalm 122 (in the Roman Catholic *Vulgate* 122r), in which the joy of the Jewish exiles on their return from Babylon to Jerusalem is compared to the joy of the Christian looking forward to the coming Messiah and the Kingdom of Heaven.

This poem further shows how close Mennonite spirituality can come to Roman Catholic piety. Published for the first time in 1620 at the end of his tragedy *Hierusalem vnoocst* [The Destruction of Jerusalem], it was reprinted some twenty years later, after Vondel's conversion to Catholicism. Only a few minor alterations were made regarding the content - 'spirit of the Lord', for example, was changed to 'spirit from Heaven' - but the melody was changed from that of a psalm to that of a popular love song, psalms being considered too Protestant by Catholics of the time.

Vondel's contribution to the phenomenon of lyrical didactics is not very great. The most notable example is undoubtedly the extremely long *Aandachtige Betrachtting twer Christue: Lyden* [Close Contemplation of Christ's Sufferings] (ca. 1620), a translation from a German original which he versified. Here, in 36 strophes making a total of 288 lines, the different stations of Christ's passion are interpreted in terms of individual sin, penance, repentance, and conversion, ending with a forceful appeal to internalize Christ's sufferings in one's own life. Admittedly, this text is not Vondel's own, but by versifying it he also appropriated it. At any rate it is a beautiful specimen of Mennonite spiritual didactics, and of the, to our taste perhaps somewhat curious, role of singing in that context. Further on, we will see the same theme treated by other Mennonite, as well as Calvinist, authors.

One thing remains to be explained: Vondel's attitude towards pagan mythology. You may remember that for Karel van Mander mythology formed an integral part of his Christian world view, being nothing more than reformation of Jewish history and moral truths. Originally, Vondel shared this conception. In *De Guldene Willekloek* [The Golden Shop] (1613), a book of emblems, he was very explicit about this, even though that was a commissioned work. In later years he used morally interpreted myths quite often in his secular work, but not in his religious poems and plays, and between 1609 and thereafter, the period of his commitment to the Warfunder Mennonites, virtually all his work was religious. He only mentioned mythological names there in the manner of Du Bartas: as simple metaphors for natural phenomena, such as Phoebus for the sun, Bacchus for wine, and Venus for love.

Dirck Raphaelsz Camphuysen (1586-1627), Jan Philipsz Schabaelje (1592-1656), and Reynr Anslo (1626-1669)

The mythological question became a much discussed topic in 1624, when Dirck Raphaelsz Camphuysen published his translation of the Latin poem *Idolclenbus*, written by his friend Johannes Cocsternus. Camphuysen was not a Mennonite, but came close to being one. Until his untimely death in 1627, he was in constant contact with the Rijnsburger Collegiants. In the *Idolclenbus*, all images, as well as the entire art of painting, were rejected as instruments of worldly lust and idleness, and especially all pagan images.

The poem, and Camphuysen's verse introduction to it, formed a frontal attack against such secular classicist poetry as that recently published by Daniel

Heinsius, Pieter Comelisz Hoof, and, ironically, Jons van den Vondel. It was generally believed at the time that pagan imagery and Christian poetry were incompatible. The question remained of whether Christian poets could use mythology in their secular work. Not even many Mennonite poets shared Geesterman's severe opinion on that point. But for religious poetry, the Du Bartas tradition had to give up Phoebus and Bacchus. Around 1634, Jan Philipsz Schabaelje, brother of Dierick, and himself a prolific author of devotional songs, religious emblematic works and spiritual prose-texts, wrote a didactic poem of 478 lines, presenting an argumentative synthesis of knowledge and spirituality which resembles Van Mander's *Olijf-Bergh* in concept. This is not surprising: Jan Philipsz also proved himself to be a follower of the old master in his devotional songs. In the years that followed, however, his literary career would be dedicated mainly to the production of devout prose-texts.

In the poem mentioned, *Het groote Hemispherium* [The Great Hemisphere], the cosmos is described as the manifestation of God's wisdom in a way that is reminiscent of Du Bartas. But, at the same time, this cosmos is presented as an allegorical image of knowledge and wisdom, with the scholars and sages of the times as stars who take their light from that one planet, the sun, that is Jesus Christ. All this astronomical, historical, and biblical knowledge fuses at the end of the poem into a spiritual vision of eternity.

As with Van Mander, it is Du Barras reformulated in terms of Mennonite spiritual didactics. Also like Van Mander, Schabaelje practised the lyrical variant, writing several didactic songs of considerable length that presented comparable arguments. We can see less of the influence of Van Mander and more of Du Bartas and Vondelin in the 886-line poem *Martelkron van Steen den eersten Martelaar* [Crown of Martyrdom of Stephen the First Martyr], published in 1646 by the twenty-year old Reyer Anslø. Anslø was a very different person from Jan Philipsz Schabaelje. He was not a self-taught *deur* without contacts in elitist literary circles, but an ambitious young man about town, who dedicated his first works to the headmaster of his Amsterdam Latin school.

For three years Anslø moved with gusto in the literary world, imitating Vondel in epic poems on all sorts of political and social events, filled with pagan gods and mythological references according to the taste of the time. In 1649, his first and only tragedy, on the Saint Bartholomew-massacre, was produced on the Amsterdam stage, where it would continue to play until well into the eighteenth century. That same year he departed on a 'grand tour' to Italy from which he never returned. In Rome he was converted to Roman Catholicism, and was eventually ordained in the lower orders.

These last developments indicate that Anslø, besides being an educated man, was also a religious person. During his Amsterdam years, this religiosity may, perhaps have been a bit perfunctory. His poem on Stephen seems to lack the warmth of a Van Mander or Schabaelje, even if it is technically more accomplished than their work. Except for this, there is little of his religious work to be seen: a collection of beautiful quatrains elucidating a series of Bible prints and preceded by a poem to his mother, a lyrical contemplation on the three sages.

Yet, there can be no doubt as to his genuine Mennonite inspiration. In all his poems the historical or evangelical events are adduced as stimuli for the soul to strive for heavenly bliss, and what is more, are interpreted from that perspective. In the lyrical poem on the three sages, for instance, the birth of the Messiah is presented as the condition for, and as the mystical image of, the salvation of the individual soul. And in the biblical elucidations, each quatrain interprets a single biblical event in a spiritual manner.

Again, this attitude is most striking in the genre to which it is least suited, the epic. Anslo's *Martelkroon* part *Steucn* is indeed an epic poem. The framework consists of a vivid, fictional representation of the principal moments of Stephen's martyrdom, including an active role played by Jesus Christ and the archangel Gabriel, and realized by the use of the present tense, descriptions, and direct speech. Such an epic setting was quite new in 1646, and few models existed as yet, that is to say in Dutch vernacular literature. The only other example to be found is Vondel's poem on the conquest of Grol by Frederick Henry of 1627. It is quite possible that Nee-Latin poems of this kind existed, and if they did, Anslo would have known them, for he was an accomplished Latinist. Through this work he joined the great tradition of epic poetry of which the works of Du Bartas were the most important representatives, equated in more recent years with the *Gerusalemme Libcrata* of Tasso.

When we compare Anslo's poem with, for instance, Du Bartas's poem on the Battle of Lepanto, Vondel's Grol poem, or, still better, Du Bartas's small epic *La Judit*, it is striking how much more often the fictional evocation of events was altered by him than by the others. Admittedly, such a disturbance of the fictional illusion was not unheard of in epic poems. Du Bartas, and for that matter Vondel, also expressed from time to time their own dismay, anxiety or joy at the occurrences they described, and, incidentally, even extracted a moral lesson from them. But they did not disturb the fictional illusion so often and so extensively that the whole epic structure of their poems ran the risk of being lost on the reader.

In Anslo's poem this usually happens in two ways: by emotional interventions from the author and by comparisons with other events from the Bible. Initially, these latter are predominantly made in the speeches delivered by Stephen and Gabriel and do not violate the fictional reality, although by their sheer length they have an undermining quality. But in the second half, it is the author himself who interrupts the course of events more and more, not only with exclamations, but also with admonitions and spiritual interpretations in which the previously mentioned comparisons also play their role. At the end, these admonitions and interpretations are taken over by Euzebin, the pious one, scarcely a personage but more, for the sake of the epic, a personalized function: the interpretation as such.

So, although Anslo more than any Mennonite poet before him, maintains the discursive and fictional character of Bartasian epic poetry, he, too, reorganizes it in terms of spiritual didactics and then in essentially the same way as everyone else. The content of these didactics partly testifies to preoccupations that had assumed a new importance around the middle of the century: intolerance, the

division of the visible church, the domination of the sword. But here, too, the spiritual interpretation of the story is predominant, first formulated by Gabriel, then by the author, and finally by Euzebia: the metaphysical significance of earthly suffering in relation to the Kingdom of Heaven.

Joachim Oudaan (1628-1692)

The last poet to be discussed is Joachim Oudaan, born in Rijnsburg as the grandson of one of the famous Van der Koddés, and a lifelong Collegiant as well as Waterlander Mennonite. Oudaan's religious opinions seem to have come close to Socinianism, of which he was often openly accused. In this, as in other aspects of his religiosity, he resembles Camphuysen, whom he greatly admired and of whose works he provided a critical edition. It is no wonder that in the question of mythology he took the same stand as the older poet. Pagan gods were to be *anathema*, not only in religious, but in all poetry. Even the mere metaphorical application practised by most Calvinist poets was unacceptable.

In this, he stood in opposition to Joannes Antonides van der Goes, a poet of Mennonite family, twenty years younger, whose secular poetry was regarded at that time as the apogee of classicist literature. In a laudatory poem on Antonides's masterpiece, *De Ystroom* (1671), an epic poem in four books about the Amsterdam river, the *JJ*, he could, or would, not restrain himself. At the end, he imparted a subtle sneer on the ornamental use of classical mythology that could not be misunderstood. Antonides defended himself in an extensive and erudite passage in his foreword. A few years later, Oudaan, in his turn, produced quite a sharp poem criticizing mythology: what were all these gods and goddesses if not whores, devilish masquerades that poisoned the heart and injured the honour of God?

It was a fundamental issue for him. Even in his poem on Vondel's death he complained about the abundance of gods in the poet's work. From Antonides he hoped for more, since the poet was known to be working on a biblical epic poem about the apostle Paul. In an epigram accompanying the gift of a book of psalms he expressed the wish that 'this David might light his young friend's poetic fire again'. But it never came about and, on his death, Oudaan could do nothing but complain about the unfulfilled promise that, even in its unfulfillment, was worth more than all worldly success.

The case is relevant to my subject because of the consequences for Oudaan's own poetic practice. He was one of very few poets, including the Mennonites among them, who did not apply any mythological ornament in either his secular or religious works. We see here the phenomenon of religious opinion producing a secular poetic style, and, what is more, a secular style pointing towards the future. The battle of the books was imminent in Holland, too. But perhaps the position already taken at the end of the sixteenth century by a man like Coornhert and now so eagerly defended by Camphuysen and Oudaan, had more to do with the Dutch variant of the assault on Parnassus than all rational opinions on the development of nations.



joachim Oudaan (1628-1692), a poet and member of the Waterlander Mennonite congregation of Rorredarn and a promoter of the Collegiant movement. Engraving by D. jonckman after a design by A. Houbraken, from his drama *Haagsc Broeder-moord* (Frederiksrad, en. 1674).

Oudaan, as well as Coornhert and Carnphuyzen, was a "ration" list and believed in natural reason as the principal servant of evangelical truth. None of the three adhered to medieval and Renaissance philosophical conceptions of allegory, as fostered by Van Mander and Vondel. To them, mythology was indeed simply a question of ornament, and nothing else. As we have seen, this was also the opinion of most Calvinist writers of the time, and was taken up by Anronides in his defense. For a Mennonite such as Oudaan, however, that was exactly the point; pure ornament was an inducement to lust and worldliness, luring the soul from its heavenly destiny, and, as such, an instrument of the devil.

Oudaan's own poetic style is rather plain and more argumentative and philosophical than lyrical. It moves in broad, clear sentences through the verses, only recognizable as poetry through its rhythm and rhyme. It was the logical conse-

quence of his poetic opinions which, as far as his own practice was concerned, seem to have gone further than just the refusal of mythology and to have rejected, with Cocsreranus and Camphuysen, any form of imagery. As a result, he produced a vast amount of rhymed dissertations on political and social events and philosophical issues, interesting for their content and written in a clear style, but as poetry too dry to please.

Only his very sharp satirical verses still have the ability to move one out of sheer indignation. The same goes for his plays, expressing a militant political quality. In his religious poetry, however, we occasionally encounter a somewhat more lyrical and pictorial style. This is mostly due to the biblical material he used, but also to a certain degree to the rich tradition of religious poetry of all denominations in the Dutch seventeenth century in which he explicitly joined.

There is the epic tradition, by then represented in Holland by the Roman Catholic Vondel, whose *Ioannes de Boetgezant* [John the Penitential Prophet] (1662) was the first genuine religious epic in Dutch literature. In his *Uytbreiding over het Boek job* [Elaboration on the Book of Job] (1672) Oudaan undoubtedly relied on that model and so came to a relatively vivid picture of Job's ordeal in the first of the 42 chapters of this work. The other 41 contained lyrical variations on the given theme, and, in their turn, joined the Mennonite tradition of lyrical didactic poetry.

I will not enter into the details of Oudaan's religiosity - Socinian rationalist, Mennonite spiritualist, or any blend of elements from those two positions. Certainly, more rational spirituality than mystical identification is apparent, but just as certainly he continues the tradition of Mennonite didactics outlined above. The most essential aspect thereof is the interruption of any discursive, linear, so-called logical argumentation or narration, by a vertical component - companions, spiritual interpretations, admonitions, exclamations - pointing towards the metaphysical dimension.

Oudaan's Job-variations are inundated with learned explanations and references and even allusions to contemporary politics, but also with emotional appeals and admonitions. All this culminates in the last chapter in a spiritual interpretation of Job as the foreshadowing of Christ and in a forceful appeal to follow Him. The lyrical forms used in these chapters give an apt expression to their contents. Because of its poetic presentation as well as its didactic qualities the poem may be characterized as a showpiece of Mennonite literature.

How much Oudaan relied on others in his lyrics, too, is proved by another of his lengthy religious poems, *Aandachtige Treurigheid* [Attentive Sadness] (1660). This text is an imitation of two poems on the same subject, the passion of Christ, written respectively by Franciscus Martinius and Jeremias de Decker, who were both Calvinists. Here, too, the vivid expression of Oudaan's poem was greatly inspired by, if not derived from, his models. The difference, again, lies in the didactic aim. Martinius and De Decker primarily wanted to impress the reader with his guilty nature, and, therefore, gave as moving a picture of Christ's sufferings as possible. Oudaan's description is as moving as theirs, but nevertheless the decisive emphasis in his poem lies in the imitation of Christ. Accordingly, he is the only one who adds a passage on Christ's ascension and His reception by

God the Father to the biblical data, otherwise followed more closely than the two others.

Finally, we come back to hymnody. For even Oudaan, with all his philosophical rationality, could not abstain from this typically Mennonite custom and wrote several devout songs on psalm-melodies. A good example of his endeavours in this field is the series of poems and songs that were cited and sung by the orphans of Rotterdam to arouse the charity of the citizens on New Year's Day of 1683, 1684, 1685, and 1686.

In the first year, the poem describes the birth of Christ, and tells of the shepherds in the field, the child in the manger and the sages from the east. In the complementary song the listeners admonished to abandon pride, to repent, and to practise charity. The next year, the poem treats Jesus's life on earth, while the song is about abandoning earthly riches for a treasure in heaven. In the third year the poem continues with Jesus's death, resurrection and ascension, while the song is about accounting for one's talents and charity. And in the fourth year, finally, the poem announces the coming of the Messiah and the Last judgement, after which the song defines the charity shown to the orphans as the account to be presented at the tribunal of God's justice. In spite of all the differences, one is reminded of Van Mander's *Bethlehem* written some 80 years earlier.

Conclusion

In the time that had elapsed since Van Mander wrote his poems and songs, literary taste and fashion had changed greatly. But nearly a century later, the literary production of one of the most prominent Calvinists still continued to testify to the same essentials: a spiritual didactic founded on the metaphysical unity of testamental history, evangelical revelation and individual sanctification, breaking through the logical forms of narration and argumentation, and expressing itself in forms ranging from the most elaborated epic poem to the simplest devotional song.

[If these characteristics are typically, or even exclusively, Mennonite, I cannot say. Further research has to be done into the works of Mennonite, as well as non-Mennonite, authors, to clarify the correspondences and differences. But I hope to have given at least an idea - a few paradigmatic lines and a hypothesis - in order to create an image of the Mennonite contribution to seventeenth-century religious poetry.

Bibliography

Some information about Mennonite literature in the seventeenth century is given in general histories of the Mennonite movement, such as: W.J. Kihler; *Geschiedenis van de doopsgezinden in Nederland (1600-1750)*. Haarlem 1940, vol. H, [and N. van der Zijpp, *Geschiedenis der doopsgezinden in Nederland*. Amsterdam 1980 - repr. of Arnhem 1952. Much information on literary genres preferably practised by Mennonites - hymns, prose dialogues and pilgrimage-

texts, emblem books and elucidations of biblical print sources - is given by P. Visser, *Breeders in de geest. De doopsgezinde bijdragen van Dierick en [an Philipsz. Schabaeije tot de Nederlandse stichtelijke literatuur in de zeuentiende eeuw*. Deventer 1988, 2 vols. General information on the authors discussed in this article can be found in: G.P.M. Knuvelde, *Handboek tot de geschiedenis der Nederlandse letterkunde*. 's-Herrogenbosch 1971, 1st ed., vol. II. On Karel van Mander as a man of letters the only extant, rather obsolete study is: R. Iacobse, *Carel van Mander (1548-1606), dichter en prozaschrijver*, Rotterdam 1906. There is a recent edition of *Bethlehem: Karel van Mander, Bethlehem dat is het Broodhuys*, edited by P.E.L. Verkuyl. Groningen 1985. On Joost van den Vondel's Mennonite poetry see: M. Spies, 'Vondels dichtwerken uit zijn doopsgezinde periode', in: *Doopsgezinde Bijdragen* 15 (1989), p. 97-114; and J. van den Vondel, *Twee seevaart-gedichten*, ed. by M. Spies. Amsterdam/Oxford/New York 1987, 2 vols. The best biography is still that written in the seventeenth century: Geeraard Brandt, *Het lenen t-an Joost van den Vondel*. Translated into modern Dutch by M.M. van Oostrom and M.A. Schenkeveld-Van der Dussen. Amsterdam 1986. The standard edition of his works is: J. van den Vondel, *Waken*, edited by J.F.M. Sterck et al. Amsterdam 1927-40, 10 vols. Vondel's songs were edited with musical notation in: *Vondel Vocaal. De liederen van Vondel*, edited by Kees de Bruijn en Marijke Spies. Haarlem 1988. On Dierick and Jan Philipsz Schabaeije see the fine book by P. Visser mentioned before. Reyer Anso's religious works have not received much attention yet. General information on the poet and his works are to be found in Knuvelde's *Handboek*, and in H.H. Knippenberg, *Reyer Anso: zijn leven en oeuvre*, Amsterdam 1911, reprinted Utrecht 1972. Joachim Oudaan's life and letters are treated by J. Melles, *Joachim Oudaan. Heraut der uedraagramheid*, Utrecht 1958. Two articles have been written on his poem *Aandachtige Treurigheyd*: B. van Dam-Heringa, 'Marrinius, De Decker en Oudaan; drie gedichten over het heden van Christus', in: *De nederlandse taalgeschiedenis* 76 (1983), p. 425-442; and *idem*, 'Oudaans socinianisme, met name in zijn *Aandachtige Treurigheyd*', in: *De nederlandse taalgeschiedenis* 77 (1984), p. 484-492.

II

Women and Seventeenth-Century Dutch Literature"

There is a certain ambivalence in the subject of my lecture today, an ambivalence, as a matter of fact, I intend to exploit. For my thesis will be that the ways women were looked upon in Dutch seventeenth-century literature and, consequently, the ways the images and the opinion on women were, up to a certain degree, promoted by Dutch literature, had a rather important impact on the ways women took part in the production of literature in those days. Let us see where this complex proposition will lead us.

The first step to be taken will complicate things still further. For 'the ways women were looked upon in Dutch seventeenth-century literature' originated outside the Netherlands and, at least in part, well before the seventeenth century. That is always the trouble with literature: it speaks of today's world in terms that were coined mostly yesterday. And in pre-romantic times - say, before 1800 - when originality was not yet a virtue, it did so *a fortiori*.

Never before and after, perhaps, has so much been written about women, and about the relations between men and women, as between, say, 1550 and 1650. And no wonder, because due to the profound changes in the socio-economic reality of those days, these relations and the position of women as such, had to be reconsidered. Nevertheless, all this writing was deeply influenced, as far as I can see, by at least three different literary traditions that had their roots elsewhere: in Petrarchism, in the so called battle of women, and in the humanist matrimonial tradition of Erasmus and others. So before I can tell you something about the 'ways women were looked upon in Dutch seventeenth-century literature', I have to tell you something about these traditions themselves.

First Petrarchism. Most of you will perhaps have heard of this European movement, which consisted of an almost programmatic, and in any case extremely exaggerated, imitation of the themes and stylistic devices the Italian poet Petrarch had used in his vernacular love sonnets and elegies. And if you have not heard about it, you should read the former Cambridge professor of German and Dutch literature, Leonard Forster's beautiful book about it.

Petrarch had written his *Canzoniere* (c. 1347) and other poetry in the fourteenth century. But it was only in the second half of the fifteenth and in the sixteenth century that his themes and forms became the great thing in Italian literature. It was then that the collection of phenomena we call Petrarchism came into being:

* In: *Dutch Crossing. A Journal of Low Countries Studies*, vol. 9 (1995), p. 3-23.

the stereotyped description of the beloved, with her hair like golden threads, eyebrows of ebony, rose-coloured lips, teeth like pearls (still embodied, I think, in Walt Disney's Snowwhite); the equally stereotyped expression of the conflicting emotions of the lover, completely dependent on his lady's whims, burning and freezing at the same time, dying when she turns away, and coming back to life when she deigns to cast a glance in his direction, but always suffering, weeping and lamenting.

Petrarch, sonnet 157

[...] Her head was of fine gold, her face of warm snow,
Here eyebrows ebony, her eyes were two stars,
From which Love did not bend his bow in vain;
Pearls and red roses where sorrow received [in the heart]
Formed fair and burning words;
Her sighs were flame; her tears crystal.

(transl. L. Forster)

Petrarch, sonnet 17

Bitter tears stream from my face,
Wuh a painful wind of sighs,
Every time I chance to turn my eyes upon you,
For whose sake I am cut off from the world.
Though it is true that your sweet gentle smile
Finally quietens my burning desires
And draws me out of the fires of my torments,
As long as I can gaze on you intently and concentrarecdly,
But my spirits freeze when I see,
As we part, my stars of fate withdraw
Her sweet influence from me.

[t..... l.,

The movement was rken over around the middle of the sixteenth century by the French poets of the Pleiade - Ronsard, Du Bellay, and others - and from there reached the Southern Netherlands where Jan van der Noy was the first who, at the end of the 1560's, wrote really Petrarchist sonnets.

In the meantime, the mode had also pervaded Neo-Latin poetry - at that time, still quantitatively and qualitatively far more important than literature written in the vernacular. Let me quote to you only one poem, written by a Dutchman you have probably never heard of, but who was the most famous European poet of the sixteenth century, Janus Secundus. Janus Secundus died in 1536 at the age of 25, but before that time had written in his *Basia* (Kisses) some love poetry that caused a thrill all over Europe, not the least because of its, to the standards of that time, soft pornographic contents.

Janus Secundus

My Lydia hit me with a ball of snow
 And straight my heart with fire began to glow.
 'Twas strange a conflagration thus should start
 Where frozen water played the leading part;
 But so it was. How can I live at ease,
 When I am trapped by perils such as these?
 And what is more, no cold this fire can tame;
 It must be vanquished by an equal flame.
 A mutual warmth will my salvation be;
 So come, dear Lydia, come; and burn with me.

(transl. L. Forster)

I think that, besides the Pleiade, it was this Neo-Latin poetry that stimulated the rise of Perrarchism in Holland. This took place in a network of poets connected to the newly founded Leyden university, the most important of whom was the young Daniel Heinsius. Heinsius, who at the age of 23 was to become professor in classical literature, wrote love lyrics in the vernacular, as well as in Latin and Greek. In 1601 he published, for instance, a collection of Petrarchist emblems, with a Latin title, *Quaeris quid sit amor* (Do you wonder what love may be), but with Dutch texts.

D. Heinsius

Mijn wijsheyt, mijn verstandt, is minder uis twee oogcn,
 Deer wcrd' ick van geleyt: mijn hert, mijn grant gemoet,
 Mijn mannelick gewelt, en kan sich nier vertoogen,
 Als ghy my, o Ionckvrou, de swacren srijdt aendoet.
 Ick worde als ghy slit. ick geef u hjf en smnen,
 Ick volge naer u doen. Godm, daer ick op bou,
 Ick kom u soo na by, dar ick begin te spirmen,
 En daer ick was een man, daer ben ick nu een vrou.

My wisdom, my Judgement is less than two eyes,
 They lead me; my heart, my fierce disposition,
 My masculine strength, they cannot come forward
 When you, o my lady, fight against me.
 I become as you are; I surrender body and soul;
 I follow your ways. My Goddess, on whom I rely,
 I come so close to you, that I start spinning;
 And where I used to be a man, now I am a woman.

In the following years, the greatest Dutch lyric poet, P.e. Hooft, followed the trend, and after him came many others.

I.C. Hooft

'T is wat, als my mijns Sons almachtich ooch aenvier:
Macr dectse haer-aenschijn; dan hen ick my sclven niet.

It is somerbing, when the almighty eye of my sun looks at me;
But when she covers her face, I am not myself.

will not enter into all the details of poetic diction – the themes, images, and conceits – which Perrinchism as a movement acquired during this period, acquired partly also from other sources such as Greek and Latin poetry. Enough to say that the 'portrait of a lady' that emerges from it is that of a highly idealized dame, perfect in body and soul, and with an absolute power in the realm of love. That is also the only realm in which she seems to exist. As a matter of fact, she is more an object of men's fantasies than the idealization of any real person at all. Only when reading Hooft does one get the impression of coming down to earth a bit and viewing a rather well educated upper-middle class girl.

P.C. Hoofr

Sonnet. Nae Petrarchaes: *Cr-ni eha pocbi, etc.*

Selfwasse rauckcu van het alderfijnste goudt,
Die dwaelend' houden best den wegh der ucdigheden;
Een elpen aenschijn na de pujkidec gcsnccden,
Daer 'r luchen nestelr, en de smersij hof op houdt;
Fen liehaem van vijn' veer tot In sijn' vorsr volbouw
Met lodderfijcke prachr van net gecmccre leden;
'Twelck wijckr wt voeghens lood, met swieren nochr met rrcdeu,
En met een' cddle geur, sijn soete zceden zout:
Almachtigh' ooghen, die sraegh lust en leevcn sruclen,
En daegucn docn den nachr, en hcl in hernel haeleu;
Zlnzlijverende sang wr zielzujghenden mondt,
Die vingers lejdt ten dans op gehoorsacme snacrcn,
Vernufrtelendc tael; en deughd die deughd kan baeren;
Dces wondren hebben mijn vcrwonnen hart gewondt.

Selfgrown tendrils of the purest gold,
That keep their nature's ways best when loosened;
An Ivory face, cut after the most perfect concept,
Where smiles nestle and stateliness keeps court;
A body, from foot to head perfected
With the lovely splendour of well proportioned parts,
That in walking nor dancing deviates from its balance,
And that with a noble smell seasons its sweet morals;
Mighty eyes, that radiate delight and life,

Make day in the night, and bring hell into heaven;
 Songs that purge the senses from a scut-tearing mouth;
 Fingers that playing the strings lead to dance;
 Intelligent language, and virtue that bears virtue;
 These wonders have wounded my conquered heart.

We find a comparable Idealization of womanhood in the second tradition which exercised its influence on Dutch literature, and that has been called the 'battle of women'. It is closely related to the renaissance movement Perrarchism belongs to, and is even partly represented by the same authors, but has to be distinguished from it because of its different content and purposes. This tradition draws mainly on humanist learning: the whole bulk of classical, and to a great extent, also medieval, knowledge. Its theme was originally the praise of women, and it realized this purpose by adducing as many examples of famous women from the biblical, classical, mythological, and historical past as could be found: goddesses, queens, poets, heroines, mothers, courrisans, etc.

The first instance I know of was written by Pen-arch's friend Boccaccio, who wrote the *Decameron*. This book he wrote in Latin. It is called *De mulieribus danbus* (On famous women). Boccaccio had no emancipatory intentions: his main objective was a playful demonstration of learning. His book was a success all over Europe. In the following centuries, the subject was indeed treated sometimes with a serious, emancipatory intention. You may have heard of Chrisne de Pisan, the widowed mother of three children, who wrote her works in order to earn an income. Her *Book of the city of Ladies* dates from 1405 and was translated into Flemish in 1475, and in the sixteenth century was even published in English (1521).

In the sixteenth-century in France, however, the theme seems to have become a purely literary game, played exclusively by men. Here, and in sixteenth century Non-Latin poetry as well, the subject changes into that of a combat. Who are superior, women or men? Poems and tracts in praise of women are now answered by others blaming them, or written in praise of men. Famous, but rather an exception because of its serious intent, is Cornelius Agrippa von Nettesheim's *De nobilitate et preexcellencia foemine sexus* (1529), written for Margaret of Austria, who at that time resided in Brussels as regent for Charles V.

Again, Daniel Heinsius was one of the first to bring the genre to Holland, when he published in 1606 his *Mirror of illustrious, honest, brave, virtuous, and intelligent women*. And again, he was followed by many others. More than his, mostly Italian and French, forerunners, Heinsius seems to emphasize the essentially different roles men and women are to play in life, but before I come to that, let me first read the opening lines of his introduction.

D.Heinsius

VOORREDEN VAN DE DOORLVCHTIGHE VROYWEN

Het is een out gheschil, van langhen tijdt gheresen,
 En noch op desen dach nier duydelick ghewesen,
 Wie darnnen geven moer van deuchden en versrandr
 De Vrouwen oft de Mans den prys en d'ovcrhndt.
 Den Marmen hebben eerst met cloeckichevr van handen
 Ghenomen in haec nachts de Sreden ende Landen,
 En onder haer ghebiedr, en onder haer ghewelr
 Des uertnjcx ronc CIOHghetrocken en ghestelr.
 Daer teghens is de deuchr, daer reghen zyn de ghavcn
 Vant vrouwelick ghesl.rchr besloren en hegraven.
 En haer gherrou ghcmocr, end' haercn handel kuys,
 Heefr tot zilll leste pael den Dorpel van het huys.

It is an old discussion, originating from long ago,
 And yet not clearly solved today,
 Who, on the point of virtue and intelligence,
 Is to be given the price and victory: women or men.
 The men have with brave hands
 Conquered cities and counrnes,
 And have brought in their power and command
 The whole globe of the world.
 On the contrary the Virtues and talents
 Of women are hidden and buried,
 And her faithful nature, her chaste behaviour
 Have the threshold of the house as their boundary,

Men act in the world, while women do the housekeeping. Traditional as this may seem to us, in Heinsius' time it was a rather new conception, which was defended for the first time, and very seriously so, by humanists such as Erasmus and Vives. The humanist defence of matrimony, started by Erasmus' *De laude matrimonii declamatio* (I 518), was initially something quite different from the 'battle of women' tradition. Instead of an intellectual literary game, it was a serious point of action, mainly directed against the superiority which in the Middle-Ages was assigned to the celibatariun way of life in the cloisters. In the course of the sixteenth century, however, the two traditions seem sometimes to have merged.

In any case, they came together in Heinsius' text. This was a century after Erasmus had published his *Declamatio*, but developments took place much more slowly in those days than in ours. For Holland, anno 1606, the idea that the activities of a woman should be confined to her household was still fairly new. To make the significance of this clear, I have to leave the level of literature for a moment and to turn to reality.

In the Netherlands of the sixteenth century, women did normally participate in social and economic life. I am not speaking of the nobility - which, being mostly French-speaking, had almost no influence on Dutch culture - but of the lower, middle and upper middle-class burghers who formed the greater part of the inhabitants of the towns and villages. An Italian writer, Lodovico Guicciardini, who published in 1567 a description of the Netherlands, writes:

De vrouwen van dit land [...] gaan niet alleen in de stad van hier naar daar om haar zaken te regelen, maar ze reizen ook het land door van de ene plaats naar de andere, met weinig gezelschap, zonder dat iemand er war van zegt. [...] ze houden zich ook bezig met koophandel, door te kopen en te verkopen, en ze zijn [...] wegens de weer met woord en daad in ondernemingen die eigenlijk de man passen, en dat met zo'n behendigheid en vlijt dat op veel plaatsen, zoals in Holland en Zeeland, de mannen de vrouwen alles laten doen [...].

The women in this country [...] not only go to and forth in town to manage their affairs, but they travel from town to town through the country, without any company to speak of, and without anybody commenting upon it. [...] they occupy themselves also in buying and selling, and are industrious in affairs that properly belong to men, and that with such an eagerness and skillfulness that in many places, as in Holland and Zeeland, men leave it to women to handle everything.

Given this situation, you may understand that Heinsius' words - that 'the faithful nature and chaste behaviour of women have the thresholds of their houses as their boundaries' - implied the propounding of a new mode of behaviour,

One of the topics of humanist matrimonial literature was indeed matrimonial chastity. Women were supposed to be weaker than men - also in the literal sense of having softer flesh and of being, in consequence, more emotional and more sexually inflammable. These were old ideas which could already be found in the fifth and sixth century fathers of the church, and which in the middle-ages had laid the foundation of female cloister life. But from the moment such options were linked to the rehabilitation of marriage, the control over her sexuality became essential for every woman, and chastity the most important female virtue. A friend of Erasmus, the Spanish humanist Luis Vives, who lived for many years in the southern Netherlands, formulates it as follows:

In een man zijn verschillende deugden nodig, zoals wijsheid, welsprekendheid, een goed geheugen, rechtvaardigheid, kracht, mildheid, grootheid, en andere kennis die nodig is om te kunnen leven, en hinkheid, die nodig is om het algerneen welvaren te kunnen beharrigen. Maar als er enkele van deze deugden in een man onbreken, kan men hem daarover niet zo hard vallen. Maar in de vrouw wordt niets verlangd en is niets nodig dan alleen de reinheid, want als die in de vrouw onbreekt is dat net zo erg als wanneer niet de hiervoor genoemde deugden in de man onbreken.

A man needs several virtues: prudence, eloquence, memory, Justice, force, generosity, magnanimity, and other knowledge necessary to be able to live, and bravery, necessary to serve the common welfare. But if a few of these virtues are lacking, one should not be too severe about it. In a woman, however, nothing is needed but chastity, and if that is missing, it is as if all the Iorsaid virtues were missing in a man.

This matrimonial chastity was propagated in sixteenth-century humanist texts and engravings, especially in Germany. And it is the same chastity that defines to a high degree the choice of famous women in Hemsius' *Mirror*.

A splendid example of the confluence of the three traditions I have been sketching for you may be found in Heinsius' example of Lucia. Lucia put out her eyes - these, being the mirrors of the soul, enflamed the sexual passions of her assaulter (the Petrarchist motive) - to ensure her chastity (a matrimonial motive), and in doing so, proved herself to be the better of the two (battle of women).

Throughout the seventeenth century, these traditions may be traced, often flowing together, and most of the times assuming - and this is unimportant - a rather realistic upper-middle-class flavour, as we noticed in Hoof's Petrarchist sonnet. When we read - or for that matter, sing - the lovely songs authors such as Hooft and Bredero, and many others, wrote, it is evident that the suffering, weeping, and complaining Petrarchist lover had become a young Amsterdam man about town, looking, for instance, from the outside at his beloved dancing at a party in the parlour of one of the big houses on the canal:

P.C. Honft

Amaryl ick sruc hier veur
 Dose dour,
 S'Il den dans noch langer duircn
 Dacr ghij hinnen aen crioelt,
 Noch en voelr
 Desc coude buircn wren?

Min, sij worclr u fakkcl claer
 Niet gewaer
 Door de glascn, noch mijn clachten,
 Maer ick wandel even seer
 Hccn en wecr,
 Hoc verdrietich valr het wachren.

Maer siet gins, oft ooch cock mist?
 Xccn, sij ist.
 Aroaryl mijn lievc icvcn!

Cephalo van waer comr ghIJ?
Vruechdijr mij>
Troost ick sal u antwoorr geven.

1·1

Aruarvl, [am standing here
At the door,
Will the dance go on still longer
That you are dancing there inside,
Not feeling
These hours of cold outside.

Cupid, she does not
Perceive your torch
Through the window, nor my complaints,
But nevertheless I walk
To and fro.
How sad is this waiting.

Bur look there, am I seeing wrong?
No, it is her.
Amaryl, my sweetheart'
Cephalo, where do you come from?
Are you asking?
love, I will answer you.

1·1

And when Huygens gives from his masculine pomr of vteu his version of the battle of women, it is in a playful, teasing discussion with his female friends, the girls who are his neighbours in The Hague, Dorothea van Dorp and Lucretia van Trello:

Huygens

*Torcvuue-icfalias Mans handt hcnccn, Boertighe verantioordingt.e ande
Jeught van 'tsGrauenhaege*

Zou en man de mmsrc zun
Bij het ribli-stick van sen lenden?
Dar waer 'r oppcrsr onder wenden,
Toughens reden en nerruer
Teughcns stroom en over stuer,

11

'Ksagh wcl an de meijt her oogbe

Die al gins en weder vloghe
 Dar ick hier en daer al war
 Or her veer eschoten hadd',
 [...]

In praise of women, or; to men the upperhand. jest(uljusti(icati)ll to the youth Of The Hague

Would a man be less
 Than the nb of his loins?
 That would be turning things upside down,
 Against reason and against nature,
 Against stream and steering-wheel,
 1

[he adduces the bible, nature, Homer and Erasmus to prove his point, and then counnes. I

I saw in her eyes,
 Coing hither and thither,
 That I had shot
 A feather from her bonnet,
 1

We see also in the tradition of poems 'in praise of women', besides the Didos and Lucias and Esthers, some well-known Dutch women stealing in, such as Anna Roomers Visscher and Anna Maria van Schurman:

Johanna Hoobius

Wel is dan onsc Ecu nu van geleerde Vrouwen,
 Cansch t'eenemael onthloot dat kan ic mer vertrouwen,
 Het is ons noch bekend hoe Comans weer de kinr
 Wert om haer gestigbevdr van vder een bernint.

1
 En Iuffrou *Anna* oock, een Maeght vol geesrigheden,
 Cingh die niet meninchrnae! haer jonc ryd besteden,
 In soere Poësy, [..]

1.1
 Wie sal nicr staen verstellr? wie sal mer zvn verwondert?
 Als Wtrecht seer vermucrr der Vrouwen 10f uyr dondert,
 Doer Fama henc vliegt, en roemr doorr gansche lant
 Den wyrvermacrde lof van *Schuvnnans* edel pant.
 [...]

Well then, that our age is completely devoid

Of learned women, I can not believe,
It is well known how Comans' child
Is loved by everyone for her wittiness
[...]
And lady Ann as well, a maiden full of wit,
Did she not fill the time of her youth often
With sweet poetry?

1.1

But who is not perplexed, and full of wonder,
When the famous town of Utrecht trumpets the praise of women:
Whither Fame flies and proclaims throughout the country
The renowned honour of the noble Schumian's child?

Anna Roemers and Anna Maria van Schurmn are praised for their poetry and learning. That was, of course, in complete accordance with the battle-of-women tradition. But it was also, and this may astonish you, in accordance with the matrimonial one. From the moment Erasmus and his followers began advocating the rehabilitation of marriage and housekeeping as a woman's most natural and most desirable destiny, they had combined this with an effort to upgrade those activities. A woman had the house as her specific working area, as the man had the outer world, but as such they were to be partners, albeit a junior and a senior partner, equal and more equal. As partner of her husband and as educator of the children, the woman had to have a certain intellectual level. In one of his Latin colloquies, Erasmus introduces an abbot who is visiting a married woman and is shocked by the books she has in her room:

M. Waarom mishaaft u deze huisraad? A. Omdat de spinrokken en spullen de wapens der vrouwen zijn. M. Past het dan een huismoeder niet haar huishoudeur te regelen en haar kinderen te onderwijzen en te sturen? A. ja. M. Meent u dat zo'n gewichtige zaak zonder wijsheid uitgevoerd kan worden? A. Ik denk van niet. M. Maar die wijsheid leren me de boeken [...]

M. Why are you displeased by these utensils? A. Because the spinning-wheel and spindle are the weapons of women. M. Is it not becoming to a mistress to organize her household and educate and guide her children? A. Yes. M. Do you think such an important task can be fulfilled without wisdom? A. I don't think so. M. But wisdom is taught to me by these books [...]

Furthermore, many writers assure us that reading was to be promoted because it kept the young women from the streets, where they would encounter nothing but dangers [i.e. to their chastity),

So, when in 1622 Anna Roemers, 39 years old and as yet unmarried, but having a certain reputation as a poet, was welcomed in Zeeland by her fellow-poets, many of them could not restrain themselves from pointing to her undesirable

spinsterhood. A female colleague we have encountered already, Johanna Coomans, wrote:

Maar nog ourbreckt er war aan deez' hegaafde maagd,
 Der is dar zu de unum van 'mnaagd re lunge drnagt.
 Ik wense dau, joukvrouw, dar u wordr roegezondeu
 Feu, daar guuaar uw wens mochr worden ann gehonden
 1 1
 Dar gij nls moeder llllcht voorttelen een geslacht
 Dar ullc druk verdrijft wanneer 'r rnuar eens en lachr.
 En als 'r dan kwam uw hals r'omvangen met zujn vlerken,
 Dar ware u mecr vermaak als aluw kunsrig werken.

But still something is lacking in this talented maiden,
 To wit, that she is endowed with the title of 'maiden' for a too long time.
 I wish, my lady, that someone will be sent to you,
 someone to whom you will be connected to your full contentedness
 [...]
 And that as a mother you will procreate an offspring
 That with a single smile drives all sadness away,
 and when embracing you with its small arms
 Gives you more pleasure than all your artful achievements.

A Ivarued woman such as Annn Maria van Schurman, giving her time to scholarly studies, was only acceptable as long as she was acknowledged as an exception, a deviation from normality. Van Schurman herself - defending the ability and the right of women to intellectual activities - emphasized that, in her opinion too, marriage and housekeeping came first.

In the meantime, we have surreptitiously passed from my first poem: 'the ways women were looked upon in literature', to the second: 'the ways the images of and opinions on women were promoted by literature'. One may safely say, I think, that the matrimonial tradition not only pervaded all writing on women and love in the United Provinces, but that it also directed to a considerable extent the opinion on those issues, at any rate among the middle class public. This second point related primarily to the work of Jacob Cats,

In several works, the huge didactic poem *Marriage* (1625) and above all the collection of versified stories, culled *Wedding Ring* (1637), Cats has in endless verse propagated the characteristics, virtues, and duties of the Dutch burgher housewife: and with considerable success. No books, apart from the Bible, were so widely read - and listened to when read - as his. One quotation, just for the taste of it:

J. Cats, *Houwelick*

Men gaf in ouden tijt, outren de eersren morgen.
 Eeu sleurel aen de bruyr, tot ingangh van de sorgen,

Een sleutel van het huys en al het huys-bedrijf,
En dan was eers de bruvr een gantsch volkomen wijf.

In old times, the first morning
The bride was given a key, as admittance to her responsibilities,
A key to the house and to all domestic things,
And only from that moment on the bride had become a complete wife.

The image that is transmitted to us by all this writing, is that of a woman whose destiny is marriage. A marriage out of love and free will, hence all the love songs and amorous story and emblem books with their Petrarchistic flavour, which played a role in education and courting; but also a marriage that normally required parental consent, because it was decisive for the rest of the girl's life, and that of her children. Cats is very explicit, and prolix, on this point:

J. Cats, *Hcnaoelick*

Ick wij slechrs dat een jonge macghr
Als sy ter eeren werr gevracght,
Nier strn x, ell met een [uchten sin,
Sal srorren in een losse mm;
Een sraegh versoeck, in ware vlijt,
En dat nier vuor een kleynen tijt,
Met stille sinnen uvr re sracn,
Dat rued ick ulle vrusrets aen,

11

Voor al, soo let roch op de deught,
Let op den handel snner jeught,
En hoe hy sich gedragen heeft,
WJnneer hy buyren hccfr geleeft,
In Duitslanr, of in'r Fransche rijck,
Of elders in een ander wijck;
Let op een wijs, een nuchter man,
Die u tot stcunse! dienen kan,
En in den gcesr en aan het lijf,
En veer het wichrigh huys-bedrijf;

11

I only wish rbar a young maiden,
When she is proposed to,
Will not throw herself in a hurry
And lighr-heartedly in a loose love-affair.
To hold ill consideration
For no short time,
A steady preserved proposal, made in true eagerness,
That is my advice to all girls.

[...]

Before all, pay attention to his virtue,
 Consider the way he has been behaving himself in his young days.
 When he used to live abroad,
 In Germany, or France,
 Or elsewhere,
 Look for a prudent and sober man,
 Who will be a support to you
 In matters of the mind as well as of the body,
 And in the domestic affairs, that are so Important.

When we consider the way the marriages of Hooft and Huygens came about, reality must not have been very different.

As a future mother and housewife, the girl received a certain intellectual education that, depending on her talents, the social class she belonged to, and the interests of her parents, could amount to quite something. We know of women who learned Hebrew to be able to read the Bible in the original language. In more liberal families, she might learn to sing and to play an instrument, and to do water-colours or engravings on glass, as the famous Visscher sisters did. These women could very well have been put forward as Dutch examples of praiseworthiness. But in the end, the duties of marriage presented the only real fulfilment of life they could look forward to.

Originally this image was not in accordance with Dutch middle class reality. But it did become so during the first half of the seventeenth century. First, in upper middle class families, like those Huygens and, to a somewhat lesser degree, Hooft, belonged to; and from there downward. Around the 1650's it may have reached the lower middle class bourgeoisie, albeit that even at that time a woman in business was still no great exception.

This development had considerable consequences for 'the ways women did take part in the production of literature': my third point. For the first time in modern history, women were accepted in the same intellectual and cultural domain as men, and up to a certain level, albeit mostly a considerably lower one, trained to it. In earlier times, during the Middle Ages, women were often far more learned, but their intellectual achievements were confined to a closed circuit, that of the nunneries, and concerned exclusively female religious issues. But in entering the masculine intellectual world, these modern women remained what they were meant to be anyway: junior partners. 'Literary conversation' became one of the characteristics of female civil behaviour, and writing poetry a socially charming pastime, as watercolours and singing were.

The literary production of women bears testimony to this situation. Nearly all female poetry from the first half of the seventeenth century is written in relation to the poetry of men. Anna Roomers' literary fame depends for the greater part on the exchange of poems between her, Daniel Heinsius, and Heinsius' cousin Jacob van Zeevotte - a literary correspondence in which she is praised as a new 'Vulturn and the tenth of the muses, compliments she politely rejects - and, a few years later; between her, Constantijn Huygens, and Pieter Cornelisz Hooft.

In this latter exchange, Huygens introduces a new conceit when he answers a sonnet by Anna with one on the same rhyming words. This trick was repeated in 1621 in a whole series of sonnets by Hooft, Huygens, Anna, her younger sister Tsselschade, and other friends. The following year, poems are exchanged with friends in Zeeland on the occasion of her Visit there. The only independent literary works from her hand we know of, are her translation of a French collection of religious emblems that was never published, and the small poems she added to the reprint of her father's emblembook. That is all. And note: she was the most famous female author in the Netherlands of the seventeenth century.

The situation regarding the poetry of other female authors is even worse. Of the odd twenty poems by Tesselschade that survived, no less than eleven are addressed to friends. And the same goes for other poetesses we know of. It is mainly in a situation of poetical exchange that they seem to write, and often the social rather than poetical character of such exchange is emphasized by the device of rhyme-repetition. In 1654, for instance, no less than twelve poets, three of whom were women, engaged in such a series on a light erotic theme. Literature had become a social game, indeed.

All this does not mean that women did not write autonomous literary work at all. It only means that such work was not regarded as important enough to be conserved. When there was a connection to poetry written by men, their poems might sometimes be published. Hence, the huge quantity of exchange-verses. The rest stayed in handwriting and was thrown away in due time. Most of Tesselschade's poems we only are acquainted with because she communicated them in letters to friends, who, being men, conserved their correspondence. But her translation of Tasso's *Gerusalenune Iibcrata*, on which she worked for about twenty years, is lost, save the stanza she quoted in a letter to Hooft.

It is only in the second half of the century that some women produced publications of their own. Perhaps not the most important of these, but certainly the most curious, is the collection of poems by two women, Cathanna Quesners and Cornelia van der Veer, which was published in 1665 under the title 'Battle of Laurels' *tlauioer-strvti*. The volume opens with a combat of generosity, in which the two ladies praise each other up to the top of mount Helicon, all the way long with the same rhymes:

Lauwer-stryt tusschen Cathanna Quessters en Cornelia van der Veer

[...]

[Catharina]

Neen, Fehus Priesterin, my passen gheen Lcuwerieren,
Mijn vaarzen sijn re swack, zy hebben kracht noch spieren.
Om op den top van 't wijd-beroemde Helicon
Te klauteren; [...]

[Cornelia]

Ik ben onwaardt den diener van hem die Lauwerieren
In plants van Dafne kust, uw vaarzen hebben spiereu,

En naders vol van merch, waar door gy Helikon
 Beklaurend met **vermaak**; [... 1

11

[Catharina]

No, priest of Phoebus, I do [not deserve laurels,
 My verses are weak, they have power nor muscles
 To climb to the top of famous Helicon,

|

[Cornelia]

I am unworthy to the service of him who kisses laurels
 Instead of Daphne's mouth; your verses have muscles
 And veins loaded with marrow, to climb Helicon
 With pleasure; [... 1

Horrible verses indeed. But they are interesting, from the viewpoint of form that defined the very limitations of female poetry. A pity that already at the time of publication, Catharina Quicquiers had decided to lay her pen down, stricken as she was, in her own words, by Cupid's arrow. Four years later she died, in childhood we may infer.

The first really independent female poet was another Catharina, who for some time succeeded the first one in Cornelia van der Veer's friendship: Catharina Lescaille, publisher and bookseller. Her literary inheritance was not thrown away after her death, but published in three huge volumes. Here for the first time, the literary production of a woman could stand on its own. But for the same reason, it was no longer female poetry. Catharina Lescaille writes as any other poet of her time, and therefore she falls outside this lecture, which considered the female role in seventeenth century Dutch poetry.

Argumentative Aspects of Rhetoric and Their Impact on the Poetry of Joost van den Vondel*

In this paper, I wish to discuss the rôle of argument in rhetoric as it concerns the poetry of the *poeta laureatus* Joost van den Vondel.¹ I will illustrate my proposition by way of an analysis of Vondel's poem celebrating the new Amsterdam town hall, which is today the Royal Palace, on the Dam Square, a majestic and sumptuously decorated building, a triumph of seventeenth-century Dutch architecture and art.

At the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth century, the most progressive Dutch poets were drawn to the Pleiadic, Neo-Platonic conception of poetry, according to which 'true' literature distinguishes itself by an *innate* quality that many perhaps best described as 'inspired imagination'. This is, certainly in the first resort, a specifically *lyrical* conception, which regards freedom of mind and a multiplicity and diversity of imaginative ideas as the pre-eminent poetic qualities. This conception was theoretically elaborated by no less a person than Daniel Heinsius, notably in his inaugural speech at Leiden University in 1603: *De poetis et eorum interpretibus*, which marks a moment of crucial importance for the whole development of vernacular literature.²

Although clearly Neo-Platonic in origin and, initially, also in content, in the course of time this lyrical conception of *literature* narrowed to a conception of *lyrical poetry*, and appeared to run parallel to Aristotle's ideas about tragedy and the epic. We may infer this for Heinsius himself, and in mid century we find it explicitly in Gerardus Joannes Vossius' *De artis poeticæ natura ac constitutione liber* of 1647.³

According to Vossius it is at its most recent and optimum stage of development that literature is characterized by inspiration and Imagination. In an earlier phase of history, literature did not exist in this sense, and poems were nothing more than metrical orations in rhyme.⁴ In his *Poeticarum institutionum libri tres* (likewise of 1647) he again draws attention to this, in his opinion older, form of literature. In reference to this, Vossius mentions his *Commentariorum rhetoricorum, siue orationum institutionum libri sex*, which first appeared in 1606 and of

* In: Brian Vickers (ed.), *Rhetoric Revalued. Papers from the International Society for the History of Rhetoric*. Birmingham/New York, Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies/Center for Medieval & Early Renaissance Studies, 1982 (p. 187-198).

which in 1643 a fourth elaborated new edition had been published.' But in his literary text-book he wants to present only what he considers the optimum form of literature.

When Vossius speaks of the development of poetry, he alludes to developments that are alleged to have taken place in Roman antiquity. Yet - whether or not this is coincidence - it tallies with what we may observe in the sixteenth and seventeenth century. Graham Castor has already pointed out that in France the Pleiadic conceptions replaced those of the *seconde rhétorique*, which emphasized rhetorically structured argumentation." Elsewhere, I have tried to prove that we not only come across a similar conception in Julius Caesar Scaliger's *Poeticæ libri septem* of 1561, but that it also underlies in any case, in the Netherlands, a whole tradition of sixteenth-century Neo-Latin poetry. - Though Vossius may, almost a century later, consider the rhetorical conception outdated, and though (not wanting to disapprove of the *deccere* as such) he rejects its rhetorical realization for poetry in the strictest sense of the word, the question remains whether everyone agreed with him in that respect. Which brings me to Joost van den Vondel. Practically untouched by lyrical fashion, Vondel wrote long poems in the humanistic vein of the sixteenth century, always aiming at the instruction of the audience through rhetorical means.

I have begun with this sketch of some literary-historical lines of development in order to make clear that even in the sixteenth and seventeenth century the relation between rhetoric and literature is not a firmly-established one. On the contrary, different interpretations may be assigned to this relation, depending on which view one supports about the object and function of literature. On the one hand, when the specific literary quality is located in the sphere of inspiration and imagination, a relation with rhetoric exists in the form of *elocutio* and in point of loci and *argumenta*. Vossius indicates this clearly in the first paragraph of his *De «MS poeticæ natura ac consuetudine liber*, referring for these aspects to his rhetorical handbook.⁸ But what the poet, given this conception, *cannot* obtain from the *ars oratoria* are the conditions which determine the coherence, the structure of his work. Whereas for epic and tragedy this is the unity of action defined by fictional reality (the *imitatio*). in the case of lyric poetry it is the uncontrolled inspiration of the author.⁹

On the other hand, when the education of the public through rhetorical means is also regarded as a function of literature, the poet is just as much concerned with the more dialectical aspects of rhetoric, that is to say, the argumentation- and discussion-patterns that rhetoric is also and often mainly concerned with, in so far as it is an argumentative theory. In relation to poetry, the importance of these aspects is emphasized by Scaliger, again in the first paragraph of his work."

Rather unjustly, at least in the Netherlands, hardly any attention has been paid by literary-historical studies to these argumentative aspects of the *ars oratoria*. In my opinion, one of the main reasons lies in the fact that in his famous *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*, Lausberg connects poetry rather strictly with a too one-sided conception of the *genus demonstrativum*.

As we all know, the epideictic genre occupies a special place within classical rhetoric, in that its main function does not lie in the argumentative treatment of a point at issue, but in the *amplificatio* of established facts, with a view to pleasing the public rather than convincing it. This view, notably advanced by Aristotle, reappears, for example, in Cicero's *De partitione oratoria*, and Vossius argues along the same lines: in his study *De rhetoricae natura ac constitutione liber unus*, first published in 1621, he asserts that the panegyric serves mainly to exhibit the eloquence of the orator to the satisfaction of the public.¹ Lausberg's infatuation with the *Part pour l'art* aspect of the epideictic genre - an infatuation culminating in the italicized sentence 'Das Lob der Schonheit ist die Hauptfunktion der epideiktischen Rhetorik'² - is probably connected with his twentieth-century conception of poetry. It induces him to print in small type everything relating to the ethical aspect of the genre, reducing it to notes,³ and to neglect the argumentative aspects altogether.

Yet this was most certainly not intended by Aristotle, and even less so by Vossius. Aristotle even emphasizes the ethical aspects of the genre,⁴ and in his *Commentariorum rhetoricorum libri sex*, Vossius says in so many words that in the *genus demonstrativum* it is not only excellent and fluent speech but also an excellent and virtuous way of life that matters. Since, because of this, the orator is concerned with vices and virtues, Vossius claims that the genre comes close to the *genus deliberativum*.⁵ This implies that the argumentative aspects of rhetoric are of equal importance to the *genus demonstrativum*. In fact Vossius assigns the epideictic together with both other genres to that group of truly rhetorical discourses that consider a finite question, on the basis of evidence and argumentation. He distinguishes this group from the *orationes* intended to appeal merely to the emotions, such as, for instance, congratulations and complaints.⁶

It is not immaterial to our argument to point out that Vossius, as a theorist of rhetoric, went so far as to emphasize the specifically argumentative character of this *ars*. In the *Commentariorum rhetoricorum libri sex*, his successful handbook of rhetoric, he dedicates by far the greatest part of the first three books to argumentative issues, and his philosophical discourse *De rhetoricae natura ac constitutione liber unus* may for the greater part be regarded as an elaboration of the thesis which Aristotle postulated in the opening pages of his treatise on rhetoric: 'Rhetoric is a counterpart of Dialectic'.⁷ With this, Vossius continues the fifteenth- and sixteenth-century tendency to emphasize the similarities between dialectic and rhetoric. This tendency had led Ramus to the revolutionary step of relegating the whole of argumentation-theory to logic, curtailing rhetoric to a mere theory of style and recitation.⁸ About half a century later, what has been called the Neo-Ciceronian Counter-Reformation⁹ leads in Vossius' case to an analysis which, on the basis of their similarities, specifies the differences between both disciplines on the level of argumentation. On account of the specific content, purpose, and function of rhetoric namely, to persuade the audience to adopt a certain kind of behaviour concerning a particular question, rhetorical argumentation has its own specific characteristics, not only in the sphere of emotionally-appealing means of persuasion, but also in the rational sphere.¹⁰

Vossius' rather abstract reflections in this respect need not concern us further, since in his *Connentanoruni rheroricoruni libri sex* the principles of rhetorical argumentation are dealt with concretely. Of these principles, the rhetorical forms of the syllogism: the *entlrymcnta* and the *epicbeirerna* are of importance where the structure of a rhetorical discourse is concerned, and the same goes for the theory of the different *status* which Vossius elaborated in detail, following ill the footsteps of Hermogncns.

As regards the former, Quintilian points out the possibility of building up entire rational discourses on the model of the simple or complex *epicbeirerna*, "This *epicbeirerna* consists at the most of a *fiHJfiositio*, its supporting arguments, an *assusnpuo*, again with supporting arguments, and finally a conclusion." The fact that Vossius wants to split up the central section of an oration into two main parts - a *propositio*, which sets out the problem and provides the premises for the conclusion, and a *contentio*, the argumentation of the concrete case - is closely bound up with the form of this *epicbeirerna*. The force with which he - following Aristotle - propagates this division as the most essential, and the minimal importance he attaches to the *narratio* as an independent structural component, implies a positive preference for the argumentative character of an oration rather than for its narrative value, which after all, determined the attractiveness of the rhetorical model for a great many *poetae*.

As regards the different *status*, the distinct levels involved in the dispute between supporters and opponents - the *status coniecturalis*, the *status finitionie*, the *status qua/itatis*, and the *status quantitatis*,²⁶ to confine ourselves to four - of these Vossius maintains, in imitation of Cicero's *Topica*, that they are also directly involved in the *genus demonstratiuum*. For even in a eulogy it may be open to question whether something has actually been done by someone (*status coniecturalis*). Likewise, the precise definition (*status finitionis*) or the moral evaluation (*status qualitatis*) of the action may be questionable. Vossius adds that even if these things are not actually called in question, they might be potentially." The latter implies that in the *genus demonstratiuum* which hardly ever explicitly formulates a *dubium*, and hence has no means of determining a certain central *quaestio* with a specific *status*, all these different discussion-levels must be considered, in order to meet all potential objections.

So, where Vossius is concerned, there is no question of even the least trace of a Lausbergian equation of poetry with a display-platform-conception of the *genus demonstrativum*. On the contrary, compared with the sixteenth-century humanistic tradition, Vossius seems to present the different disciplines with a more explicit division of labour, assigning imagination and narration to poetry and argumentation to rhetoric, and defining in turn, the rhetorical way of argumentation more clearly in contrast to dialectic.

It is this argumentative aspect of rhetoric that particularly appeals to Vondel as a *poet*. His seventeenth-century biographer Ceeraard Brandt bears witness to Vondel's interest when he informs us of the fact that in about 1625, Vondel took lessons in logic or the art of dialectic, in order to write better poetry." The fact that several at least of his panegyrics are built according to the argumentative principles mentioned above, shows how he benefitted from these lessons. He fol-

lows the principles so ardently propagated by *Vossius-rhetor*, namely: the division of the middle part of an oration into a *propositio* and a *contentio*, and the construction of the latter according to the *status-theory*. This applies not only to *Het Lof der Zee-vaert* ('In Praise of Navigation') of 1623, but also to his [*I*]-*urydinge van het Stadhuis t' Amsterdam* ('Inauguration of Amsterdam Town Hall') of 1655, and his *Zeemagazyn* ('Marine-Arsenal') of 1658.²⁹ That is, it applies to poems that were written after Vossius had come up with his view on the division of labour between poetry and rhetoric in his literary-theoretical works, published in 1647, and this in spite of the fact that Vondel and he were personal acquaintances.

For the purpose of demonstration, I will now give a survey of the argumentative construction of the *I**tuovdinge van het Stadhuis t' Amsterdam*, the 1378-line poem written by Vondel when the new Amsterdam town hall came into use, and which appeared on that occasion in the form of a booklet of 44 pages. 10 To Start with the most general division: Vondel's poem consists indeed of an *exordium*, a *propositio*, a *contentio* and a *peroratio*, the parts that Vossius considers to be essential.

I will not go into all the ethical and emotional arguments adduced in the *exordium*, in order to render the public *attentum* and, above all, *benevolum*, because they do not immediately contribute towards a better understanding of the rational argumentation. One rational function of the exordium, though, does concern us, namely the *docifem* parare, informing the public what the poem will be about. Vondel indicates that his subject will be the town hall, civil authority, and the annual fair, and all this in praise of Amsterdam. Thus, he presents, as I will demonstrate in what follows, the different subjects that constitute the material of his argumentation.

In fact, all three subjects return in abstracto in the following *propositio*. This *propositio* presents a general thesis, as is the case in all of Vondel's panegyrics that I have analysed. In this particular case, it is a compound thesis which posulates that: (a) human weakness necessitates authority, and that, therefore, a town hall as seat of the government exists for the good of the community; and (b) that people may continue practising their trade and conducting their business, if the government is on the alert for enemies from without, and that a town hall may therefore be regarded as a house enclosing a thousand other houses. Thus, two items that form the components of the argument, propagate, in the form of a syllogism, the necessity for a town hall, namely: public authority, and the community defined in terms of economic activity. Hence, the conclusion that the town hall may be regarded as the town's heart. Five instances of other *republicae* are adduced as the Inductive proofs of this proposition. .

This leaves Vondel to demonstrate that the concrete instance: the Amsterdam town hall, meets the above-argued criteria, namely: that it is an adequate seat of a reliable civil authority, and that it is the stimulating centre of community life. The *contentio*, which now follows is entirely dedicated to this argumentation, and apart from eight lines forming the *peroratio*, it monopolizes the rest of the poem. Thus, the argumentative middle part of Vondel's poem does indeed dis-

play the construction of an *epitaphium*, be it one of an extremely complex structure.

Vossius in particular emphasizes that one of the reasons for making a distinction between rhetoric and dialectic, is the fact that rhetoric deals with individual concrete, instead of general abstract issues." For the sake of argumentation of such an individual issue, the rhetoricians have in fact derived specific rhetorical/od from the dialectical/od *communis*. As examples of *loci specialis* belonging to the eulogy of buildings, Quintilian mentions honour, utility, beauty, and the makers or founders, whereas Vossius in his survey of these *loci* emphasizes in particular the archirechronic qualities.» All these *loci* may be found in the *contentio* of Vondel's *Inwydinge*. But the striking thing is that besides these *loci*, we also come across *loci* belonging to the eulogy of cities. These *loci*, the history, the situation, and geography of the city of Amsterdam - mentioned by both Quinrilinn and Vossius as the specific *loci* belonging to the city-*laus*³⁵ - are the ones that constitute the lion's share of the poem, especially early in the argumentation.

In this Vandel may have followed an example. For one of the most familiar Latin translations of Aphthonius' *Progymnasmata*, there figures a poem that bears a clear resemblance to the *Inwydinge*, as far as its structure according to the *loci* belonging to the eulogy of cities and buildings is concerned. I have used the sixteenth-century translation of Rodolphus Agricola and Johannis Maria Carunaeus which, annotated by R. Lorichius, was published in Amsterdam no less than seven times between 1642 and 1665. In this translation, a great many examples have been added to Aphthonius' text, one of them a panegyric in praise of Leiden University, entitled *Encomium Marpurgensis Academiae*, in which the construction according to *loci* is indicated in the margin." But the very resemblance between the *Encomium* and the *Inwydinge* makes the differences all the more significant. The structure of the *Encomium* is dictated by not much more than the order in which these *loci* *epitaphicae* are presented by Quinrilinn. By means of the eulogistic arguments derived from these *loci*, we are presented with an enumeration of the moral and material qualities of town and academy, while there is no question of an argumentative structure in terms of 'since... therefore'. Thus this sixteenth-century *Encomium* is indeed one long *amplificatio*, conforming to the precepts of the nonargumentative *genus deonstrativum*.³⁷ The absence of something like a universal *thesis* presented in a *propositio*; against the background of which all these *argumenta* might be given an argumentative function, is also indicative of the non-argumentative character of this poem. In Vondel's case, on the other hand, these same *loci* do follow the order of a certain argumentative structure, so that his *contentio* indeed represents an argumentation. This structure is in fact that of the different *status*.

Argumentation is called for when there is a *quaestio*, that is to say, in this case, when the praiseworthiness of the object may be called in question. This holds good most certainly in the case of the Amsterdam town hall, an enormous and expensive object of prestige.³⁸ Vondel comes forward with the objections that could be made against the building only towards the end of his poem: the size and splendour of the building supposedly bear witness to too much confi-

dence in the favours of changeable fortune. But all 1194 preceding verses anticipate the refutation of this proposition, so that when the objections are actually raised, the reader or listener is sufficiently indoctrinated to discredit these statements and to go along with the ensuing positive proposition.^w

The gist of the argument is that the municipal authority of Amsterdam, as the representative of God on earth, is itself best qualified to consider what degree of sumptuousness (the *locus* of beauty) befits the venerability of its own seat of government, and subsequently, it is argued that the many tasks that have to be accomplished by the authorities for the benefit of the community necessitate such an enormous building (the *locus* of utility). Although expressed only towards the end of the poem, it is necessary for the argumentative analysis to keep in mind that this is what has to be proved: the *assumptio* of the *epicheirema*. Two lines of argumentation may be derived.^s in terms of which it has to be demonstrated that the Amsterdam town hall is indeed an adequate seat of the municipal government of Amsterdam. Only after this has been proved, can the praiseworthiness of the municipal government of Amsterdam be brought forward in order to demonstrate also the *honor* of its seat. The criteria for this praiseworthiness are set down in the *propceiuo*. They are the maintenance of order within the community, and the outward defence of the community.

Concerning the praiseworthiness of the Amsterdam town hall itself, the first compound question that may be raised by a critical mind is: is the town hall indeed the functional centre of the town, and is it indeed the result of a correct decision of the municipal authorities. These questions belong to the level of the *status coniecturalis*, and each has its own *sub-status*.

The question whether the Amsterdam town hall is indeed the functional centre of the town, immediately invites the counter-question just how the functional centre of the town should be defined. Thus, Vondel's *contentio* begins with a bird's-eye view of the history of Amsterdam (a *locus* belonging to the *city-Iaus*), demonstrating how the situation of the different historical town halls was functionally changed in accordance with the economic development of the town from fishing-village, via centre of regional trade, to trading metropolis. At present, anno 1655, the new town hall is situated on the Dam Square, the great market-place, centre of the international trading empire (the *locus* of the situation of a town, belonging to the *city-Iaus*).

A similar procedure is followed where the second part of the question is concerned. The question whether the building of the town hall is indeed the result of a correct decision of the authorities, invites the counter-question as to just how that decision was effected and earned through. In answer to this, Vondel traces briefly the course of events during the planning-stage, and demonstrates how, due to the steadfastness of the municipal authorities, and despite a great many setbacks, the building of the town hall proceeded. It is a highly-coloured account, evidently doing violence to the true course of events,^v but not to such an extent that for a more general public the story deserves no credit at all.

So here we are with the town hall on the Dam Square. Nevertheless, this does not mean that Vondel considers the subject closed, because a critical reader might object that the Dam Square is not the centre of the town as defined above,

and that the building of the town hall does not adequately reflect the decision and perseverance of the municipal government. In answer to these potential objections, Vondel starts with a description of the Dam Square as both archaic and functional centre of the town (again a *locus* belonging to the city-laure), and continues with a description of the building activities, under the supervision and guidance of the architects. It is an answer on the level of the *status initionis*; concerned with the precise definition, and for which Cicero recommends the description as an adequate means. Only when these potential objections have been answered have both parts of the Issue been settled. And only now is the discussion of the town hall on the level of the *status coniecturalis* brought to a satisfactory conclusion: everything indicates that it is indeed both the functional centre of the town, and the result of a correct decision on the part of the municipal authorities. Although, by now, we have reached verse 612, we have not yet even glimpsed the town hall itself. The lines of argumentation followed meant that first, all kinds of other matters had to come up for discussion, so that for those who do not see through the argumentative structure, the poem may create the impression of a rambling chaos. The needs of the trading town (the annual fair of the *exordium*), and the capacities of the city-council (the civil authorities of the *exordium*), are indeed the qualities that determine the praiseworthiness of the town hall.

Here, Vondel arrives at a kind of intermediate conclusion, anticipating the *status qualitatis*. In this conclusion, on the basis of utility, beauty and venerability (the loci belonging to the *laus* of buildings) both lines of argumentation come together at the same point, the issue at stake: the town hall itself.

And yet at this point, the critical reader or listener might object that this is all very well, but that the town hall itself proves that all has come to nought. Vondel also has to justify the hitherto formulated pretensions with regard to the town hall itself, which means that here again the burden of proof at the level of the *status initionis* rests on the poet. The problem is again solved by means of a description, passing in review exterior and interior of the town hall, and the main decorations in the form of paintings and sculpture.

Thus, Vondel finally and definitely arrives at the *status qualitatis*, the level to which the special *loci* in praise of buildings belong.⁴³ After all that has gone before, the beauty and utility may quickly be denied. Having also finally raised the objections against the building *expressis verbis*, now all further emphasis is placed on the venerability of the building, the *honor*. Entirely according to the criteria laid down in the *propositio*, by means of a detailed eulogy of the Amsterdam municipal authorities, Vondel proves the respectability of the seat of government.

Regarding this municipal government: in the rest of the Republic of the United Provinces, opinions varied on the moral qualities of those in power in Amsterdam. In the *peroratio*, Vondel calls upon the antagonists to acknowledge at last that the welfare of the entire country depends on Amsterdam and its municipal authorities. Yet when he does so, the rational argumentation has already been completed.

With respect to this argumentation, I hope I have demonstrated that Vondel's lessons in logic had a fruitful result. It would appear that Vossius' tendency to emphasize the argumentative character of rhetoric leads, in the case of some of Vondel's poetry, to a more distinctly argumentative framework, as compared with sixteenth-century literary texts. At the same time, he seems in this respect to be running counter to the seventeenth-century literary trend, codified by the same Vossius, which wanted to liberate poetry precisely from the dictates of rhetorical argumentation.

Notes

1 The Rhetoric of Ronsard's 'Hymne de l'Or'

(Talk given at the sixth conference of the international Society for the History of Rhetoric, Tours-Poitiers, 15-20 July 1987.)

- Pierre de Ronsard, *Oeuvres complètes*, ed. Palli Laumonier, 8 vols., Paris 1915, p. xvi.
- 2 Michel Dassonville, 'Éléments pour une définition de l'Hymne Ronsardien', in: *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 24 (1962), p. 25; I consulted the reprint of this article in: Madckin/Lazard ed., *Autour des 'Hymnes' de Ronsard*, Geneva 1984, p. 1-32.
 - 3 Guy Demerson, *La Mythologie classique dans l'œuvre lyrique de la 'Pliade'*, Genève 1972, p. 40]; see also Guy Demerson, 'La Mythologie des Hymnes', in: *Autour des 'Hymnes' de Ronsard*, p. 103-143.
 - 4 Ronsard, *Hymnes*, ed. Albert Py, (Geneve 1978), p. 46.
 - 5 Jean Frappier, 'L'Inspiration biblique et théologique de Ronsard dans *L'Hymne de la Jussée*', in: *Mélanges d'histoire littéraire de la Renaissance offerts à Henri Chamard*, Paris, 1957, p. 97-108, esp. 105; Jean Frappier, 'Tradition et actualité dans *L'Hymne de l'Or* de Pierre de Ronsard', in: *Literary History and Literary Criticism: Acts of the Ninth Congress, International Federation for Modern Languages and Literature*, ed. Leon Edel, New York 1965, p. 126-41, esp. 130-31.
 - 6 In: *Literary History and Literary Criticism*, p. 141-149. See also M.F. Verdier, 'A propos d'une controverse sur l'Hymne de l'Or de Pierre de Ronsard', in: *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 35 (1973), p. 7-18, Jean-Claude Margolin, 'L'Hymne de l'Or et son ambiguë', in: *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 28 (1966), p. 271-293 (287 and 290-291).
 - 8 Alex L. Gordon, *Ronsard et la Rhétorique*, Genève 1970, p. 70-71; Terence Cave, *The Cornucopian Text: Problems of Writing in the French Renaissance*, Oxford 1979, p. 233-237.
 - 9 See also my article 'Scaliger on Hollaude', p. 165-166, in *Acta Scaligeriana: Actes du Colloque international Jules-César Scaliger*: ed. J. Cubeher de Beynac and M. Lagnien, Agen 1986, p. 157-169. [also in this volume]
 - 10 O.B. Hardison, *The Enduring Monument: A Study of the Idea of Praise in Renaissance Literature* (Theory and Practice), Chapel Hill NC 1962, p. 195-197; A. Leigh DeNeef, 'Epic Rhetoric and the Renaissance Lyric', in: *The Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 3 (1973), p. 203-23 esp. 204-221.
 - 11 J.C. Scaliger, *Poetices libri septem*. Faksimile-Neudruck der Ausgabe von Lyon. Ed. A. Buck, Stuttgart etc., 1964, III. 105, p. 157: 'Cum omne genus orationis ad deliberarium reduxerimus: finis enim iudicii est Justitia. Iustitia ab electione. Electio à dehercuncione. Item Laudationis finis imitatio: rum superiora (i.e. cap. 'O' 'O4: occasional pieces such as epithalamia, propemptica, etc.), rum haec ipsa, quae deinceps recensimus (i.e., cap. 105-123: hortatory, persuasive and laudatory genres) sub deliberandi genere continebuntur'. See also I. 1. p. 2-3. See Brian Vickers, 'Epic and Epic in the Renaissance', p. 404-507, in: *Renaissance Literature and Contemporary Theory: New Literary History* 14 (1983), no. 3, p. 497-537.

- Scaliger, III. 115-116, p. 163-164.
 Heinrich Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*, München 1960, Vol. I, 262, p. 148-149. I refer to this book in the case of such universally accepted categories that Ronsard could have found them in any work whatsoever on rhetoric.
- 24 Lausberg, 274-277, p. 156-158, and 264, p. 58.
 25 Lauvberg, 337, p. 186.
 26 Lausberg, 289, p. 164.
 27 Lausberg, 262, p. 149. In the 16th century, this division is treated at length, for example by Rudolph Agricola in his *De Inventione Dialectica*; ed. Alardus Aemstelredamus, Cologne 1539, Chapter 16, p. 258-259: 'Alterat diuini orationis et quid sit expositio, quid argumentatio'.
 28 Lausberg, 233-235, p. 127-128. See Scaliger, III. 105, p. 58.
 Lausberg, 430, p. 236.
 Lauvberu. 432-439, p. 236-239.
 Emerson, *La Mythologie classique* (note 3), p. 407.
 Marc G.M. van der Poel, *De 'Declamatio' bij de Humanisten. Bijdrage tot de studie van de Rhetorica in de Renaissance*, Nieuwkoop 1987, p. 137, 142-143, [40] 51, 194-197.
 Donald Lemen Clark, 'The Rise and Fall of Progymnasmata in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Grammar Schools', in: *Speech Monographs*, 19 11952, p. 259-263; Jean-Claude Margolin, 'La Rhétorique d'Aphthonius et son influence au XVIIe siècle' in: R. Chevalier (ed.) (*"L'Éloge" sur la Rhétorique, Calliope I*, Paris 1979, p. 238-269.
 I consulted *Aphthonii Sophistae Progymnasmata*. Partim à Rod. Agricola. partim à I. Maria Catanaeo Iannirare donat. Cum luculentis et vtilibus in eadem scholiis Reinhardi Lorichii Iudam.un. Parisiis 1573. The first printing is dated 1542; an expanded reprint appeared in 1546 and it was this edition that became the authoritative one in the 16th and 17th centuries. (Clark, p. 261. There were French prints of this edition in 1555 (Lyon, J. Frellon, and *ibidem*, A. Vincent). See Gerda C. Huisman, *Rudolf Agricola. A Bibliography of Printed Works and Translations*, Nieuwkoop 1985, p. 140-141.)
- 29 Clark, 'The Rise and Fall' (note 2), p. 40.
 30 Aphthonius, p. 24-25.
 31 Ronsard, p. 179-205.
 32 Aphthonius, p. 39-40.
 33 Aphthonius, p. 142-144.
 34 Van der Poel, *De 'Declamatio'* (note 22), p. 149-151.
 35 See James Hurren, 'Rhetorical Doctrine and some Poems of Ronsard', in: *16th Century Rhetorical Idiom. Essays in Rhetoric, Oratory, Language and Drama presented to Herbert August Wichelns*, Ithaca NY 1958, p. 315-334, esp. 320, n. 1.
 36 Lausberg, 902, p. 449-450.
 37 Margolin, 'L'Hymne de l'Or' (note 7), p. 290-293.
 38 Scaliger, III. 115, 116.
 39 Lausberg, 64, 3 and 4, p. 58-59. See also Scaliger III. 118, p. 164.
 40 See Weinberg, 'Critique de la communication de Jean Frappier', in: *Literary History and Literary Criticism*, p. 41-44, esp. 42-43.
 Van der Poel, p. 199-205, confuses 'pamdoc' and 'adoc' but his conclusion that the *Praise of Folly* and other declamations of this genre should be taken as serious is completely correct.
 Frappier, 'Tradition et actualité' (note 5), p. 132-133.
 Margolin, 'L'Hymne de l'Or', r. 291-293.

2 From Disputation to Argumentation: The French Morality Play in the Sixteenth Century

- Werner Helmich, *Die Allegorie im französischen Theater des 15. und 16. [abrbundcrs]*. Tübingen 1976. *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, Beiheft 156, passim. Alan E. Knight, *Aspects of Genre in late Medieval French Drama*. Manchester 1983, p. 57-73.
- Joel B. Alnann, *The Tudor Play of Mind. Rhetorical Inquiry and the Development of Elizabethan Drama*. Berkeley 1978, p. 18-34.
- Marijke Spiess, 'Op de questye... Over de structuur van rsc-ccuwsc zinnespelen,' *De "iell-we ta.iigide* 83 (1990), p. 139-150.
- 4 Helmich, *Die Allegorie*, p. 164-170.
- Helmich, *Die Allegorie*, p. 32 and 175-177. The text is published in *Moralités françaises. Rcimpression fac-similé de vingt-deux pièces allégoriques imprimées aux XV^e-et XVI^e siècles*, ed. Werner Helmich, Genève 1980, 1:110.
- 6 Helmich, *Die Allegorie*, p. 32 and 171-172. The text is published in *Moralité françaises* 1980, 1:113-420.
- Helmich, *Die Allegorie*, p. 31, 183-184, and 186. The text is published in: G. Cohen. *Mysterès et moralités du manuscrit 617 de Chantilly*. Paris 1920, p. 41-77.
- 8 Helmich, *Die Allegorie*, p. 32 and 181-183. The text is published in *Moralités françaises* 1980, 1:425-881.
- 9 Cf. Anthonv Kenny and Jan Pinborg, 'Medieval Philosophical Literature,' *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy. From the Rediscovery of Aristotle to the Disintegration of Scholasticism, 1100-1600*, 2d. ed., ed. Norman Kretzmann, Anthony Kemp and Jan Pinborg. Cambridge 1984, p. 11-42; esp. 29. Martin Crobmon. *Die Geschichte der scholastischen Methode*, part 2, *Die scholastische Methode im 12. und beginnenden 13. Jahrhundert*, 2nd ed. Berlin 1957, p. 221.
- 10 H. Walter, *Das Streitgedicht ill der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*. München 1920, p. 17-29. F.J. Mäder, *Der Streit des "Föchter tioucs", Zur Ccscmcchte eines allegorischer Motivs*. Bern, Frankfurt 1971, p. 14-34, 41-42, and 89.
- 11 Kenny and Pinborg, "Medieval Philosophical Literature", p. 267-269.
- 12 Grabmann, *Die Geschichte*, 2:425-429 and 495-529. Kenny and Pinborg, 'Medieval Philosophical Literature', p. 22-24 and 30-33.
- 13 Grabmann, *Die Geschichte*, 2:427-428.
- 14 *Moralités françaises*; 1:1-84, and 3:267-312.
- 15 *Moralités françaises*, a:105-156.
- 16 Helmich *Die Allegorie*, p. 35. The text is published in: Paul Aebischer, 'Le Couvert d'Humanité par Jean d'Abundance,' *Bibliothèque d'humanisme et renaissance* 24 (1962), 282-338.
- 17 There are: *La France des Theotogastres* (ca. 1523-29). (*Moralités françaises*; 3:1-9); Marieu Malingre, *Moralité de la Maladie de Chrestienté* (c. 1533 ed.) (*Moralités françaises*, 3:13-108); *La Vérité Cacbee* (ca. 1533-34 ed.) (*Moralités françaises* 3:111-188); *Comédie du Pape Malade et tirant à la Fin* (1561 ed.) (*Moralités françaises*; 3:191-264); Henry de Barran, *Tragique Comédie Française de l'Homme iust(i.) par Foy* (c. 1552, 1554 ed.) (*Moralités françaises*, 3:491-584); and Henry III Tour, *Moralité de Paix et de Guerre* (r 558 ed.) (*Moralités françaises*, 3:587-649).
- 18 Ph. Melanthonis, *Elementorum rhetorices libri .1^o: 'De confutatione'*, Philippi Melanthonis Opera, ed. G. Bretschneider. vol. 13. Hahs Saxorum 1846 col. 435.
- 19 C. Vasoli, 'La rctonca c la cultura del Rinascimento,' *Rhetorica* 2 (1984), p. 12-162; esp. 129-131. Marc Cogan. 'Rodolphus Agricola and the semantic Revolutions of the History of Invention,' *Rhetorica* 2 (1984), p. 163-194. Lisa Jardine, 'Distinctive Discipline: Rudolph Agricola's Influence on Methodical Thinking in the Humanities,' *Rodolphus Agri-*

cola Phrisius 1444-1485, ed. F. Akkerman and A.J. Vanderjagt, *Proceedings of the Inter-"Iio"/I/ Conference, Groningen 1985*. Leiden 1988, 38-57; esp. 4.1. and the older literature mentioned there.

- 20 Cogan, 'Rodolphus Agricola', p. 176-184.
- 21 Cf. for instance Melanrhon 1846 'De confutarione.' col. 434-435.
- 22 *Moralités françaises*, 3:xix; text on p. 491-584.
- 23 Thrsimplies I think, a counternrgument to jardine's statement that 'Agricola's dialectical "nu-thod" was adopted ..., hut ... not *practised*'. See jar-dine 1988, 56.
- 24 (i. for instance. Melanrhon 1846, col. 424-428.
- 25 Cf. Marc van Jer Poel, *De 'declamatio' hij de humanisten. Bijdrage tot de studie ran de functies van de rhetorica i" de renaissance*. Nicuwoop 1987, /iassim (with an extensive summary in English).

3 Between Epic and Lyric. The Genres in j.C. ScaJiger's *Poetices Libri Septem*

Bernard Weinberg, 'Scaliger versus Aristotle on 'Pocncs.' *Modern Philology* 79 (, 94 1-42), I. 337-360, esp- 360.

François Lecercle, 'La compulsion raxinomique: Scaliger et la théorie des genres.' L, *Stat-ur et l'Empreinte: La Poétique de Scaliger* Ed. C. Balavoine & F. Laurens. Paris 1986, p. 89-99, esp. p. 94-95.

Weinberg, 'Scaliger versus Aristoth-', P. 359.

- 4 Cf. Lecercle. 'La L'ompulsion raxinomique,' p- 92-93.
[Julius Caesar Scaliger, *Poetices Libri Septem*. Facsumle Reprint of the Edition Lyon 1561. Ed. August Buck. Srutrgarr 1964, L1, p- ., col. i, II and p. 3, col. i D,
- 6 Scaliger, *Poetices*, I.1" p. 2, col. 1 C - p. 3 col. 1 C.
Senliger, *Poetices*, I.1, p. [col. 2. C - p. i, col. 1 A-B.
- 8 Scaliger, *Poetices*, I.1, p. 6 col. A-B.
- 9 Scaliger, *Poetices*, I.2, p. 6, col. A-B and I 3 p. 6, col. i B - 2 B.
- 10 Scaliger, *Poetices* I.2, p. 6, col. 1 B en I.3, p. 6. col. 2. A. Lecercle, 'La compulsion tuxinomique,' p. 95, must have overlooked rhevc passages when stating the opposite.
- 11 L Aristotle, *Poetics*, I.2-3 III (1447a), III., (1448a), IV.7-9 (1448b), XXVI.1-8 14(2bl.
- 12 Scaliger, *Pocncs*, I.4-57, p. 6-54.
- 13 Cf. also Scaliger, *Poetices*, II.1, p. 55, col. 1 A: 'Quae ex auuquis peruta narrationibus [... ad Illiicillill reuocata sunt.'
- 14 Scaliger, *Poetices*, II.1, p. 55, col. 1 B - col. 2 B. Cf. also III.r, p. 80, col. i A-B.
- 15 Scaliger, *Poetices*, III.1, p. 80, col. , B-C. Cf. also II.2. p. 81, col. , C. On this question more extensively: Alain Michel, 'Scaliger entre Arjsrote et Virgile.' *Acta Scaligeriana*, Eel. J. Cubelier de Bevnac er M. Magnien. Agen 1986, p. 63-73, esp. 64-65.
- 16 Scaliger, *Poetices*. I.1, p. I. col. 2 E, and I.1, p. 3. col. 1 D. Cf. resp. Aristotle, *Poetics* IX.5 I 45 Ihi. and Cicero, *Pro Archia*, VIII.18.
- 17 Scaliger, *Poetices*, III.2, p. 83, col. 1 C. and III.24, p. 111, col. 1 A. Cf. also Weinberg, 'Scaliger versus Aristotle,' p. 342-343, and ,Alid,d, 'Scaliger entre Arisrote et Virgile,' p 68.
- 18 Scaliger, *Poetices*, III.1, p. 80-83; cf. also VII.2, p. 347, col. 1 A-D.
- 19 Scaliger, *Poetices*, VII.2, p. 347, col. , A-B.
- 20 Scaliger, *Poetices*, III.2-24, p. 83-113.
- 21 Scoliger, *Poetices*, III.25, p. 113
- 22 Cf. also Weinberg, 'Scaliger versus Aristotle,' p. 353
- 23 Scaliger, *Poetices*, III.1, p. 80, col. , A.

- 24 Scaliger, *Poetices*, III.25-28, p. 111-120 (the four qualities), and 29-95, p. 120-144 (the figures).
- 25 Scaliger, *Poetices*, III.28, p. 119, col. 2 C.
- 26 Scaliger, *Poetices*, III.96, p. 144, col. 1 A; d. also 1.3, p. 6, col. u A.
- 27 Scaliger, *Poetices*, III.124, p. 169, col. 1 C, and III.125, p. 169, col. 2 B. Cf. also I.44, p. 47, col. , B-D.
- 28 Scaliger, *Poetices*, III.96, p. 144, col. A-13.
- 29 Scaliger, *Poetices*, III.96, p. 144, col. B-2 A.
- 30 Scaliger, *Poetices*, VIII. p. 348, col. , A-B.
- 31 Scaliger, *Poetices*, III.124, p. 169, col. 1 C13.
- 32 Scaliger, *Poetices*, 1.6, p. 12, col. , A-13 Cf. Aristotle, *Poetics*, VII.6-7 (1451a). For this passage on the dramatic genres I am greatly indebted to Mreke B. Smits-Veldt, who in her study *Samuel Cosier. ethicue-didacticus: een onderzoek naar dramatische opzct en morele instructie van Ithys, Polyxena en Iphigenia*. Groningen 1986, p. 29-33 and 37-47, made a thorough analysis of Scaliger's opinions on this point.
- 33 Scaliger, *Poetices*, III.97, p. 141, col. 2 A-C.
- 34 Cf. Ansrulle, *Poetics*, VII.2-3 (1450b) and VIII.4 (1451a).
- 35 Scaliger, *Poetices*, VIII. j, p. 347-348.
- 36 Scaliger, *Poetices*, III.97, p. 146, col. 1 B-C.
- 37 Scaliger, *Poetices*, III.97, p. 144, col. 2 C and p. 145, col. 2 C-13. Cf. Smits-Veldt, *Samuel Cosier*, p. 44-46.
- 38 Scaliger, *Poetices*, III.97, p. 145, col. , D.
- 39 Scaliger, *Poetices*, III.10, p. 161, col. 1 A-D.
- 40 O.B. Hardison, *The Enduring Monument: A Study of the Idea of Praise in Renaissance Literary Theory and Practice*. Chapel Hill 1962, esp. p. 195-198; A. Leigh DeNeef, 'Epidicric Rhetoric and the Renaissance Lyric.' *The Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 3 (1973), p. 203-231, esp. 211-212; Brian Vickers, 'Epidicric and Epic in the Renaissance.' *New Literary History* 14 (1983), p. 497-537, esp. 508.
- 41 CL DeNeef, 'Epidicric Rhetoric,' p. 205-207 and Vickers 'Epidicric and Epic,' p. 506-507.
- 42 DeNeef 'Epidicric Rhetoric', p. 212; d. also Lecercle, 'La compulsion taxinomique,' p. 94-96.
- 43 Scaliger, *Poetices*, III.105, p. 157-158.
- 44 Cf. Mark D. Jordan, 'Ancient Rhetoric and the Problem of Persuasive Genres.' *Rhetorica* 4 (1986), p. 309-333 esp. 315-316.
- 45 Scaliger, *Poetices*, III.105, p. 157, col. 1 D.
- 46 Scaliger, *Poetices*, I.1, p. 2, col. 2 B - p. 3, col. 1 C.
- 47 Scaliger, *Poetices*, III.101, p. 150, col. 2 A. Cf. also Mrijck Spies, 'Scaliger en Hollandc.' *Acta Scatigenana* 1986, p. 157-169, esp. p. 165-166. See also this volume, chapter 4.
- 48 Scaliger, *Poetices*, III.101, p. 150, col. 2 C-D.
- 49 Scaliger, *Poetices*, III.109, p. 160.
- 50 Cf. Mrijck Spies, 'La Rhétorique de l' Hymne de [Or de Ronsard].' *Rhetorica* 7 (1989), p. 159-170, esp. 160-162. See also this volume, chapter 1.

4 Scaliger in Holland

C.L. Heesakkers, *Praecidanca Douzana: Materials for a Biography of Janus Douza Pater (1545-1604). His Youth*. Amsterdam 1976, p. 128.

- 2 For the history of Scaliger's appointment in Leyden, see F.E. Molhuysen, *De komst van Scaliger in Leiden*, Leiden 1913.
- 3 I consulted Hadrianus Junius, *Nomenclator (etc.)*. Tertia editio. Anverpiae 1583.

- Joannes Fungerus, *Sylva carminum (etc.)*. LILGJUIIIHn Batavorum " 85, p. 66-67.
- Paul Diho", *L'Enseignement philosophique dans les universités Néerlandaise à l'Époque précartesienne* (1575-1650). S.I. 1954, p. 33 and 49.
- Janus Dousa Fihuv. *Poemata (etc.)*, Lugd. Bat. 1607, f. aoa.
- Josephus Scaliger Jul. Caes. E., *Epistola de vetustate et splendore gentis Scaligerae et Ill. Caes. Scaligeri rita (etc.)*, Lugd. Bat. 1594. IIIIII' Caesar Scaliger, *Epistolae et orationes (etc.)*, Lugd. Bat. 1600.
- See J.-A. van Dorsten, *Poets Patrons and Professors: Sir Jhili, Sidney, Daniel Rogers and the Leiden Humanists*, Leyden and London 1962.
- Gerardus Joannes Vossius, *Universalis philosophiae Ἀκρωτηριασμοῦ*, Disputation held at Leyden University, 2 February, 1598. Theses and defences. Edited and introduced by M. van Straaten. Leyden 1955, p. 52-53 and Cf. Vossius, *Universalis philosophiae Ἀκρωτηριασμοῦ*, 'Introduction', p. 17.
- I quote from the third edition: Gerardus Joh. vossius. *Oratoriarum institutionum libri sex*, Fdirio n-ria etc.), 1-runcoforti 1616, and the dedcarion. p. (li 6 recto and chapters I.3 (p. 28) and V.2 (p. 299); see also I.5 ip, 145) and V.2 (p. 315).
-)_H, Mrrer, *De literaire theorieën van Daniel Heinsius (etc.)*, Amsterdam 1975, p. 170-176 and p. 206-208.
- Daniel Heinsius, 'Hymnus off I.of-sanck van Bacchus', p. A.4 recto-verso (Daniël Heinsius, *Nederduytsche poemata*. Faksimiledruck nach der Ersr.rusgabe von 1616. Ed. Barbara Becker-Cantarino, Bern 1983).
- In the Preface to the tragedy *Isabella*, written in collaboration with the poet P.C. Hooft (Samuel Coster, *Werken*, ed. R.A. Kollwijn. Haarlem 1883 p. 301).
- Th. Rodenburgh, *Eglentier Poëtens Borst-weringh*. Amsterdam 1619, p. 33, 43, 45, and 48. See S.F. Witsstein, *Bronnen en bewerkingwijze van de nntcende gedeelten in Rodenburgh Eglentiers Poëtens Borst-weringh*. Amsterdam 1964, p. 5-6.
- 16 Constantijn Huygens, *Dagh-uerck*, ed. F.L. Zwaan. Assen 1972, p. 127 and 26. [See I Strengholt, *Huygens-studien (etc.)*, Amsterd.uu 1976, p. 168 and 172. The quotation " from the Sixth Book of *Poëtices libri septem*, Lyons, 1561, p. 111.
- 17 D. H. Smif, *Johan van Leeuwerck* 1597-1656. Amsterdam 1933, p. 22 and 38.
- 18 In the prefaces to *Lucifer* (1654), *Salomoneus* (1657), *Jeptha* (1659), and *Koning Edipus* 1660). Afterwards Vondel mentions Scaliger in his defence of the theatre *Tooneelschilt* 1661) and in the introduction to his translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 1670).
- 19 W.A.P. Smit, *Van Pasch. 101 Noah (etc.)*, vol. I, Zwolle 1956, p. 12-13 and p. 27. See also W.A.P. Smit, *Het Nderlendse renaissance-uvnee! als probleem en taak voor de literatuur-historie*. Amsterdam 1964, p. 44.
- J. van den Vondel, *Werken*, ed. J.F.M. Sterck et al., vol. VIII, Amsterdam 1935, p. 853. See also Vol. V (1931), p. 713-714.
- Smu, 1/11 *Nederlandse renaissance-toneel*, I, 12-14.
- A. Keersmacker-s. 'Drie Amsterdamse liedboeken 1602-1615. Doorhrak van de renaissance" *De nieuwe taalgijs* 74 (1981), p. '2' 133.
- The distinction is not as clear as I present it here. [an Starter's volume of poetry, *Friescrc lust-hof* 1625), has all the characteristics of an anthology, whereas the collective production *Zeeuwsche nachtegael* (1623) shows a uipartite division as discussed below in our discussion of certain volumes of individual authors.
- Jan van der Noot, *Hel bosken* (circa 1570), Jacob Cats, *Protens* 1618), G.A. Brvdero. *Boertigh, amoreus en aendachtigh groot lied-boeck* 1622).
- I borrow the idea from one of my students Marijke Blankman. See also LK, Grootes, 'Literatuur-historie en Cats visie op de jeugd', *Spektator* 9 (1979-1980), p. 477-493.
- P. C. Hooft, *Emblemata amatoria* 1611); Daniël Heinsius *Nederduytsche poemata* I (1611); Jacob van Zeevotc, *Nederduytsche dichten* (1626).

- 27 With the exception of Cats, who wrote emblems.
- 28 Sec P. Tuynman, 'De const van rhetorike en Hoofrs vroege poczte' in: *Uyt liefde gcschreven. Studies over Hooft 1581-1981*, ed. E.K. Grootes et al., Groningen 1981, p. 11-27.
- 29 *Over-ysselsche sangen en dicliu'l* 116301. The dedication is only in the second edition (1634).
- 30 Pc. Hootr. *Cedichten*. Ed. Jacob vander Burgh, Amsterdam 1636.
- 31 I think of the collective edinson *Parnassus* 1111 rY, published by Jan Zoer 11663) and of Jan Luvken's volume of *Dn-asc hier* (1671) in which we distinguish a reminiscence of the principle of arrangement.
- 32 Roemer Visscher, *Brahhcing*. Amsterdam 1614.
- 33 Thomas Schillet, *Art poétique françoys*, 11.1-11; Joachim du Bellay, *La deffence et illustration de la langue françoise*, 11.4; Jacques Pelcner du Mans, *L'art poétique*, 11.3.
- 34 More or less comparable to Visscher's volume is the posthumous volume of a number of poems of G.A. Bredero, brought out 11620 by his publisher as *Nederduytsche ri;me*.
- 35 Consrnrijn Huygens, *Ottionum libri sex. Poëmata varii sermonis, stili, argnmenti* (1625).
- 36 J. van den Vondel, *Verscheide gedichten* (1644).
- 37 J. Westerbaen, *Gedichten* (1657; combination); J. Six van Chandelier, *Poësv 111157*; subject matter); COI'tantijn Huygens *Korcn.hlocmen* (1658; subject matter); Jan Vos, *Alle de gedichten* (1662; combination); Jan Zoel, *D'uitsteekenste digtkunstige werken* (1675; subject matter); J. Vollenhoven, *Poëzy* (1686; rhetorical); G. Brandt, *Poëzy* 11668; rhetorical).
- 38 Sec Tuynman. 'De const van rhetorike en Hoofrs vroege poczie', *passim*.
- 39 O.B. Hardson, *The Enduring Monument: A study of the idea of (praise in) Renaissance Jil-erary theory and practice*. Chapel Hill 1111NC 1962, p. 196-198; A. Leigh DeNeef 'Epidic-ctic Rhetoric and the Renaissance Lyric', *The Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 3 (1973), p. 203-231; Brian vickers, 'Epidic-ctic and Epic in the Renaissance'. in: *Renaissance Lilerallre a'd Contemporary Theory. New literary History* '4 (1983), p. 497-537, esp. p. 501-508.
- +0 See J.C. Scaliger, *Poetices libri septem*. Faksimile-Neudruck der Ausgabe von Lyon 1561. Ed. A. Buck, Stuttgart etc. 1964, 111.05, p. 157: 'Cum omne genus orltioni, ad deliberatium reduxerimus: finis enim iudicii est iustitia. Iustitia ab electione. Electio à deliberatione. Item Laudarioms fini" imitatio: tum superiora (i.e. cap. 101-104), tum haec ipsa, quae deinceps resenscimus (i.e. cap. 105-123) sub deliberandi genere continebuntur'. See also I., I. 2-3.
- 41 Scaliger, *Poetices*, III. 101 (p. 150) - 123 (p. 169).
- 42 DeNeef, 'Epidic-ctic Rhetoric and the Renaissance Lyric', p. 211-212 and p. 219.
- 43 Scaliger, *Poetices*, III. 101 (p. 501).
- +4 See for example caput 109, p. 159-160, where he gives structural rules for the laudatory genres.
- 45 Scaliger, *Poetices*, III. 100 (p. 140). See also Quirilianus, *I"stituli" oratoria*, X, iii, 16-19.
- 46 Scaliger, *Poetices*, III. 124-126, p. 169-171. The last chapter, III. 127, is devoted to the title of the work.
- 47 Scaliger, *Poetices*, III. 124 ff. 169); 126 (p. 170).
- 48 Scaliger, *Poetices*, III. 96, p. 144: 'Tota igitur ecr in Poesi, Epica ratio illa, qua Heroum genus, vita, gesra describuntur, princeps esse videtur: ad cuius rationem reliquae Poescos partes dirigantur. (etc.)'.
- 49 See M.A. Schenkeveld-van der Dussen, 'Theorie en poëzie: een epithalanuum van Six van Chandelier', *De nieuwe taalgids* 72 (1979), p. 391-398, esp. p. 394-395.
- 50 Jacobus Ponruuus, *Poeticarum institutionum libri tres. Eiusdem Tyrocinium poeticum*. Ingolradii 1594.

51. Conradus Joannes Vossius, *Poeticarum illi, libri tres*. Amstelodamum 1647. See also Gerardus Joannes Vossius, *De artis poeticae natura ac constitutione liber*. Amstelodamum 1647. XIV 3, p. 86.
52. See for example *Poeticarum institutum, libri tres*, III. 13 ('De caruunis Ivricis .irgumento'). par. a, p. 64 and par. 5, p. 69.
53. See Paul R. Sellin, 'The Last of the Renaissance Monsters: the Poetical Inventions of Conradus Joannes Vossius, and some Observations on English Criticism'. in Paul R. Sellin and Stephen Baxter, *Anglo-Dutch Cross Currents in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, Los Angeles 1976, p. 9-21.
54. Scaliger, *Poeticae libri septem*, III. 25, p. 113: 'Cuius praei oratores id agerent modus, ut moverent: incondite nanque suadebant. Poetae vero sit oblectarent tantum canonicus enim solis otium transigebant. utrique ab alteris postea id, quod cerabant, murari sunt. Poetarum auctoritas, ac sonis addita fuit anima postea (...), appositis fabellis pro exemplo, sententiis pro preceptione. Id quod Horatius rectissime expressit eo versu: *Omne tulit punctum qui miscuit utile dulci*. ut toto Poetae vis duobus capitibus absolvetur, docendo, et delectando'.
55. Vossius, *De artis poeticae natura ac constitutione liber*, I.1, p. 1-2; III. 17-21, p. 19-21, III. VI. 5-9, p. 32-35.
56. The volumes I examined were: Janus Douza, *Epigrammatum lib. II (etc.)*, Antverpiae 1570; Julius Caesar Scaliger, *Poemata in duas partes divisa*, s.l. 1574; Janus Douza, *Nova poemata*, Lugd. Bat. 1575; Joannes Fungerus *Sylva e' nimmi (etc.)*, Lugd. Bat. 1585; Georgius Benedicrus *De rebus gestis III. Principis Guilielmi (etc.) Item Epigrammata. Epit'hi*, Lugd. Bat. 1586; Janus Douza, *Eligiann lib. II Epigrammatum lib.*, Lugd. Bat. 1586; Jac. Susius *Carmina tam sacra quam prophana*, Lugd. Bat. 1590; Jac. Pontanus *Tyrocinium poeticum*, Ingolstadii 1594; Hadrianus Jullius, *Poematum liber primus (cl. J.)*, Lugd. Bat. 1598; Corn. Schonncus *Lucubrationum*, Colon. AIL 1603.
57. Janus Douza filius *Poemata (etc.)*, Lugd. Bat. 1607; J. Scaliger, *Poemata "n"i (etc.)*, Lugd. Bat. 1615; H. Gronus *Poemata (etc.)*, Lugd. Bat. 1617. In Daniel Heinsius' *Poemata* this influence is not noticeable until the fourth edition, [Lugd. Bat. 1614. It is obvious in what is known as the 'nova' edition, Lugd. Bat. 1621.
58. I encountered the collective term 'sylva' alongside of the title of the volume of Joannes Fungerus of 1585, and already in the edition of poetry of Douza Sr. of 1570. In that case, the title covered a miscellany of all sorts of poetry: epigrams and lyrics, but no grand rhetorical poems, quite notably lacking were poems in heroic verse. Moreover, this section is placed at the end of the volume. We see the same phenomenon in the first volumes of poetry of Heinsius - *Elegiarum lib. III (etc.)*, Lugd. Bat. 1603; *Poematum nova dilio*, Lugd. Bat. 1606; etc. - and in the edition of the works of Janus Secundus by Petrus Senecenus (a friend of Douza), Lugd. Bat. 1619.
59. For example in Caspar Barlaeus' *Poemata* and in Dominicus Baudi's *Poemata*.

5 Developments in Sixteenth-Century Dutch Poetics. From 'Rhetoric' to 'Renaissance'

Anthonis de Roovere, *De gedichten*. Ed. J.J. Mnk. Zwolle 1955, p. 131-133; *Mariken van Nieumeghen*. Ed. Dirk Coigneau. 's-Gravenhage 1982, p. 94-97/v. 490-555; Jan van Strijcken, *Refrenenbundel: A, III, 524*. Ed. F. Lyna/W. van Eeghem. 2 vols. Antwerpen 1970, I, 08-1 [alno. 57, and II: 63-67/no. 166; Anna Bijns *Nieuwe referenzen*. Ed. W.J.A. Jonckbloet/W.L. van Helden. Gent, 1886, p. 282-284/no. 77; cf. L. Roose, 'Lot van retoric: DC poetica der redorijckers een verkenning,' *Liber abominorum Prof. L. Rombauts*, Leuven 1968, p. 111-128, esp. 116-111.

Notes

- Z James J. Murphy, *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: A History of Rhetorical Theory from Saint Augustine to the Renaissance*. Berkeley/Los Angeles/London 1974, p. 47, 57-62; Harry Caplan, *O Eloquence: Studies in Ancient and Medieval Rhetoric*. Ed. Anne King/Helen North. Ithaca/London 1970, 53-56; Joseph M. Miller/Michael H. Presser/Thomas W. Benson (ed.), *Readings in Medieval Rhetoric*. Bloomington/London, 1974, p. 183; d. also J.D.P. Warners, 'Mariken en de retorica.' *De Nieuwe taatgids* 68 (1975), p. 16-21, esp. p. re.
- Debra K. Shuger; *Sacred Rhetoric: The Christian Ground Style in the English Renaissance*. Princeton, N.J. 1988, p. sr.
- 4 W.L. Brackman, 'Een nieuwe interpretatie van Anthems de Roovers -Refereyn van Rhetorica.' *Jaarboek De Fonteyne* 18 (1968), 109-124 (esp. 17-18). Besides, as my colleague Prof. Dr. H. Pleij informs me, inspiration by the Holy Ghost is often invoked in the prologues of medieval religious narrative texts.
- 5 *Centse spelen v'n 1539*. Ed. B.H. Erné/L.M. van Dis. 2 vols. 's-Gravenhage 1982, *passim*. As for the blazon of the Bruges chamber, d. figure 2 (taken from: *Centse spelen* [1982], 1:86).
- 6 Shuger, *Sacred Rhetoric* (note 3), 52.
- 7 Van Stijvoort, *Recreyenbundel* (note 1), 11:66.
- 8 Murphy, *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages* (note 2), p. 109-130.
- 9 Cf. Van Stijvoort, *Recreyenbundel* (note 1), 11:64, 67.
- 10 Buns. *Nieuwe refereinen* (note 11, p. 283).
- 11 A.J. Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages*. London 1984, p. 129-131; d. Caplan 1970 (note 2), p. 82.
- 12 A reprint was issued in Gouda in 1607. This last edition was used here. About the author cf. Jan F. Vanderheyden, 'Jan van Mussem 1111.' *Yerslagen & mededelingen der koninklijke Vlaamse academie voor taal- & letterkunde* (1952), p. 289-306, 923-948 and 'De "rhetorica" van Jan van Mussem.' *Verslagen & mededelingen van de koninklijke academie voor Nederlandse taal- & letterkunde* (1975), p. 13-52, 173-233.
- 13 Vanderheyden, 'Jan van Mussem', p. 44-52; Vanderheyden 1952, p. 937-944.
- 14 Jan van Mussem, *Rhetorica die edele const van welsegghen*. Gouda: Jacob Migoen, 1607, f. 8.
- 15 Warner F. Parrerson, *Three Centuries of French Poetic Theory*. 2 vols. Ann Arbor, 1935, 1:68-163; François Rigolot, *Le Texte de la Renaissance: Des rhétoriciens à Montaigne*, Genève 1982, p. 26-37. Texts in Emrys Inghors (ed.), *Recueil d'arts de seconde rhétorique*. Paris 1902. Cf. also: H. Lubienski-Bodenhorn, 'The Origins of the Fifteenth Century View of Poetry as "seconde rhétorique".' *Modern Language Review* 74 (1979), p. 26-38.
- 16 Langlois, *Recueil* (note 15), VIII and I: 'Ryme peult estre nombrée entre les couleurs de rhétorique, toutesfois je l'ay separée comme celle laquelle requiert plus grant exposition. car rymes se font en plusieurs et diverses manieres.'
- 17 Patterson, *Three Centuries* (note [5]), 1:87-88 (Eus. Deschamps, 1392), 1:145 (Jean Molinet, 1493), 1:192 (Jean Le Maire de Beiges, before 1525), 1:206 (Grafien du Pant, 1539).
- 18 Roger Dragonetti, 'La poésie... Ceste musique naturelle.' *La Musique et les lettres: Etudes de littérature médiévale*. Genève 1986, p. 27-42.
- 19 Langlois, *Recueil* (note 15), p. 216.
- 20 Matthys de Castelein, *De const van rhetoriken* [Ghent: Jan Caewael, 1555]. 1-acs. rpt. Gent 1986, *4/251. About Castelein cf. Dirk Coigneau, 'Matthijs de Castelein: 'Excellent poete moderne'.' *Verslagen en mededelingen koninklijke academie voor Nederlandse taal- & letterkunde* (1985), 451-475. All extensive analysis of the text is given by S.A.T.J.H. Jansen, *Verkenningen III Matthijs Casteleins Const van Rhetoriken*. Assen 1971.

- De Castelein, *De const van rhetoriken*, p. 5/str. 15.
(i. lunwn, *Verkenningen*, p. 92-161.
- Langlois *Recueil* (note 111, p. viii. For other examples cf. Marc-Rend Jung, 'Poetria: Zur Dichrunnsthcoric des nusaehenden Mittelalters in Frankreich.' *Vox romanica*, 30-31 (1971), p. 44-64, vsp- 55-61.
- De Castelein, *De const van rhetoriken* (uow 20), p. 24/str. 72.
Langlois *Recueil* (note 15), viii.
- Jung 'Poetria' (note 231, p. 55-56.
- D' Castelein. *De const van rbeu.riken*, p. 43/str. 127. See Coigneau 1985 (noI.- roI. p. 453-454.
- 28 De casrocl», *De const van rhet.mtzen*, p. 28/str. 83; 58/str. 174; and 61/str. 182: 242/
- 29 Jansen, *Verkenningen*, p. 263-265.
- 30 De Casu-k-in (1986), p. 10/str. 29; 28/str. 82; 58/str. 175; 61/str. 181 and 247/str. 228; 248/str. 232. Cf. Jansen (1971), p. 263-265.
- 31 De Casnlein. *De const van rhetoriken*, p. 19/str. 55.
- 32 Cf. e.g. Murphy, *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages* (note 2), p. [79 (John of Garland); Paul Zumhor, *Je Masque et l' lumière*: I., *Poétique des grands rhétoriciens*. Paris 1978, p. 172 (Jacques Legrand).
- 33 De Castelein, *De coIst van rhetoriken*, p. 25/str. 73, 55/str. 163, 56/str. 168.
- 34 De Castelein, *De const van rhetoriken*, p. 57/str. 170, 55/str. 164, and 54/str. 162; see for all of thi, Coigneau 1985 (note 201. p. 465-467.
- 35 De tosrelein, *De vonsr van rheturilcen*, p. 18/str. 54.
- 36 De Castelein, *De const t-an rhetoriken*, p. 16/str. 46.
- 37 De Castelein, *De const van rhetoriken*, p. 7/str. 20
- 38 De Casn-icin. *De const van rhetoriken*, p. 14/str. 41; 17/str. 49; and 16/str. 46, resperuvcl-
ll'
- 39 Jung, 'Poetria' (note 23), p. 52-53 (Reanaud le Queux 1501, Guillaume Téliin 1534).
- 40 Shuger, *Sacred Rhetoric* (note 3), p. 59-64. Cf. also the reference made in 156 by the chamber of Dicsr on this point to l-rasnurs (note 48).
- 41 De Castelein (1986), p. 250/str. 237.
- 42 Jansen, *Verkenningen*, p. 23-24.
- 43 De Castelein, *De const van rhetoriken*, p. 2v
- 44 Eduard de Dene, 'Instrument rhetoricael.' Ed. W. Waterschoot/D. Coigneau. *Jaarboek De Fontein* 28 (1976/77), Vol. 2, p. 47-53. See also Coigneau 1985 (note 20), p. 465. The same goes for a poem in defence of rhetoric from about 1566 published by L. Roose, 'Oranje tegenover Midas: Een Antwerp lofdichr op retorica.' *Jaarboek De Fontein* 14 (11964/65), p. 121-128, esp. 125-128. Besides this there are also a number of plays in manuscript on the same subject which I have not yet been able to see; cf. W.M.H. Hullemelen, *Repertorium van het rederijersdrama*, 1500-c.1620, Assen 1968 Ip. 32/nos. 117, 1P2 and 106/1P3. Hrd'17. 113/1R1).
- 45 *Spelen van sinne vol scoone mralisacien* [...], Antwerpen, Willem Sylvius, 1562. Cf. L. Roose, 'Dwelck den mensche aldermeest tot cousren verwect: De poetica der Brub.mr.-c rederijers in 1561. *Hulde-album Prof. Dr. J.F. Vanderbeyden*. Langemark 1970, p. 91-108.
- 46 This applies to the plays of the Antwerp chamber De Ohjfruck (the Olive-brunch), the Mechelen chamber De Peoene (the Peony-flower), both chambers of Diest, and the chambers of 's Hertogenbosch, Bergen op Zoom, Vilvoorde, Brussels, Lier and Louvain (which won the first prize).
- 47 Ernst Robert Curtius, *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter*. Bern 1954, p. 47, 50-51.

- 48 *Spelen* 1562 (note 45), Yy.r"
- 49 *Spelen* 1562, Nn.,". Cf. Curtius, *Europäische Literatur* (note 471, p. 156; Jung, 'Poetria' inote 23), p. 61.
- 50 *Spelen* 1562, p. i.2'-1.3'.
- 51 Roosc, 'Dwelck den mensche ..' (note 45), p. 103.
- 52 *Spelen* 1562, p. Q.1'
- 53 *Spelen* 1562, p. Q.2"
- 54 *Spelen* 1562, p. C.1'
- 55 *Spelen* 1562, p. C. 1'.
- 56 Roosc, 'Dwelck den mensche..' (note 45), p. 95, attributes it to Van Hnecht. Howeverc i see no reason to do so. All the mher conmhunons by Van Hacche are signed.
- 57 *Spelen* (1562), p. B.2'.
- 58 The final words of this text still link poetry to rhetoric, which may, however, have been just a generalization. A second introductory text, also anonymous, offers a short history of the rhearre, taken from Cassiodorus and others, and includes notes on the history of the chambers of rhetoric ill the Duchy of Braban.
- 59 Lucas D'Heere, *Dell hof en hooengaerd der poesien*, Fd. W. Waterschoot, Zwolle 1969. About him d. S. Eringa, *La Renaissance et les rhétoriciens ncerlandais: Matthieu de Casteleyn - Anna Bijns - Ille de Heere*. Amsrcrdam 1920; also W. Waterschoot, 'Lucas D'Heere en Den Hof en Boomgaard der Poësie (1565).' *Jaarboek De Fonteyne* 14-15 (1964/65), p. 47-128. On th; influence of Marot, Scbillier and other French poets, see Waterschoot 1964/65, p. 89-105.
- 60 D'Heere. *Den hof en boomgaard*, p. 3-4.
- 61 Cf. Marijke Spies, 'La rhctonque de l'Hymne de l'Or de Ronsard.' *Rhetorica* 7 (1989), p. r.19-170. See also this volume, eh. I.
- 62 Cf. Graham Castor, *Pléiade Poetics: A Study in Sixteentb-Century Thought and Tenni*., (Jgy. Cambridge 1964, p. 18-21
- 63 (Gerrit Kuiper, *Orhis artium en renaissance*, Vol. I: *Cornelius Valerius en Sebstianns Foxius Morzillus ills bromen van Coornhert*. Harderwijk 1941, passim; Harm Klifman. *Su-dies op het gebied van de vroegnieuwenederlandse tri"i"mlraditie (c.1550-c.1650)*. Dordrecht 1983 p. 159-163.
- 64 His plays can be found in Dirck [Volckertszoon] Coornberr, *Het Roerspel en de comedies van Caomben*. Ed. f, van der Meulen. Leiden 1955; about him d. H. Bongcr, *Leven en werk van D. V. Coombert*, Amsrcrdam 1978; also Alln;ke CG. Hearkens, 'Leren met lust: Coornherts toneelspele.' *Dirck Volckertszoon Coornberr: Dwars nuar recht*, Ed. H. Bongcr et al. Zutphen 1989, p. 80-87.
- 65 Cooruhert. *Het Roerspel en de comedies*, p. 18.
- 66 Coornhert, *Het Roerspel en de comedies* (note 64), p. 156-158; cf. Fleurkens 'Leren mer lust' (note 64), p. 84-85.
- 67 I. Peeters, *Taalopbouw als renaissance-ideaal: Studies over taalopvattingen en taalpraktijk in de zcstiende en zeventiende eeuw*. Amsterdam 1990, p. 68.
- 68 Manjke Spies. 'Ick moet wonder schryven: Het paradoxale lofdicht hij de leden van de Eglennr.' *Eer is het lol des deuchts: Opstelten o'er renaissance en clasicisme aanglmden aan dr. F. Veenstra*. Ed. H. Duits et al. Amsterdam 1986, p. 43-51, esp. 44-47; Peeters, *Taalopbouw als renaissance-ideaal*, p. 63, 73-75. See also A.CC. Fleurkr-ns, *De toneetspele van N. V. Coornhert (1522-1590) als middel 101 het geven van morctc instructie*. Hilversum 1994.
- 69 To be found in K. Ruelens (ed.). *Referenien en andere gedichten "it de 16e eeuw vers. en «[geschreeen d. Jan de Bruyne*. Vol. 2, Antwerpen, 1881 II:35-38. About him cf. J.J. Mak, 'Iets over de Amsrcrdamse rederijker Eghert Meyncrtsz." *U)l ionsten versaemt: Retoricaie studien* 1946-1956. Zwolle 1957, p. 139-147.

- 70 Shuger, *Sacred Rhetoric* (note 11, p. 61-68)
- 71 A.J. Kölker, *Alardus Aemstelredamus en Cornelius Crocus: Twee Amsterdamse prolester-humanisten: Hun leven, werken en theologische opvattingen*. Nijmegen/Utrecht 1963, passim; J. Trapnau, 'Ioannes Sartorius (ca. 1500-1571), gymnasiarch te Amstcrdm en Noordwijk, als Erasmus en spiraualist.' *Nederlands archief voor kerkgeschiedenis* 70 (1990), p. 10-11, esp. 12, 38-41
- 72 H.L. Spiegel, *Twee-spraack - Ruygh-bewerp - Km! Begri!! - Rederijck kunst*. Ed. W.L.H. Caron. Lironiugen 1962. The quotation in the introductory letter to the Amsterdam magistracy, p. 4.
- 73 Kuiper, *Orbis, Irli!!!*, [note 63], p. 364-367; Klifman 1983 (note 63), 155-171
- 74 Spiegel, *Troc.sprcaele* (note 72), 180-181
- 75 He wrote' an Introduction to the project as a whole, which was printed in the first publication, the grammar from 1584 (Spiegel [1962], 6-8).
- 76 Peeters, *Taalopbouw als renaissance-ideeën!* (note 67), p. 40-50.
- 77 In: H.L. Spiegel, *Hertspiegel en andere zedeschriften*. Ed. F. Vlaming. Amsterdam: Andnes van Damme. 1723, p. 206-208.
- 78 N. van der Laan, *Uit Roemer Ysscher's Brabbeling*. Vo]. a.Lrrrechr 1923, p. 36-42.
- 79 Cf. Erasmus, *Aphorismata* (tyranny), III: Desiderius Erasmus *Opera omnia*, Vol. 4. Lugdunum Batavorum: Petrus van der Aa, 1703, col. 227 C; and *Moriae encomium* (hy-pocripsy and Pauline foolishness), in: Erasmus (1703), col. 405-503 Id" 100. *Opera omnia*. Vol. 4/3; *Moriae encomium id est stultitiae laus*. Ed. Clarence H. Miller. Amsterdam/Oxford 1979.
- 80 III: Van der Laan, *Uit Roemer visschers Brabbeling* (note 78), p. 62-70. Cf. J.C. Arens 'F. Colenuccio's *Alitheia* herijmd door Roemer Vrscher.' *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse taal- & letterkunde* 82 (1960), p. 154-156.
- 81 Jan van Hout, *Opdracht aan Broer Cornelis. [Jan van /'!!! - cahiers 1*. Ed. K. Bostoen et al. Leiden 1990, p. 8-9.
- 82 J. Prinsen, 'Bronnen voor de kennis van leven en werken van Jan van Hout: I.' *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse taal- & letterkunde* 22 (1903), p. 203-239, 21V 224.
- 83 Vlarren Rndelslu-im. 'Een onbekend gedicht van Jan van Hout.' *Taal & letteren* 13 (1903), p. 533-544, esp. 539-544; J. Prinsen, 'Bronnen voor de kennis van leven en werken van Jan van Hout: IV.' *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse taal- & letterkunde* 32 (1913), p. 188-209, esp. 208-209.

6 The Amsterdam Chamber De Eglentier and the Ideals of Erasmusian Humanism

- H. Brugmans, *Ceschiedenis van Amsterdam*. 2nd ed. by L.J. Brugmans. Part 2. Utrecht etc 1972. p. 75-127. E. Ellerbroek-Fortuin, *Amsterdamsche redrijkersspelen in de zestiende eeuw*. Groningen etc. 1937, p. 1 and 30.
- 2 'Een Nieuwe Jaar 1578'. In: H.L. Spiegel, *Hertspiegel en andere zede-schriften*. Ed. F. Vlaming. Amsterdam 1723, p. 203-205
- 'Balm-den gemaceer Ol' de satisfactie van Amsterdam anno 1578.' In: Laurins Jacobsz. Reael, *Refereyen, Baladens, Epitafien, Historialen, en anderen Liedelrens*, UB-Gbl'Jit sign liS 993, nr. 16. I wish to thank Mrs. A. Bancke who transcribed the manuscript and did some research into its contents.
- 4 'Een liedeken ... ghemaect bij L.J. vanden handel incort, vanden selven Fgherr mijnert-zoon enz.' In: Reael, *Refereyen*, nr. 32.
- 'Refereijng ghemaect Ol' die vraege Wat soheijr de mensche lang acn-hancr Gheleesen dell 26en decembris 1580 te Amstelredam op die Camer In Liefd bloeicudc'. In: Reael, *Refereyen*, nr. 17.

- 6 'Op 't Nicuwejaer 1580' In: *Spieghel, Hertspseghel*, p. 206-208.
- 7 I analyzed the following texts: Antonis de Rooverc, *Referyn van Rethorica; Mariken van Nicumeghen* (ca. 1515), vs. 524-555; some rexts in the collection by Jan VIII Srijvoort; Matthijs de Casrelein, *Conae van Rhctonken*, (1555); and the plays written on the theme 'What induces man most to art' ('Dwelck den mensche aldermeest tot consten verwect) and published in Antwerp in 1562 as *Spten van Sinne*. See also: L. Rouse, "'Dwelck den mensche aldermeest tot cousren verwect". De poetica der Brabantse rederijkers in 161.' In: *Hulde-album J.F. Vanderheyden*. Langemark 1970, p. 91-108; L. Rouse 'Lof van Rethorica. De poetica der rederijkers een verkenning.' In: *Liber alumnorum E. Rornbauts*. Leuven 1968, p. 111-128; the edition "f *Mariken van Nioumegen* by Dirk Coigneau (The Hague 1982), p. 162-164; and S.A.I.J.H. Iansen, *verbenningen ill Matthijs Casteleins Const van Rhetoriken*. Assen 1971.
- 8 See for the grammar (*Twe-spraack vande Nederdunsche Letterku"st*) L. Peeters 'Tekst en autcurschap van Spiegels 'Twe-spraack (, 584)?' *Ti;dsdm'(t voor Nederlandsc taal- en Letterkunde* 98 (1982), p. 117-13°. His argumentation holds generally also for the other works (*Ruygh-bewerp vande Redekaveling*, "(t, *Nederduytsche Dialectike* and *Rederijk-kunst*), in which, moreover, Spiegel's device 'duechr verhueght' figures several times.
- 9 G. Kuiper, *Orbis, "It", n en renaissance l. Cornelius Valerius ell Sebastianus Foxius Mvzillus als bronnen van Coornbert*. Harderwijk 1941, p. 364-367. Harm Klifman, *Studies op het gebied van de i-roegniemonederiandse triviumtraditie tea. 1550-ca. 1640*. nor-drecht 1983, p. 159-163.
- 10 In: Hendrik Laurensz. Spiegel, *Twe-soraack. Ruygh-bewerp. Kon Begrip. Rederijck-kunst*. Ed. W.J.H. Caron. Groningen 1962, p- 182-183 (*Rederijckkunst*), p. 65 (ritlc-p.rge *Redenkaveling*) and p. 7 (*Coornhert in the Twe-spraack*).
- 11 'T L., (*van Rethorica*. In: N. van der Laan, (*fit Roemer Visscher's Brabbeling*. Part 2. Utrecht 1923, p. 36-42.
- 12 See Lisa Jardine, 'Lorenzo Valla: Academic Skepticism and the New Humanist Dialectic.' In: *The Skeptical Tradition*. [d. M. Burnyeat. Berkeley ere. 1983, f. 253-286 esp. p. 268. Lisa Jardine, 'Distinctive Discipline: Rudolph Agricola's Influence on Methodical Thinking in the Humanities.' in: *Rodolphus Agricola Phisius 1444-1485*. Ed. F. Akkerman and A.J. Vanderjagr. Leiden ere. 1988, p. 38-57.
- 13 A.J. Kolker, *Alardus Acstelredamus. en Cornelius Crocus, Twee Amsterdamsc prierster-humanisten. Hun leven, werken en theologische opvattingen*. Ninnegen/Urrechr 1963, p. 71-179. This means by the way, that Jardine's rather pessimistic statement that 'Agricola's dialectical "method" was adopted t...l, but (...l not practised' 'Disnncrive Discipline", p- 56) deserves correction.
- 14 I used: Aphthonius Sophista, *Progymnasmata*. Transl. R. Agricola and l.l.l. Catanaeus. Ed. R. Lonchius Hadarnarius. Paris 1573, p. 85-86. This edition appeared originally ill 1542. An augmented edition appeared in 1546, and it was this one that grew famous in the 16th and 17th centuries. See: Gerda C. Huisman, *R"d., 'f Agricola. A Bibliography of Printed Works a"d Translations*. Nieuwkoop 1985. p. 14°-141
- 15 I used the translation in Dutch: Polydorus Virgilius, *Waerachtige Beschrvinghe. Inhoudende wie de eerste Antheuren ende Vinders aller oersheyden Consten (...) zijn ghe-weest*. Transl. E.M.G., Amsterdam 1612, cap. 8, p. 48-50.
- 16 Desiderius Erasmlls, *Apophtegmatium (...) libri octo*. Antwerpen 1564, p. 342. In *Opera omnia*, part 4 (1703), p. 227a.
- 17 Under the ritle *Strid; tusschen Waerheyt en S(hii)*. Ill Van der Laan, *Uit Roemer Visschers Brabbeling*. V"L 2, p. 62-70. See: J.e. Arens, 'Po Collenuccio's *Alitheia* berijmd door Roemer Visscher.' In: *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsc taal. en letterkunde* 82 (1960), p. '54-'56.

- 18 Heinz Günter Schmitz, *Physiologie des Scherzes. Bedeutung und Rechtfertigung der Ars locandi im 16. Jahrhundert*. Hildesheim etc. 1972, p. 24 and passim. With thanks to Mrs. A. Sterk, who wrote a paper on Visscher's 'T.L. of van Rhetorica'.

7 Rhetoric and Civic Harmony in the Dutch Republic of the Late Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Century

Translation Myra Scholz-Heerspink.

- Jl. Brugmans, *Geschiedenis van Amsterdam*. 2nd. ed. revised by J.L. Brugmans. Vol. 2. Utrecht. Amsterdam 1972 (3rd ed. 1930), p. 111-159; Marijke Spies, 'The Amsterdam chamber De Eglentier and the ideals of Erasmian humanism.' *From RCI, III, Riches. Culture and History of the Low Countries 1500-1700. International & Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Theo Hermans/ Reinier Salverda (eds.). Louvain, Centre for Low Countries Studies, 1993, p. 100-118 (esp. 109-101. See also this volume, chapter 6.
- 3 Marijke Spies, 'Developments in sixteenth-century Dutch poetics. From 'rhetoric' to 'renaissance'.' *Renaissance-Rhetorik, Renaissance Rhetoric*. Heinrich F. Pötr (ed.). Berlin/ New York, 1993, p. 72-91. esp. 72-78. See also this volume, chapter 5.
- 4 Spies, 'Developments in Sixteenth-Century Dutch Poetics,' p. 77-81.
- Lucas d' Heere, *Den 1^{en}. (ru boomgaard der poësie)*. Ed. W. Waterschoot. Zwolle 1969, p. 14-1X.
- 6 The rlx't is published in: K. Ruelens, *Referen en andere gedichten uit de 16e eeuw verzameld en afgeschreven door de Brnyne*. Vol.2. Antwerpen 1881, p. 15-38
- Spies, 'Between Ornament and Argumentation. Developments in 16th-Century Dutch Poetics.' In: *Rhetorics-Rhétoriques-Rederijkers*. Jelle Koopmans e.a. (eds.), Amsterdam etc. 1995, p. 120.
- 8 Lisn jurdine. 'Distinctive discipline: Ruuolph Agricola's influence on methodical thinking in the humanitie-. *Rodolphus Agricola Phrisius 1444-1485. Proceedings of the International Conference at the University of Groningen, 28-30 October 1985*. F. Akkerman and A.J. Vuuderjnr (eds.). L'ue III New York/ Köbenhavn/ Köln 1988, p. 38-57, esp. 42-43; Spies 'Developments in Sixteenth-Century Dutch Poetics' (note j), p. 84-85.
- 9 P. Mack, *Renaissance argument. Platon, and Agricola in the traditions of rhetoric and dialectic*. Leiden, New York, Köln 1993, p. 132 and 190 a.o.
- 10 A. Hauffen, 'Zur Litteratur der ironischen Enkomien.' *Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturgeschichte* 6 (1893), p. 100-185, esp. 100, 64; M.G.M. van der Poel, *De 'decl. III, liti' bij de humanisten. Bijdrage tot de studie van de functies van de rhetorica in de renaissance*. Nieuwkoop 1987, p. 199-201.
- 11 *Paradoxa stoicorum proemium* 4-5, ill: *Cicero's twenty-eight volumes*. Vol.4. Cambridge, Mass./London 1982, p. 256-257.
- 12 R.L. Cole, *Paradoxa epidemica. The renaissance Italian of paradox*. Princeton 1966, p. 15-21.
- 13 le. Iando], *Veradoxes. re sont propos contre la commune "Ti"i" [etc.]*, [Transl. bv Cb. Estienne]. 2nd. ed. Paris: [Charles Estienne], 1553 (1st ed. 1553).
- 14 Marijke Spies, 'Coornherts "L. of van de ghevanghenissr": crust. spel, of ernstig spel? *Vragende wijs. Vragen over tekst, taal en taalgeschiedenis. Bundel aangeboden aan Leopold Peeters*. J.B. den Besten/ A.M. Duinhoven/ J.P.A. Stroop (eds.). Amsterdam/Arlnr. 1990, p. 25-30.
- 15 Brugmans, *Geschiedenis van Amsterdam*, (sec n) 21 vul. 2, 1972, p. 75-83.
- 16 J.L. Mak, 'Iets over de Amsterdamse rederijker Eglbert Mevncrtsv.' *Uyl ionsten rors-renn. Reticale studies 1946-1956*. Zwolle, 1957, p. 139-147.
- L. Reael, *Referen, baladens [etc.]*. Ghand: University Library, s.a, Ills. 993 nr. 33.

- 18 F.J. Duhicz. *Op de grens van humanisme en hervorming. De betekenis van de Imek-drukkunst te Amsterdam ill een bewogen riid, 1506-1578*. Nieuwkoop 1962, p. 169; cf. also p. 153-164 and p. 203-205.
- 19 H.L. Spicghel, *Hertspiegel en andere zedeschriften*. Ed. P. Vlaming. Amsterdam, Andries van Damme, 1723, p. 203.
- 20 Rcacl, *Retcreiincn, haladcus* (note 17), nr.12.
- 21 Keael, *Refereijnen, baladens* »r.e.
- 22 Cf. for instance: Joke Spauns. *Haarlem na de reformatie. Stedelijke (ullultr e" kerkelijk let-en, 1577-1620*. 's-Cravenhauc 1989, passim.
- 23 H. Bongcr, *Leven en u-erj: van N, V. Coornhert*. Amsterdam 1978, p. 28-32.
- 24 H.L. Spiegel, *Tue-spraaci, Ruygh-bewerj. Ken "egrip. Rederijck-kunst*. EJ. W.J.I.I. Caaron. Groningen 1962.
- 25 Spiegel, *Twe-spraack* mote 24), resp- p.a , 7, and 65.
- 26 Marijke Spies "Ick moer wonder schrvvcu': her paradoxnic 10fficht bij de leden van de Eglentier.' *Eer is het /of des deuchts*. OIJslel(/)I ouer renaissance en classicisntc aangeboden aan dr. Fokke Veenstra. H. Duits/ A.I- Uelderblom/ M.B. Smus-Veldr teds.j. Amsterdam 1986, p. 4J-51.
- 27 Van der Poel, *De .dedamatio hi; dc humanisten* (note 101, p. 193-235).
- 28 M.A. Schenkevold-van der Dussen, 'Het probleem van de goddelijke inspiratie bij chrisren-dichters ill de rode en rydc ceuw.' *Tijdschrift voor Ncdcriandsc taal- en letterkunde* 105 (1989), 182-200, esp. 185-186; J.M. Koppenol, *Leids beelal. Het Loterijspel (1596) van Jull van Hout*. Hilversllm 1998, p. 163- 65.
- 29 Spil", 'Developments in Sixteenth-Century Poetics (note 3), p. 73-75.
- 30 Spicghel, *Hertspiegel en andere zedeschriften* (note 19), p. 206-208.
- 31 Spies, 'The Amsterdam Chamber De Eglentier' (note 2), passim. The text is published in N. van der Laan, *Uit Roemer Visscher's Brabbeling*. Vol.2. Utrecht 1923, p. 36-42. For much of the following information on the literary context of Visscher's poem I thank mrs. A. Sterk, who wrote a Ma-rhesis on this subject.
- 32 Polvdorus Vergilius. *De rerum inventoribus libri octo*. Basileu: Joh. Frobenius, 1516. Lib. Icap. 8, p. 38-41.
- 33 Des. Erasmus *Apoptegmatum (...j libri octo*. In: *Opera omnia*. Vol.4' Lugdunum Baravorum: Petrus van der Aa. 1703 (1rth ed. 1531J; col. 227 C.
- 34 J. Gadol, L.B. Alberti, *universal mall ofthe early renaissance*. Chicago/London 1969, p. 221-223; J-0Arens, 'P. Collenuccio's *Alithea* berijmd door Roemer Visscher.' *Tijdschrift voor Ncdcriandsc taal- en letterkunde* 82 (1960), p. 154-156. The text is published ill: Van der Laan. *Uit Roemer Visscher's Brabbeling*, vol. 2 (note .11), p.62-70.
- 35 Des. Erasmus *Adagio-em opus*. In: *Opera omnia*. Vol.2. Lugdunum Batavorum: Petrus van der Aa, 1703 (1rth ed. 1508); col. 210.
- 36 Spies, 'Between Ornament and Argumentation' (note 2), p. 120.
- 37 Des. Erasmus *Moriae encomium*. In: *Opera omnia*. Vol.4. Lugdunum Batavorum: Petrus van der Aa, 1703 (1rth ed. 1511; col.498.
- 38 Colic, *Puradoxia epidemica*, (note 12), p. 22-31
- 39 S. Franck, *Paradoxia ducenta octaginta. Dat is eelxxx wonderreden [etc.]*. [Embden]:s.e. s.a. [1565?]. • title-page and p. 2; H. Bongcr and Aj. Gelderblom, 'Coornhert en Sebastian Franck.' *De zevencnde eeuw* 12 (1996), p. 321-339, esp. 325-1 av.
- 40 Marc van der Poel, *Cornelius Agrippa, the Hl/mallist Theologian and his Declamations*. Leiden/New York/Koln 1997.
- 4' Cornelius Agrippa von Nettesheym, *De Incertitudine et vanitate Scientiarum et Artium, atone Excolientia verbi Dei Declamatio*. Antwerpiae, s.c., 15.11, p. 11^{re} u-12^{cesio}; Van der Poel, *Cornelius Agrippa* (note 40), p. 102.

- 42 Agrippa von Nettesheim, *De Incertitudine*, p. 13¹¹⁰. Cf. also Colie, *Paradoxa epidemica* (note 12), p. 400-401.
- 43 Van der Poel, *Cornelius Agril'Ja* (note 40), p. 102-103; Bongers and Gelderblom, 'Coornhert en Sebastian Franck' (note 101), p. 330-333.
- 44 S. Melissen, 'De goddelijke mens. Een humanisrendiscussie over de natuur van de mens.' *Spektator* 16 (1986-87), 194-218, passim; F. Veenstra, 'Spiegel, Coornhert en de wij: III of gebonden?' *Spiegel der letteren* 30 (1988), p. 115-141, passim.
- 45 Spiegel, *Twee-spraak* (note 24), passim.

8 *Helicon and Hills of Sand: Pagan Gods in Early Modern Dutch and European Poetry*

- Joost van den Vondel. *Werken*, edired by J.F.M. Sreerck et al., Vnl, 10. Amsterdam 1937, p. 33-34. All quotations are translated by M. Spies.
- 2 For a general survey of Ovid's influence on 17th century Dutch poetry and especially on Vondel, see: Mreke B. Snurs-veldr, 'Orpheus, dichter-lichrmesrer, nunnaar en martelaar', *Lampas* 21 (1988), p. 361-382, and the older literature mentioned there.
For the discussion between Coornhert, Spiegel and Van Mender see: Marijke Sriil, "'Pocetsche fabriekken" en andere allegorieën, eind 16de-begin 17de eeuw', *Oud Holland* 105.4 (1991), p. 228-243, esp. 228-233 and 238-241.
- 4 *Het Roerspel en de comedies van Coornhert*, edited by I. van der Meulen. Leiden 1955, p. 18.
Erasmus, *The Ciceronian: a dialogue on the idca/latin style*, nanslared by Berty I. Knott, in Erasmus, *Collected works*, edited by A.H.F. Levi, Vol. 28. Toronto/Ituffalo/London 1986, p. 383-388 and 392.
- 6 Virgil, *Ecloues, Georgics, Aineid*, ranslared by H. Rushton Fairclough, rev. ed., Vol. [London/Cambridge (Mass.) 1965, p. 66-69.
Coornhert, *Het roerspel en de comedies*: p. 156-158.
- 8 Cf. Julii' Caesar Scaliger, *Poetices libri septem* 1.4. Lyon 1561, facs. ed. A. Buck, Stuttgart-Bad tannstrat 1987, p. 6.
- 9 H.L. Spiegel, *Hert-spiegel*, ed. E. Veenstra, Hilversum (ova), I, vs 125-128, p. 10-11.
- 10 *Hert-spiegel* IV, vs. 49-128, p. 93-98.
- 11 Cf. Lraham Castor, *Pléiade poetics. A study in sixteenth-century thought and terminology*. Cambridge 1964, p. 24-50.
- 12 *Spelen van sinne vol scoone moralisacien* [etc.]. Anwerpen 1562, p. B 2¹¹⁷.
- 13 Lucas D'Heere, *Den hof en boomgaard der poësie*, edited by W. Waterschoot, Zwolle 1969, p. 24-29.
- 14 Eric Jan Sluijter, *De 'heydensche fabulen' in do Noordnederlandse schilderkunst, circa 1590-1670* [etc.]. Den Haag 1986, p. 312-317; Karel van Mander, *Den grondt der edel vry s.bilder-const*, edited by H. Miedema, Vnl. 2. Urrecht 1973, p. 307 and s.v. 'platonisme'.
- 15 Karel van Mander, *Wtlegghingh (Op den Metamorphosis Puh. Ouidii Nasonis* [etc.], I Haarlem, 1(,04, p. 3-0-.
- 16 Van Mander, 'Wtlegghingh', 23¹¹⁷⁰-25¹¹⁷⁰.
- 17 V.lil] Mander, 'Wtlegghingh', 4¹¹⁷⁰.
- 18 Spies, 'Pocetsche fabnjcken' (note 3), p. 232 and 240-241.
- 19 Sluijter, 'De heydensche tabulcu', p. 14-16.
- 20 Cf. for instance: Jacob van der Schuer, 'Cboor ofte versamelingghe der Muses' in *DCI Nederduytschen Helicon*. Hasrlcm, 1610, p. 50-61.

- 21 Cf. Joost van den Vondel. *Tioee zeevaart-gedichten* [etc.], edited by Marijke Spies, 2 vols. Amsterdam/Oxford/New York 1987, *passim*.
- 22 Constantijn Huygens, *Gedichten*, edited by J.A. Worp, Vol. 1 Arnhem 1892, p. 134-1.15.
- 23 Marijke Spies, 'Arion - Amphioll' Huygens en Hooft in de stormen van 1621-1622' in E.K. Grootes et al. (ed.), *Uyt liefde geschreven. Studies over Hooft*. Groningen 1981, p. 101-116; esp. 105-106.
- 24 J.H. Meter; *The literary theories of Daniel Heinsius*. [etc.]. Assen 1984, p. 38-67
- 25 Vondel. *Tu.ec zeevann-gedichten*, Vol. 1, ars-azr.
- 26 Daniel Heinsius, *Nederduytsche poem.un.* (1616), edited by Bnrbaru Becker-Cantarino. Bern/Frankfurt am Main 19831.
- 27 Daniel Heinsius, *Jacchus en Christus. Twee lofzangen*, edited by LPh. Rank, j.D.P. Warners and F.L. Zwaan. Zwolle 1965, p. 24-35 and 99-104.
- 28 Heinsius, *Bacchus en Christus*, resp. vs. 51-56 (p. 114-116) and vs. 645-654 Ip. 184).
- 29 Heinous, *Nederduytsche Poemata*, 'Einlcirung", p. 26-35.
- 30 Baerbel Becker-Cantarino, *Daniel Heinsius*. Boston 1978, p. 19-20.
- 31 D.R. Carnphuysen, *Stichtelycke rymen*, Vol. 2, (s.L. 1624) resp. 179-180 and 170-175. Cf. also: M.A. Schenkeveld-van der Dussen, 'Ccmphuysen en het "genus hunule"', in H. Duits et al. (eds), *Eer is het lof des deuchts* [etc.]. Amsterdam 1986, p. 141-153.
- 32 Heinsius, *Bacchus ell Chris.n.s* 'Inlciding", p- 16.
- 33 Becker-Cantarino, *Daniel Heinsius*, p. 66.
- 34 Gustave Cohen, *Écrivains Français en Hollande dans la première moitié du 17e siccle*. Paris 1920, p. 275-291
- 35 J.-L. de Cucz de Balzac, *Oeuvres*, edited by L. Moreau, Vol. 1. Paris IB.4, l' 3. 'Discours huictiesmc', p. 320-160.
- 36 Cf. Carnphuysen, *Stichtctvcec rumen*, Vol. 2, p- 179-IBo.
- 37 Wilhelm Sluircr, "N(Jodige onderwijsingc en vermaninge acnden Christeliken sanger ende lescr" in *Psahnen. lot-sangen, ende gecstelilec liedekens* [ere.1.Deventer 1661, p. b 3^{recto}-11^{recto}
- 38 Cf for instance: Daniel Heinsius, *Herodes infanticida. Tragoedia*. Lugd. Bat. 1632, p. 39-40; and Th. Ag., *Treurspel*. *De moord der onnooze/en*. Amsterdam, 1639, p. B 3^{recto}. As to the author, d. P.H. van Moerkcrken, 'Wie is de schrijver van het treurspel "De moord der onnooze/en"?", *Tiidschrift vaor Ncdertandsche Taal- ell i.cncrknnde* 11 (1894), p. 136-143
- 39 J. Melles, *Joachim Oudaan*". *Heraut der verdraagzaamheid*. Utrecht 1958, p. 57-59 and 177.
- 40 Cf.J. te Winkel, *Ontwikkelingsgang der Nederlandsche letterkunde*, 2nd ed., Vol. 4. Haarlem 1924, p. 109.
- 41 J- AnTonides van der Goes, *De Ystroom*, Amsterdam, 1671, p. * * * 4^{recto}.
- 42 Heinsius *Epistola qua dissertationi D. Balzaci ad Herodem Infanticida respondetur*, edited by M. Zuerius Boxhom.Leyden 1636.
- 43 Antonide', *De Ystroom* 'voorreden', * * * 1^{recto} - * * * 3^{recto}.
- 44 Erasmus, *The Ciceronian* (note .1), p. 437; Balzac, *Oeuvres*, Vol. 1. p. 328
- 45 Joachim Oudaan, *Poëzy*, V.,.1. I Amsterdam 1712, p. 32-38.
- 46 H.M. van Goensl 'Uitweiding over hetgebruik de <lude fabel-historie in de dichtstukken der hcdendagcschen' ill: *Een pletdooi poor de wetenschappelijke beoefening van de letterkunde* [etc.], edited by J.B. Brandt Corstius. Groningcell 1972, p. 69-112.

9 Amsterdam School-Orations from the Second Half of the seventeenth Century

- F.J. Kuiper, *De I-ollan,ls,'School-ordre van 1625*. Groningen 1958, p. 146-148, '7[-172.
- 2 Kuiper, *School-ordre*, p. 59.
 - 3 KILLpT, *School-ordre*, p. 46-56.
 - 4 Kuiper, *School-ordre*, p. 14-23.
 - 5 Marijke Spies 'Between epic and lyric. The genre in Ie. Scaliger's *Poetices Lilm Septem*.' In: Heinrich F. Plett ted.r. *Renaissance-Poetik, Renaissance Pcencs*. Berlin. New York 1994, p. 260-270. See also this volume, ch. 3.
 - 6 Marc G.M. van der Poel, *De 'declamatio' hi; de humanisten. Bijdrage [ot de studie van de functies. van de rhetorica ill de renaissance*. Ni<-uwkoop 1987, passim.
Van der Poel, *De 'declamatio'*, p- so-a [190-1v [.
 - 8 See Appendix 1 for a descriptuon.
 - 9 J.E. Huydecoper c.u.. *Urationes*. Amsterdam: joarutes Haffman. 1752-1759. Universirv Library Amsterdam: 304 C 24.
 - 10 G.J. Vossius, *Elementa rhetorica, oratorii ejusdem panitionibos occomodata. inque usum scmlanon Holtandioe et West-Frisiae edita*. Leyden 1626. See for this and the other editions: C.S.M Rademaker, *Life and work of Gerardus Joannes Vossius* (, 577-1649). Assen 1981. 'Checklist of Vossius works' nr. 15, p. 36 [-362.
 - 11 G.J. Vossius, *Rhetorices contractac sire nartitionnm oratoriarum libri quinque*. Leyden: Johannes Maire, 1621. See for this and the other editions: Rademaker, *Life and work of Vossius*, 'Checklist' nr. 9, p. 358-359.
 - 12 Aphthonius, *Progymnasmata*, parrim à Rodolpho Agricola, partim à Iohanne Maria Catauaeo, Latinitate donata. Cum scholiis R. Lorichii. Iused the edition Amsterdam: Ludovicus et Dauulus Hxevini 1655 University library Amsterdam: 1289 F 10. See for the other edinons: Kuiper, *School-ordre*, p. 137 and the catalogue of the Amsterdam university library.
 - 13 Matthaëus Timpius, *Dormi secure, vel Cynosura proiessionen ac studiosonn eloquentiae*. In qua cennn et viginri themata cratona. Quorum quaedam nude duntaxat sllnt disposita: quaedam verò ex docnssius et theologis et philosophis dilatata et exornata; noll sohun srudiosis, sed professoribus eloquentiae, ac pictatis verae amantibus utilissima en pemecessaria L. 1 De novo emendata et thematis aliquot aucta. 1 vols. Amsterdam: sumpnbus Henricus Laurentius, 1642. University library Amsterdam: 1048 G 16.
 - 14 Thomas Farnmbius, *Index rhetoricus et oratorius, scholis et i"stitutiolli tenerioris aetatis «consodatus*, Cui adjiciuntur formulae oratoriae et ;nll'x poeticus Editio novissima priorihus emendatior. Amsterdam: Joannes Janssonius 1648. University library Amsterdam: 1731 J 6.
 - 15 Ivar Petr Adolphus *Medulla oratoria*. Continens omnium Iransirionum formulas, quibus ornari possir omno rherorica. Ill gratiam studiosorum eloquentiae, ex variis oratoribus collecta. Amsterdam: Ex officin; Flzeviriana, 1656 University library Amsterdam: 213 H 24.
 - 16 Renerus Neuhusius, *Florilegium philologicum. Sive veterum et recentiorum eloquentiae promus-condus*. In usum illustris gymnasii Alcmariani. Editio novissima multi, locis auctorior et correctior. Amsterdam: Janssonius 1658. University library Amsterdam: 1197 H 7.
 - 17 Georgiu Beckherus, *Orator extemporaneus seu urns oratoriae breviarium bipartitum*. Cuius pars prior praecepta continer generaliu, posterior praxin in specie ostendit. Amstrdam: Ludovicus Flzevirius 1610. University library Amsterdam: 1056 D 46.
 - 18 Conradus Dierencus, *Institutiones oratoriae, sive, De consoibendi, orationibus, è oeterum ac recentiorum or"torul/1 praeceptis methodica introductio*; in ll"lll juvenutis scho-

lasticae illustratae. Edino nova, revisa, correcta, schemate logico-rherorice practice amplificam. Amsterdam: jounnes Ravestcinus. 1654. Universiry library Amsterdam: 1°99 F 7

Famianus Srrada, *Floquenna bipartita*: pars prima prolusiones academicas, sive prolixioris exhibet orationes, ad facultatem oratoriam, poericam, historiarnque spectantes: altera, paradigmata eloquentiae brevioris proponit, usui fUlura imitaturis ad dicendam breviter quaecunq; de re sententiam: excerpta ex Decade prima Historiae de Bello Belgico ejusdem auctoris. Amsterdam: joannes Ravesteynius, 1658. University library Amsterdam: 1063 B 33.

- 20 Jacobus Crucius *Suada Delphica. Sive orauonrs 45 varii argumenti*, Srudicsac [juvenruris manuducno ad arrem oratoriarn. Amsterdam: joannes janssonius. 1650. University library Amsterdam: 1058 D 25.

I.H. van Eeghen. *Im-entariissen van archleuen betreffende de Latiinscbe school, bet Athenaeum en Gezelschappen 1-an studcmen aan het Athenaeum 1e Amsterdam*. Amsterdam 1946, p. 11.

- 22 See Appendix I.

- 23 Van der Poel, *De 'declamatio'*, p. 81, nr; 271, and p. 127-128.

- 24 Neuhusius, *Florilegium*, p. 95 en 100.

- 25 Adolphus. *Med"lla*, nr. 69, p. 70 en nr. 27, p. 56.

- 26 Timpius. *Dormi secure*, dl. 1, nr. 6 'Vituperario Hydropsis diviriarum seu Avaritiae', p. 21-32.

- 27 Apbthomus. *Progymnasmata*, 'Aliud loci communis exemplum: in avarum', p. 181 183 en 'Tertium exemplum thescos, continens. divitias non esse summum bonum'. p- 362-365.

11 Women and Seventeenth-Century Dutch Literature

lhrs is the text of a lecture given at the Institute for Historical Studies at the University of London, Xovember 18, '994.

12 Argumentative Aspects of Rhetoric and Their Impact on the Poetry of Joost van den Vondel (1587-1679)

I should like to thank Mrs. Patricia van Hees for translating this and Mr. Edmll Vincent for some editorial corrections.

- 2 J.H. Meter, *De literaire theorieen van Daniël Heinsius. Een onderzoele naar de klassieke en humanistische bronnen van De Tragodiae Constitutione ell -mdere geschriften*. Amsterdam 1975, p- 86, 95-105 10x-1 a, 186-94. Marijke Spies, 'Het epos ill de 17e eeuw in Nederland; een literatuurhistorisch problecm. 11,' *Spektor* 7 (1977-78), p. 562-94, notably 578-80. Cf. also P. Tuynman, 'Pen-us Scvvenus. 12 January 1576-30 April 1660,' *Quaerendo* 7 (1977), p. 5-45 notably 13.

- 3 Spies 'Het epos in de 17e eeuw.' II, p- 580-81.

- 4 Gerardi jonnis Vossii *De artis pocticae natura ac constitutione liber*. Amsterodami 1647, III. 10, 11 and 17, p. 15-19. See also Marijke Spies, 'Het epos ill de 17e eeuw ill Nederland: een literatuurhistorisch problecm. 1,' *Spektor* 7 (1977-78), p. 379-411, notably 390.

- 5 Gerardi Joannis Vossii *Pocticarum institutionum, libri tres*. Amsterodami 1647, III. xiii. 5, p. 69, and 9, p. 72. For the dates of (he editions of the *Commentariorum rhetoricorum, sive oratorium mstitutionum libri sex* see C.S.M. Rademaker, *Gerardus l'allnes Vossius* (1577-1649). Diss. Nijmegen. Zwolle 1967, 'Bibliografie,' no. 3, p. 276. See also: Spies 'Het epos in de 17c eeuw.II,' p. 565.

- 6 Graham Casor, *Pleiade Poetics. A Study in Sixteenth-Century Thought and Terminology*. Cambridge 1964, chap. 1 and 2.
Spies, 'Het epos in de 17e eeuw.' I, p. 396-97, and 'Het epos in de 17e eeuw.' II, p. 566-69 and 572-73.
- 8 Vossius, *De artis poeticae natura ac constitutione liber*, I. 1, p. 2-3.
- 9 Vossius, *De artis poeticae natura ac constitutione liber*, VI. 8, p. 34-35. Vossius, *Poeticae ("rllll illllll, /i" /Um, libri tres*, J. 1. I, p. 6 and 11, xiv. 4-5. p. 75. See also Vossius, *De artis poeticae natura ac constitutione liber*, XI. (. p. 66-67. In more detail: Spies 'Het epos in de 17e eeuw.' I and II, respectively p. 390-91 and 564-65
- 10 Julius Caesar Scaliger, *Poeticae libri septem*. Faksimile-Neudruck der Ausgabe von Lyon 1561 mit einer Einleitung von August Buck. Stuttgart etc. 1964, I. 1, p. 1. col. 1 C. In more detail: Spies, 'Het epos in de 17e eeuw. I and II; p. 396-97 and 566-69 respectively.
- 11 Aristotle, *The 'Art' of Rhetoric*. With an English translation by John Henry Freese. London etc. 1967, I. ix. 40. Cicero, *De partitione oratione*, ar. 71 Uemrdi joannis Vossii *De rhetoricae natura ac constitutione. et antiquis rhetorice. sophistis ac oratoribus. liber unus*, 5. I have used the edition enlarged by Vossius himself which appeared posthumously in 1658 in Gerardi Jon. Vossii *De logicis et rhetoricae natura ac constitutione libri 11*. Hagae-Comitis 1658. The expression referred to may be found on p. 45-46. For the dating of the first edition see Rademaker, Vossius, 'Bibliografie,' no. 8, p. 277. See also Vossius *Commentariorum rhetororum libri sex*, I. iii. 1, p. 17.
- 12 Heinrich Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*. 2 vols.. München 1960, I. par. 239, p. 110. See also par. 241, p. 131
J See v.g. Lausberg, *Handbuch*, I. J. par. 240, p. 1 gr. note 1, and par. 253 p. 138 Cf. also par. 1163, 1, 555-56, and par. 1165, p. 557-58.
- 14 Aristotle, *The 'Art' of Rhetoric*; I. ix. 1-37.
- 15 Vossius, *Commentariorum rhetororum libri sex*, I. v. 1, p. 43-44.
- 16 Vossius, *Commentariorum rhetororum libri sex*, I. iii. a. p. 23-24.
- 17 Aristotle, *The 'Art' of Rhetoric*, I. i. 1; cf. also I. II. 7.
- 18 On this see W.S. Howell, *Logic and Rhetoric in England, 1500-1700*. Princeton 1956, p. 148-65.
- 19 Howell, chap. 4 'Counter Reform: Socrates and Neo-Lucronius.'
- 20 Vossius, *De rhetoricae natura ac constitutione liber unus*, 4, 5 and 6, p. 27-49.
- 21 Quintilianus, *Institutio oratoria*. V, xiv. 10.
- 22 Vossius, *Commentariorum rhetororum libri sex*, III pars. prior. v. 4, p. 374.
- 23 Vossius, *Commentariorum rhetororum libri sex*, III pars. prior. 1. 2, p. 322-23, and iv. 2 p. 365-66.
- 24 Aristotle, *The 'Art' of Rhetoric*, II, xiii. 1-3.
- 25 On Ant. Sob. Miurno, *De poeta*. VI. 11. 1559 see e.g. S. F. Witstein, *Funeraire poëzie in de Nederlandse renaissance. Enkele funeraire gedichten van Heinsius, Hooft, Huygens en Vondel, heiden tegen de achtergrond van de theorie betreffende het genre*. Diss. Utrecht. Assen 1969, p. 55-58 and 72. Cf. also Scaliger, *Poeticae libri septem*, I. 1, p. 1, col. 1 CD and III. 108. p. 159-109. 1.160.
- 26 Vossius, *Commentariorum rhetororum libri sex*, I. VI. 7, p. 120-21.
- 27 Vossius, *Commentariorum rhetororum libri sex*, I. vi. 8, p. 121-22. Cf. Cicero, *Topica*, 25-98.
- 28 Geeraardt Braudt, *Het leven van Joost van den Vondel*, Ed. by P. I. eendertz jr. 'sGravenhage 1932 (orig. 1682), p. 19.
- 29 Printed in: *De toerhen van Vondel* ed. J.F.M. Sierck e.u. 10 tomes + reg.. Amsterdam 1927-40, respectively t.a. p. 43-55, t. 5, p. 859-904 and t. 8, p. 654-5. My detailed rhetorical analysis of *Het Lof der Zee-vaert* is published in *Vondel bij gelegenheid*, ed. L. Roose en K. Portman. Middelburg 1979, p. 63-91 A similar analysis of the *Inwydinge*

- van het Stadhuis I' Amsterdam* has been published in *Visies op Vondel na driehonderd jaar*, ed. S.F. Witstein and E.K. Grootes. The Hague 1979, p. 165-217. Marjonne M. van Randwijk gives an analysis of the *Zeemagazyn* in her master's thesis, a copy of which may be found at the Institute for Dutch Studies of the University of Amsterdam.
- 30 See: J.H.W. Ungcr, *Bibliographic van vondete Werken*. Amsterdam, 1888, no. 549, p. 107.
- 31 That the *exemplum* is the rhetorical form of logical induction is argued by Vossius in his *Commentariorum retoricorum /iliri sex*, III pars. prior. v.6, p. 376.
- 32 Vossius, *De rhetoricae naturae ac constitutione liber unus*, 4, p. 37-39.
- 33 Vossius *De rhetoricae natura ac constitutione liber unus* 8, p. 19-20.
- 34 Quinilianus. *Institutio oratoria*. III. vi. 2.7. Vossius, *Commentariorum retoricorum libri sex*, I. v. 39, p. 105.
- 35 Quintilianus, *Institutio oratoria*, III. vii. 2.6. Vossius, *Commentariorum retoricorum libri sex*, I. v. 39, p. 104.
- 36 See E.J. Klipper, *De Hollandsche 'schoolorde' van 1625*. Groningen 1958, p. 137 and p. 201. I have used the edition Aphthonii *Progymnasmata*, partim à Rodolpho Agricola. partim à Johanne Mana Caranaeo, Latinitate donata; cum scholiis R. Lorichii. Amsterodami 1655. The poem referred to is on p. 27-41.
- 37 See e.g. Quintilianus, *Institutio oratoria*, III. vii. 6. See also Ansrrole. *The 'Art' of Rhetoric*, I. ix. 40.
- 39 See Karhannc Fremantle, *The Baroque Town nail of Amsterdam*. Utrecht 1959.
- 40 We are here dealing with a shift in the logical order of argumentation for reasons of manipulation, one of the issues [hat constitute the differences between rhetorical argumentation and dialectic. Cf. VOSSILLIS, *De rhetoricae natura ac constitutione liber unus*, 18, p. 122.
- 41 On this see Cicero, *De oratore*, II. xxx. 132. Cicero *De inventione*, I. xiii. 18. Quinilianus, *Institutio oratoria*, III. x.5-xi.20. See also Vossius, *Commentariorum retoricorum libri sex*, Lvi. 6. p. 118.
- 42 See I. van Vondels *Invydinge van 't Stadhuis I' Amsterdam*, 1655, ed. by M.E. Kronenberg. Deventer 1913, p. 8-14.
- 43 Cicero, *De partitione oratoria*, 12. 41.
- 44 Vossius, *Commentariorum retoricorum libri sex*, I. vi. 7, p. 12'.

List of Works published by Marijke Spies 1973-1999

Publications indicated by an asterisk (*) are included in this book.

- Karel van Mander (1606-1666), *De kerck der deucht*. Ed. Hessel Middema en Marijke Spies. Amsterdam Kunsthistorisch Instituut van de Universiteit van Amsterdam 1973. Van deze editie verscheen een verbeterde tweede druk Amsterdam 1977. Amsterdamse smal-
den 5-
2. 'De crisis in de historische Neerlandistiek'. In: *Spektator* 3 (1973-1974), p. 493-512.
'Het epos in de 17e eeuw in Nederland: een literatuurhistorisch probleem. I en II'. In: *Spektator* 7 (1977-1978), p. 379-411 en 562-594.
 4. 'Naar een historisch-materialistische literatuurwetenschap: het project "Loof der Zeevaen"'. In: *Politiek en Wetenschap* 37 (1977), p. 219-228.
'Het stadhuis staat op de Dam. Een onderzoek naar de argumentele opbouw van Vondels "Inwydinge van het Stadhuis te Amsterdam" (1655)'. In: *Visies op Vondel na 300 jaar*. Een bundel artikelen verzameld door S.F. Witstein en F.K. Croores ter gelegenheid van de driehonderdste sterfdag van Joost van den Vondel. Den Haag 1979, p. 165-217.
 6. "'Het Loof der Zee-vaert" (1623). Vondels politieke maiden speech'. In: L. Roos en K. Porteman (red.), *Vondel bij gelegenheid 1679-1979*. Middelburg 1979, p. 63-91.
Argumentatie of beïnceling. Een aanzet tot een literatuurhistorische probleemstelling met betrekking tot de Nederlandse letterkunde "in de eerste helft van de 17e eeuw". Diss. Univ. Amsterdam 1979.
 8. *VOLLEDEN Amsterdam. Vondels gedicht "De Inwydinge van 't Stadhuis te Amsterdam" in beid gebracht*. Catalogus Theatrummuseum, samengesteld o.l.v. M. Spies. Amsterdam 1979.
 9. 'Beatrijs en de honingvlociende leraar'. In: M.M.H. Bax e.a. (red.), *Wie veel leest heeft veel te verantwoorden*. Opstellen over filologie en historische linguïstiek aangeboden aan Prof.dr. F. Lulofs. Groningen 1980, p. 100-117.
 10. 'Arion-Amphion: Huygens en Hooft in de stormen van 1621-1622'. In: E.K. Grootes e.a. (red.), *Uyt lieide geschreven. Studies over Hooft 1581-16 maart 1981*. Groningen 1981, p. 101-116.
 11. * 'Argumentative aspects of rhetoric and their impact on the poetry of Joost van den Vondel (1607-1679)'. In: *Rhetoric regained: papers from the International Society for the History of Rhetoric*. Ed. Brian Vickers. Binghamton N.Y. 1982, p. 187-198.
 12. 'T. Chooft, hoofd de poeten'. In: *Ons erfdeel* 14 (1981), p. 485-494.
 13. *Vondels Inwydinge van 't Stadhuis te Amsterdam*. Ed. Saskia Albrecht e.a. Muiderberg 1982.
 14. 'Van mythes en meningen: over de geschiedenis van de literatuurgeschiedenis'. In: Marijke Spies (red.), *Historische letterkunde. Facetten van vakbeoefening*. Groningen 1984, p. 171-193.
 15. *Des mensen of! en nederdang. in natuur en iceen in de Onoordelijke Nederlanden in de zeventiende eeuw*. Amsterdam. Barneveld 1985. BulkRoek nr 142. Van dit werk verscheen in 1985 een tweede druk.

16. 'Rhetorica's en poëtica's in de renaissance en hun invloed op de Nederlundsche literatuur. In: *Lampas* 18 (1985), p. 143-161.
17. 'Scaliger en Hollande'. In: *Acta Scaligeriana*, Ed. J. Cubelier de Bevnac et M. Magnien. Agen 1986 p. 157-69.
18. 'In de glans van het leven: literatuurgeschiedenis als kunstgeschiedenis in wisselend perspectief'. III: *Theoretische geschiedenis* 13 (1986), p. 219-230.
19. 'Charlotte de Huyhert en het gelijk: de gelcerde en de werkende vrouw in de zeventiende eeuw'. In: *Lectuur* 3 (1986), p. 339-350.
20. 'Ick moer wonder schryven: het paradoxale lofdicht hij de leden van de Eglentier'. In: H. Duits (red.), *Eer is het Loof des Deuchts. Opstellen aangeboden aan dr. Fokke Veenstra*. Amsterdam 1986, p.43-51.
21. 'Orde meet er zijn: over de inrichting van zeventiende-eeuwse dichtbundels' In: F. Wil-luirt en H. Mees (red.), *'t Onderzoek leert. Studies ter nagedachtenis van Prof.dr. L. Rens*. Leuven, Amersfoort 1986, p. 179-187.
22. *vondel. Volledige dicht- en oorspronkelijk proza*. Verz. d. Albert Verwey. Opnieuw uitgegeven met een inleiding d. Mick E. Smits-Veldt en Marijke Spies. Amsterdam 1986.
23. J. van den Vondel, *Twee zeevart-gedichten*. Ed. Marijke Spies. 2 din. Amsterdam etc. 1987. Monumenta Literaria Neerlandica 3
24. 'Zoals de ouden zongen, luzen de jongen. Over de overgang van zang- naar leescultuur in de eerste helft van de zeventiende eeuw'. III: W. van den Berg en J. Stouten (red.), *Het woord aan de lezer. Zeven literatuurhistorische verkenningen*. Groningen 1987, p. 89-109.
25. 'Vondel in veelvoud. H't Vondel-onderzoek sinds de jaren vijftig' In: *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse taal- en letterkunde* 103 (1987), p. 235-269
26. 'Vondels actualiteit' In: Marja Geesink en Anton Bossers (red.), *Vondel: het epos van een ambachtelijk dichterschap*. 's-Gravenhage 1987, p. 44-47.
27. 'Vondel russen Van Mander. Heinsius en Hooff'. In: *Spektator* 17 (1987-1988), p. 28-42.
28. *Vondel vocaal. De tiedren van Vondel inicengebracht en ingeleid door Kees de Bruijn en Marijke Spies*. Haarlem 1988.
29. 'La rhétorique de l'Hymne de l'Or de Ronsard'. In: *Rhetorica* 7 (1989), p. 159-170.
30. 'Vondels dichtwerken uit zijn doopsgevinde periode' In: *Doopsgezinde bijdragen* NR 15 (1989), p. 97-114.
31. 'De winkler. Literatuurgeschiedenis als wetenschap', III: *Literatuur* 6 (1989), p. 333-334.
32. 'Christen Jeugd, Ierd Konst en Deugd: De zeventiende eeuw (samen met Annemarie van Tol en Sietske Hoogerhuis). In: N. Heimeriks en W. van Toort (red.), *De heic Biblebontseberg. De geschiedenis van het kinderboek in Nederland en Vlaanderen*. Amsterdam 1989, p. 105-167, 669-670.
33. 'Renaissance-studies in the Netherlands, 1980-1990'. In: *Bulletin of the Society for Renaissance Studies* 7 (1990).
34. '-Coomherts -Lot van de ghevanghennisse': crust. spel. of crnsng spel?' In: *vragende WIS. vrocon en-er telat, taal en eschiedenis, Bilddel aangeboden aan Leopold Peeters bij zijn afscheid als hoogleraar historische taalkunde van het Nederlands aan de Universiteit van Amsterdam*. Amsterdam, Atlanta 1990, p. 25-30.
35. 'De koopman van Rhodes. Over de schakelpunten van economie en cultuur'. In: *De zeventiende eeuw* 6 (1990), p. 166-174.
36. 'Op de quest...: over de structuur van zeventiende-eeuwse zinnespelen'. In: *De nieuwe taalgids* 83 (1990), p. 139-150.
37. 'De andere Bredero'. In: Erus van Alphen en Maaïke Meijer (red.), *De canon onder vuur. Nederlandse literatuur tegendraads gelezen*. Amsterdam 1991, p. 35-48.
38. 'Betaald werk I Poczci als ambacht in de 17e eeuw'. In: *Holland* 23 (1991), p. 210-224.

39. 'vl'ocetsche Inbrijcken" en andere ailegoncen. r-ind rede-begin ryde eeuw' In: *Oud Holland* 105 (1991), p. 228-243.
40. Recensie van: Louis Peter Criip, *Het Nederlandsche lied in de Couden Eeuw. Het rnedrams. me oan de contrafactuur*. Amsterdam 1991. Publikaties van het P.J.Meertens-Instituut [. In: *De niemoe taatgids* 85 (1992), p. 166-170.
41. 'Rederijkers en reformatie in de tweede helft van de zestiende eeuw in Amsterdam'. In: *De zeventiende eeuw* 8 (1992), p. 66-74.
42. 'Barock-Rhetorik. Niederlande'. In: *Historische Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*. Hrsg. von Gert Ueding, Gregor Kalivoda en Franz-Hubert Rohling. Bd. 1 Tübingen 1992, k"l. 1343-1350.
43. Recensie van: Julie L. McGee, *Cornelis Corneliszoon van Haarlem (1562-1638). Patrons, friends and Dutch humanists*. NielTwkoop 1991. (Samen met Truus van Bueren). In: *O"nd Holl"nd* 106 (1992), p. 199-205.
44. 'vAsrromia die haer constich ghenccrr inden loop des hernel": Sterreukunde 01' het Antwerps landjuweel'. In: H. van Dijk, M.A. Schenkeveld-van der Dussen en J.M.J. Sickling (red.). *In de zevende bemei. Opstellen ucor P.E.L. Verkuyl O'erliteratuur en kosmos*. Groningen 1993. p. 52-56.
45. 'Retorica in de tijd van middeleeuwen, humanisme en renaissance'. III: Caroline Fisser e.a., *Cicero Orator. Cicero's Pro Milone in retorische en cultuurhistorische context*. Den Bosch 1993, p. 121-131.
46. 'From disputation to argumentation: the French morality play in the sixteenth century' In: *Rhetorica* 10 (1992), p. 261-271.
47. -, juli 1584: De Amsterdamse kamer "De I-glonner" draagt de "Twe-spraak van de Nederduische letererkunst" op aan het Amserdamse sradsbestuur: nieuwe opvattingen over literatuur'. In: M.A. Schenkeveld-van der Dussen e.a. (red.), *Nededandse titeroumr. een geschiedenis*. Groningen 1993, p. 177-182.
48. 'Oudejaarsavond 1675: Cornelia van der Veer schaduwt Katharina Lescaijle als dexce van het huis van haar vviendin Sara de Canjoncle naar dar van haar zuster gaat: het vrouwelijk aandeel'cln. M.A. Schenkeveld-van der Dussen e.a. (red.), *Nederlandec titeranmr. een geschiedenis*. Groningen 1993, p. 282-287.
49. * 'The Amserdam chamber De Eglentier and the ideals of Erasmian humanism'. In: *From reuott to riches. Culture and history of the Low Countries 1500-1700. Internationa!./ml interdisciplinary perspectives*. Hd. Th. Hermans and R. Salverda. London 1993. Crossways 2, p. 109-118.
50. * 'Developments in sixteenth-century Dun'h poetics: from "rhetoric" to "renaissance" In: *Renaissance-Rhetoric / Renaissance Rhetoric*. Hrsg. von Heinrich F. Plett. Berlin, New York 1993, p. 72-91.
51. "Minerva's corumenaar: gedichren rond het Amserdamse srudhuis'. In' *De uoentiende eeuw* 9 (1993), p. 15-33.
52. Signalement van: Franciscus van den Enden, *Vrije Politieke Stellingen*. Ed. Wim Klever. Amsterdam 1992. In: *De zeventiende eeuw* 9 (1993), p. 88-90.
53. 'Enige opmerkingen over de relatie tussen de kunsten in de zeventiende eeuw'. In: *Rhetorica, Poëtica, Kunsttheorie. Themacahier Instituut voor Cultuurgeschiedenis*. Amsterdam 1993, p. -16.
54. 'Rhetorica: strategic'. Rede uitgesproken bij de aanvnarding van het ambr van bijzonder hoogleraar in de geschiedenis van de rhetorica vanwege de Amsterdamse universiteitsvereniging aan de Unversireit van Amsterdam op 8 juni 1993. In: Marijke Spies en Kees Meerhoff, *Rhetorica: strategie en creativiteit*. Amsterdam 1993, p. 5-21.
55. 'De voordelen van een blauwtje lopen: argumentatieleer bij Roomer Visscher'. In: Caroline Fisser e.a. (red.), *Recootic van de klassieken V. Zes voordrachten*. Leiden 1993, p. 55-74.

56. Bij Noorden om, O'it'ier Bruncl ell de doorvaart IW., "(Jhinc en C'ith,1)' in de zestiende eeuw. Amsterdam 1994.
'Ongelijke liefde van de 16e tot de 18e eeuw' In: Marijke Broekhuijsen en Myrle Tjoeng (red.), *Wat heet oud: gedachten over Oudcrtonren*. Bourn 1994, p. 11-29.
58. 'Mennonites and literature in the seventeenth century' In: *From martyr to muppy (Mennonite "rh,m professionals). A historical introduction to culture,1 assimilation processes "f a religious minority ill the Netherlands: the Mennonites*. Ed. by Alastair Hamilton, Sjouke Voolna and Piet Visser. Amsterdam 1994, p. 83-98.
59. 'Verbeeklingen van vrijheid: David en Mozes, Burgerhart en Bato, Brutus en Cato' In: *De zeventiende eeuw* 10 (1994), p. 14'- 58.
60. 'Not every conrndicnon is a contradiction. A response to Lia van Cerncrt'vln: Els Klock, Nicole Teeuwen and Marijke Huisman (eds.), *Women of the Golden Age. An international debate on women in seventeenth-century Holland, England and Italy*. Hilversum 1994, p. 1'-53.
61. 'De andere visie'. In: *Simulacrum* 3 (1994), 4, p. 16-17.
62. 'Between epic and lyric. The genres in J.C. Scaliger's *Poetices libri septem*'. In: *Renaissance-Poetik I Renaissance Poetics*. Hrsg. von Heinrich F. Pfeff. Berlin, New York 1994, p. 260-270.
- (... 'Lastige Amsterdonners: De redrijckerskamer De Eglentier in de tweede helft van de 16de eeuw' In: *Voortgang, Jaarboek voor de Neerlandistiek* '4 (1993 en 1994), p. 1-14.
64. 'De "macrzang" van Van Campen- de stem van de lircraruur'. In: Jacobine Huisken. Koen Ottenheym en Gary Schwartz (red.), *Jacob van Campen. Het klassieke ideaal v1 de Gouden Eeuw*. Amsterdam 1995, p. 227-238.
- (1. 'In het jaar 1650...' (samen met Willem Frijhoff). In: J.A. Lruvs en Jan Bos, *T'gulde iae 1650 in de Short-Title Catalogue, Netherlands*. Den Haag 1995, p. 5-17.
66. 'Between ornament and argumentation. Developments in 16th-century Dutch poetics' In: Jelle Ko"prn'III, Mark A. Meadow, Kees Meerhoff and Marijke Spies (eds.), *Rhetoric-Rhétoriqueurs-Rederijckers. Proceedings of the colloquium, Anrsterdam, 10-13 November 1993*. Amsterdam etc. 1995. Verhndclinae» Lencrkunde der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Ietcrkunde, Nicuwc reeks dl. 162, p. 1'7-122.
67. Recensie van: M. van Vaeck, *Adriaen van de Venne's 'Tafercel van de Belacchende Werelt' (Den Haag, 1635t, 3 dln. Gient 1994. III: Spiegel der letteren 37 (1995), p. 239-243.*
68. Recensie van: Bert Hofmn. *Liedehens vol ghecstich conioovt. Een bijdrage tot de kennis ,m de zestiende-eeuwse Schriftuurlijke lyriek*. Hilversum 1993. In: *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse mal- en letterkunde* III (1995), p. 82-86.
69. 'Women and sevcrcnth-cenrurv Dutch literature'. In: *Dilich crossing, A journal of Low Countries studies* '9 (1995), p. 3-23
70. 'Hier is gheen Helikon..' *Het redcrilleer perspectief van de un-ennende-eeuw-sc literatuur*. Oranc VUA. Amsterdam 1995.
71. 'Amsterdam school-orations from the second half of the 17th cenrurv' In: *Lias* 22 (1995), p. 99-118.
72. 'Helicon and hills of sand: Pagan Gods in early modern Dutch and European poerrv'. In: Ich-n Wilcox, Richard Iodd and Alasdarr Macdon.dd (eds.), *Sacred 'lild profane: Secular and devotional interplay ill early modern Britishl titeratnc*. Amsterdam 1996, p. 225-236.
71. Recensie van: Peter Mack, *Renaissance argument. Valla and Agricola in 11.,' tradition (ll rhetoric and dialectics*. Lciden ere. 1993. In: *Bidragen ell mededelingen betreffende de geschiedenis der Nederlanden* 110 (. 995), p. 576-579.
74. '19 augustus 1594: Stadhouder Maurits wordt in Amsterdam verwelkomd met een tablenu vivanr dnr Davids overwinning op Coliarh uitbeeldt. De functie van tableaux vivants bij openbare festiviteiten'. In: R. Erenstein e.a. (red.), *Fen tbeatergeschiedenis der*

- Nederlanden. *Tien eeuwen dram, en theater in Nederland en vlaanderen*. Amsterdam 1995, p. 148-155.
75. Recensie van: H.W. Blom, *Causality and morality in politics. The rise of naturalism in Dutch sci-entcentury political thought*. Diss. UU. 1995. In: *De zeventiende eeuw* 12 (1996), p. 279-280.
76. 'Jan Thonisz, smdsbodt te Amsterdam "Hue mennich mensch suet thuys van vreden"'. In: W. Abrahamse e.a. (red.), *Kort Tijt-verdrijf. Crpstellen over Nederlands toneel (vanaf ca. 1550) aangeboden aan Mieke B. Smits-Veldt*. Amsterdam 1996 p. 1-6.
77. Jan Thonisz, *Van sint Jans onthoofdinge*. Zestiende-eeuws Amsterdams rederijkersstuk. Ed. Frédérique de iluy, Paul Laport en Marijke Spies. Amsterdam. Munster 1996.
78. 'De vrijheid in de 'Olyf-Krans der Vrede' (1649)'. In: *De zeventiende eeuw* 13 (1997), p. aor-a0x.
79. *Arctic reetes I" fabled lands. Olmncr Brunct and the passage to China and Cathay in the sixteenth century*. Translated from the Dutch by Myra Heerspink Scholz. Amsterdam 1997.
80. 'Van "Vaderlandsch Gevoel" tot Europees perspectief: de studie van de 17e- en 18e-eeuwse literatuur in de 19e en 20e eeuw. En hoe verder?' In: Jan W. de Vries (red.), *'Eene bedenkelijke nieuwigheid'. Twee eeuwen Neerlandstiek*. Hilversum '997, p. 69-83. [Also published in: Hugo Brems e.a. (red.), *Nederlands 200 jaar later: Handelingen dertiende Colloquium Neerlandicum*. Leiden 1997, Munster 1998, p. 53-72.
81. 'Hocwel ik niet van vondel houd, noch van Van Hoogstraten...' In: Herman Pleij & Willem van den Berg (red.), *Mo(i) mcgcnomens Ouor de genietbaarheid van onder teksten "il de Nederlandsc letterkunde. Voor Eddy Grootes, bij zijn afscheid op 12 september 1997 als hoogleraar Historische Nederlandse Lcnerkunde aan de Universiteit van Amsterdam*. Amsterdam 1997, p. 146-151.
82. Recensie van: Mircille Vinck-van Caekenberghe, *Een onderzoek naar het leven, het u-ert: en de literaire opvattingen van Cornelis ('an Ghistele (1510/11-1573), rederijker en humanist*. Genr 1996. In: *Spiegel der letteren* 40 (1998), p. 129-134.
83. Jaconelle Schuftel, Marc Terumc & Marijke Spies, 'Festzuge und Bühnensrucke: Antwerpen, Haarlem. Dordrecht'. In: Hcrs Lademncher & Simon Croenfeld (Hrsg.), *Krieg und Kultur. Die Rezeption von Krieg "nd Frieden in der Niederländischen Republik und im Deutschen Reich 1568-1648*. Munster ere. 1998, p. 325-345.
84. 'De dominees, de schooljongen en de professor: tranen over de doof van Michiel Adriaensz. de Ruyter' In: Elrud Ibsch, Andrea Kunne & Cristina i'umplull (red.), *De literaire dood. Opstellen aan Ferdinand van Ingen*, Assen 1998, p. 87-104.
85. 'Humanist conceptions of the Far North in the works of Mercator and Ortelius'. In: Marceel van den Broecke, Peter van der Krogt and Peter Meurer (eds.), *Ahraham Ortelius and the (irst atlas. Essays commemorating the quanicentennial of his death, 1598-1998*. Houten 1998, p. 303-317.
86. Marijke Spies Ullj Evert Wiskerke, 'Niederlndische Dichrer uber den dreissigjährigen Krieg'. In: Klaus Bussmann and Heinz Schilling (hrsg.). 1648: *Krieg und Frieden in Europa*. 3 Bde. Aufs.nzband 2: Kunst und Kultur. Munster 1998, p. 399-408.
87. Gert-Jan Egberts. Annelies de Jcu, Mieke B. Snnrs-Veldt, Marijke Spies. Peter Thissen. Natascha Veldhorst, 'Literatuur en toneel'. In: Willem Frijhoff, Hubert Nusrelmg en Marijke Spies (red.), *Ccschiedenis van Dordrecht van 1572 tot 1813*. Hilversum 1998, p. 341-368.
88. Jan Tömisz, *Van die becooringe des duvels hoe hij crijstus becoorden*. Zestiende-eeuws rederijkersstuk. Ed. Hermuu van Iperen e.a. Amsterdam, Munster, 1998.
89. 'Vrijheid, vrijheid: poczic als propaganda, 1565-1665'. In: E.O.G. Haitsma Mulier en W.R.E. Velema (red.), *vrnheid. Een grschiedenis van de vijftiende tul d,' twintigste eeuw*. Amsterdam 1999. Reeks Nederlandse begripsgeschiedenis 2, p. 7' -98.

90. * "Rhetoric and civic harmony in the Dutch Republic "f the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century. In: Peter L. Oesterreich and Thomas O. Sloane (eds.), *Rhetorical Movement. Studies in historical and modern rhetoric in honour of Heinrich F. Plett*. Leiden etc. 1999, p. 57-72.

INDEX OF NAMES

- Abondance.Tcan d' 17
Adolphus, Ivar Petr 81, 84-85
Agricola, R(J)olphus 9, 18, 47, 53-56, 59,
67, 81, 130
Agrippa von Nettesbeim, Heinrich Cornelius
66-67, 113
Alardus Arnsreldarus 54, 56, 59
Alberti, Leonbamstn 56,64
Alrman, I. B. 13
Ancau, Barthlemy 71
Anso, Reyer 100-102
Anronides van der Goes, joannes 76,103-
104
„aphthoniu" 9-10, 54-55, 80-83, 86, 130
Aquinas, *see* Thomas Aquinas
Anosto. Ludovico 46, 49
Arisrotle 22-23, 25-27, 31, 45, 125, 127-
128
Augustine. Saint 39, 48
Autels, Guillaume des 49
- Baif, Jean-Antoine de 30, 49
Balzac, Jean Louis Guez de 74 76
Burrn, Henry de 18
Banas, Uuilluarne du 95-97, 99, 100 102
Beckhenus, Ceorgius 82 83
Bembo, Pierre 49
Bellay, Joachim III 33, 44, 47, 71, 110
Bijns, Anna 39
Blasius, Joan 75-76
Boccaccio. Liovanni 49, 113
Boerhius 18
Boon, Henricus en wed. Theodorus 81
Bougouin, Sill'n 14
Brundt, Cecraardt 36, 128
Bredero, Gerbrand Adriaensz. 63, 116
Buchanan, George 30
Burgersdijk, Franco 79
Buijck, Joost 61
Buzanval, Paul de 29-30
- Camphuvsen, Dirck Rafaelsz 73-75, 100,
103-105
Casrelcin, Matthijs de 40-46, 48, 58
Castor, G. 126
Catanacus, Johannis Maria 81, 130
Cats.Tacob 120-121
Cavalcanti, Guido 49
Cave. T. 5-6
Charles V, Emperor 113
Chesnaye, Nicolas de la 10
Chrsvippus 66
Cicero 9, 13, 18, 23 37, 39-41, 43-48, 53,
58-60, 62, 65, 70, 80, 127-128, 132
Coligny. Louise dr 29
Collenuccio, Pandolfo 49, 56 64
Comes Natalis 71
Coomans, Johanna 120
Conti, N. 5, 8-9
Coornhert, Dirck Volckertsz 47-48,50, 53
59, 60, 62-64, 66-67, 69-71, 73-75, 103-
104
Cops, Simon 61
Cesrer, Samuel 31
Crocus Cornelius 54
Crucius, Jacobus 82, 83
Cumaerus, Petrus 79
Cusa, *see* Nicolas of Cusa
- Dante 49
Dassonville- M. 5, 8
Decker, Jeretnias de 105
Deguileville, Guillaume de 14
Deus. Marthaus 56
Demerson, G 5, 8
Demosthenes 56, 64, 66
Dene. Eduard de 45
DeNeef, A. Leigh 26, 34
Deschamps, Eustache 41
Des-Masures, Louis 16
Desportes, Philippe 49
Dibon, P. 29
Diercrius. Conrudus 82-83

- Disney, Walt 110
 Dorat, Jean 6, 8, 30
 Dorp, Dorothea van 107
 Dousa, Franciscus 30
 Dousa, Janus (filius) 30, 35-36
 Dousa, Janus (pater) 9-30

 Eglientier, De 47-57, 60-63, 67
 Elzevier, Louis and Daniel 81-83
 Erasmus, Desiderius 6, 9, 11, 38, 70, 44-45,
 47-49, 51-54, 55-56, 59-61, 64-66, 70,
 76, 109, 114-115, 118-119
 Esrienne, Charles 60

 Farnabius, Thomas 81-82, 82a
 Forster, L. 100-101
 Franck, Sebastian 65-66
 Frappier, J. 5-6, 11
 Frederick Henry, Prince of Orange 102
 Fungerus, Johannes 29

 Garnier, Robert 10
 Geesteranus, Joannes 74, 100-101, 105
 Ghistele, Cornelis van 45-46
 Goens, Rijklof Michaël van
 Goltzius, Henricus 10
 Gordon, A. 5-6
 Grotius, Hugo 36
 Guicciardini, Lodovico 1-5

 Jlaecht, Willem van 46, 50
 Jhardison, O.B. 26, 34
 Jleemskereck, Johan VIII 31
 Heere, Lucas Jf 45-46, 48-50, 59-60, 71
 Hegius, Alexander 54
 Heinsius, Daniel 30-33, 36, 72-76, 79-81,
 101, 101a, 113-116, 122, 125
 Helmich, W. 1-10, 18
 Henry II, king of France 11
 Hermogenes 9, 128
 Hesiod 72
 Heyns, Peter 50
 Homer 118
 Hoobius, Johanna 118
 Hoofr, Pieter Cornelisz. 2, 72, 73, 86, 101,
 111-112, 116-117, 121-123
 Horace 31, 43-44, 55
 Hout, Jan van 49-50
 Huygens, Constantine 31, 33, 72-74, 117-
 118, 122-123

 Janssonius, Joannes 81-83
 Jardine, L. 54
 Jodelle, Etienne 49
 Junius, Hadrianus 29

 Lactantius 69
 Lancelotti, Ortensio 60
 Laumonier, P. 8-10
 Laurentius, Henricus 81
 Lausberg, H. 126-128
 Leccerle, Fr. 21
 Legrand, Jacques 41-42
 Lescaille, Catharina 124
 Lipsius, Justus 29
 Lorichius, Reinhard 9-10, 51-55, 81, 130
 Lucian 45, 56, 59, 64
 Lucretius 81

 Maanen, Johannes à 81
 Mander, Karel van 71, 72, 76, 93-97, 99-
 101, 101a, 100
 Margaret of Austria 113
 Margolin, J.C. 5-6, 11
 Marot, Clément 37, 46
 Martial 44
 Martinus- Franciscus 108
 Marullus, Michael 27
 Matthias, Paulus 81
 Maurice, Prince of Orange 9, 83
 Melancthon, Philippus 18-19, 47-48, 53-54,
 56, 59
 Menander (of Laodiceia) 26
 Meter, J.H. 31
 Meynertsz, Egbert 47-49, 51-52, 59-61
 Molinet, Jean 41, 43
 More, Thomas 11
 Mostaert, Daniel 10
 Mussem, Jan van 40-41, 48, 58

 Neuhusius, Reuerus 82, 81-88
 Nicholas Of Cusa 65
 Noot, Jan van der 71, 110

 Oeco, Pompeius 54, 59
 Oudaan, Joachim 75-77, 103-106
 Ovid 45, 67, 71-72, 95

 Peletier de Mans, Jacques 33, 49
 Petrarch, Francesco 32, 46, 49, 109-110,
 112-113

INDEX OF NAMES

- Philo (of Alexandria) 45
 Pisan, Christine de 113
 Plantin, Christopher 29
 Plato 7, 23, 44-45
 Plautus 86
 Pliade, the 32-33, 37, 111, 125-126
 Poel, M. van der 9, 66 80
 Polvercrates 59
 Polvd"ru> Vergilius 55, 64
 Pontanus Jacobus 35
 Prudentius 14, 99
 Py, Albert 5
- Quesriers, Catharina 123-124
 Quintilian 11, 34, 39-40, 43, 47, 53, 58,
 128, 130
- Radau, Michael 82
 Ramus Petrus 9, 11, 127
 Ravesteyn, johan van 81-83
 Reael, Laurens 52-53, 56, 60-61
 Revius, Jacobus 32-33
 Rodenburgh, Theodore 11
 Roemers, *see* Visscher
 Rogers, Daniel 30
 Ronsard, Pierre de 5-11, 27, 29 31, 44, 46,
 49, 71, 95, 110
 Roovere, Amhoni, de 39, 47
 Ruyter, Michiel Adrinenz de 83
- Sannazaro, Jacopo 49, 76
 Scaliger, Josephus Justus 29-31, 35
 Scaliger, Julius Caesar 6, 8, 11, 21-36, 80,
 126
 Schnbaelje, Dierick 93 97, 101
 Schabbelic, TunPluhps 93, 100, 101
 Schmirz, H.-G. 56
 Scburmau, Anna Maria van 118-120
 Scvvenus Perrus 73
 Scbillet, Thomas 33, 37, 46-47, 71
 Secundus, Janus 110, III
 Sellin, I. 35
- Seneca 62
 Shuger, D. 48
- Sidney, Philip 30- 1
 Silvius, Theodorus 84-86
 Simonides 7
 Sluurer, Willem 75
 Smit, W.A.P. 11
 Spiegel, Hendrick Laurensz. 48 49, 51-54,
 56, 61-63 65 67, 70-71
 Stobaeus 5, 10
 Strada, Famianus xz, 86
 Sylvius, Willem 45-46
 Synesius of Cyrene, Bishop 59
- Tasso, Torquato 102, 123
 Theon 9, 80-81
 Thomas Aquinas 6, 9
 Thvsius, Anronius 79
 Tillpius, Marthaeus 81-83, 86
 Trello, Lucretiu van 117
 Tubelius, Ilcnricus 83-86, 88-91
- Urbanus Pope 81
- Vanderheyden, Jan E. 40
 Veer, Cornelia van der 123 124
 Vickers, H. 26•34
 Virgil 23 26, 4-1, 46, 70, 72
 Visscher, Ann" Rocnu-rsdr, 33, 72, 118-119,
 122-123
 Visscher, Rocruer 33, 49-50, 54-56, 63-67
 Visscher, Tesselschade Roemersdr. 31, 122-
 123
 Visser, P. 93
 Vives, Juan Luis 114-115
 Vondel, Joost van den 31 33, 36, 69, 72, 76,
 97-105, 125-126, 128-133
 vossius Gerardus Joanne 10-jr, 35, 69,
 79-80, 83-84, 125-130, 133
- Waesberghe, junssonius van 82
 Walaeus, Antonius 79
 Weinberg, B. 5-6, 21, 23, 27
 William, Prince of Orange 29, 48, 52, 60
 Wilson, Thomas 40
- Zevecote, Jacob van 72, 122

Tabula Gratulatoria

Dr. W. Abrahamse, luxemburg (L)
Jail Bank, Amsterdam
Boudewijn Bakker, Amsterdam
B. Bastiaan, Hoorn
Bibliotheek Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam
Jann Bloemendal, Voorthuizen
Prof. J. den Boeft, Leiden
Dr. Th.S.J.G. Bogels, Nes aan de Amstel
Drs. H.M. Borst, Zaandam
J.A.H. Sots, Nijmegen
Fred de Bree, Amsterdam
Ph. H. Breuker, Boazum
Prof. CA. Brusati, Ann Arbor, Michigan (USA)
Dr. T. van Buren, Utrecht
Drs. E. Chayes, Amsterdam
H.J. van Dam, Leiden
Dr. H.G. van den Doel, Haarlem
Drs. M.M.M. van Dongen, Amsterdam
Prof. Mr. S. Faber, Haarlem
Dr. EC. Fabian, Leidschendam
Dr. A.e.G. Heurkens, Den Haag
Prof. Dr. D.W. Fokkema, Amselveen
Prof. W. Franirs, Syracuse NY (USA)
Dr. A. Hank-van Westrienen, Heemsrede
Drs. CIM. Free, 's-Herrogenbosch
Prof. Jr. Willem Th.M. Frijhoff, Amsterdam
Drs. M.s. Ceesink, Leiden
Prof. Or. C.C.A.M. van Ccmcr, St. Anthonis
Lia van Ccmcr, Utrecht
Dr. LE Groenendijk, Oegsrgces:
Prof. dr. E.K. Crootes, Haarlem
J. den Haan, Aalsmeer
Drs. Frieda de Haas, Oosrz.ian
Dr. E.O.G. Hairsma Mulier, Amsterdam
Prof. Jr. J.D.F. van Halsema, Amsterdam
Dr. A.J.E. Harmsen, Leiden
A.E.c.: Harvey-Simoni, M.A., Cillingbarn, Dorset (GB)
Prof. E. Haverkamp Begemann, New York (USA)
Prof. dr. CL. Hecksackers, Leiden

Jan A.C. van der Heijden, Tilburg
 C.F.T.M. Herben, Amsterdam
 Prof. T.J. Hermans, Hemel Hempstead (GB)
 Dr. Th.C.J. van der Heijden, Delft
 Bibliotheek P.C. Hoofthuis, afdeling Nederlands, Amsterdam
 Prof. dr. E. Ibsch, Arnhem
 Prof. dr. F.J. van Ingen, Zeist
 Prof. dr. Th.A.J.M. Janssen, Hilversum
 Drs. Annelies de Jeu, Utrecht
 E. de Jongh, Utrecht
 Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen, afdeling Nederlands
 Drs. A.G.H. Kerckhoffs, Breda
 Prof. dr. J.J. Kloek, Loosdrecht
 Drs. R. Kocic - Terpstra, Alkmaar
 Koninklijke Academie voor Nederlandse Taal- en Letterkunde, Gent (B)
 Prof. dr. J.W.H. Konst, Berlin (D)
 A.G.M. Koopman, Bussum
 Johan Koppenol, Leiden
 N. Lunmeijer-van Deursen, Den Haag
 Ad Lennerveld, Heerlen
 Drs. J.W.R. Lierderie, Sloten (Fr.)
 Prof. dr. J.A. van Leuvensteijn, Oegstgeest
 Dr. Jan van Luxemburg, Haarlem
 Drs. O. van Marion, Oegstgeest
 G.L.F. Mamef, Antwerpen (B.)
 E.H. Mutter, Naarden
 Prof. M.A. Meadow, Santa Barbara (USA)
 Dr. Hubert Meeus, Kessel-Loo (B)
 Dr. H. Midem, Amsterdam
 Drs. P.H. Moser, Maastricht
 Drs. CH. Nabben, Ceko
 Dr. J. Noordegraaf, Amsterdam
 Leo Noordegraaf, Kolhorn
 G.J. Oevering, Dordrecht
 Drs. M. van Os, Amsterdam
 K.A. Ottcuheym, Utrecht
 Prof. dr. K. Porreman, Leuven (B)
 Mrs M.M. van Randwijk, Amsterdam
 Prof. dr. P.H. van Recnen, Amsterdam
 Prof. dr. Hilde de Ridder-Symoenv, Lovendegem (B)
 Drs. M. van Riecke-n-Rozu, Den Helder
 Drs. A. Res. Barnveld
 Rotterdamse Leeskring, Rotterdam
 Prof. dr. M.A. Schenkeveld-van der Dussen, Leidschendam
 Prof. dr. Hugo de Schepper, Nijmegen
 M.J. Scholz-Heerspink, Amsterdam

Rhetoric, Rhetoricians ,,,,d Poets

Drs. P.J. Schuffel, Amsterdam
Dr. E.J. Sluifrer, Den Haag
Drs. **M.L.** van Soest, Amsterdam
j.A.M.G. Steeghs, Heeswijk-Dinther
Dr. **C.F.M.** Streng, Amsterdam
Drs. L.G.C. Stnetman, Cambridge (GB)
Dr. E. Stronks, Utrecht
C.P. van der Sroom, Amsterdam
Dr. P.G.B. Thissen, Rocrmond
Dr. R.K. Todd, Oegsteest
Drs. E.M. Tol-Verkuyt, Amsrelvccn
Drs. A. van Toorn, Amsterdam
Or. M. van Vaeck, Leuven (B.)
Or. P.j. Verkruijssc, Amsterdam
Dr. P.L.L. Verkuyt, Haren (Gr.)
Drs. **W.** Vermeer, Zcistr
Prof. dr. J.j.V.M. de Vet, Beek-Uhhergen
Prof. dr. P. Visser, Zaandam
W.B. de Vries-Schenkveld, Amsterdam
Dr. Manjke .l. van der Wal, Oegsrgeesr
Prof. dr. LCE. van der Wall, Lciden
M. Wcsrstmre, Oldenzaul
Zeeuwse Bibliotheek, Middelburg
Roe! Zemel, Amsterdam
Ad Zuidercnr, Amsterdam