

WARBURG LIBRARY COMMONS | SCHOOL OF ADVANCED STUDY UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

[https://commons.warburg.sas.ac.uk/downloads/ww72bb50p]

Mack, Peter. *A history of Renaissance rhetoric, 1380-1620 : conclusion / Peter Mack.*

2011

Book Section

To cite this version:

Mack, P. (2011). *A history of Renaissance rhetoric, 1380-1620 : conclusion / Peter Mack*. Oxford UP. https://doi.org/https://global.oup.com/academic/product/a-history-of-renaissance-rhetoric-1380-1620-9780199597284?cc=gb&lang=en&

Available at: https://commons.warburg.sas.ac.uk/concern/published_works/m039k489b

Publisher's URL: https://global.oup.com/academic/product/a-history-of-renaissance-rhetoric-1380-1620-9780199597284?cc=gb&lang=en&

DOI: https://global.oup.com/academic/product/a-history-of-renaissance-rhetoric-1380-1620-9780199597284?cc=gb&lang=en&

Publisher: Oxford UP

Date submitted: 2020-05-29

Copyright is retained by the author. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the User Deposit Agreement.

Conclusion: The Impact of Renaissance Rhetoric

Between 1460 and 1700 Europe produced about 12,000 editions of around 40 ancient and perhaps 3,000 recent works largely concerned with rhetoric. In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries hundreds of grammar schools were founded, in most of which some form of rhetoric was taught at the culmination of the syllabus. For much of the sixteenth-century, outside Italy, classical rhetorical texts were taught in the Arts faculties of most universities. How did this immense effort of writing, printing and teaching change the kind of rhetoric that was learned? What impact did renaissance rhetoric have on reading, behaviour and culture? How did renaissance rhetoric differ from medieval rhetoric?

These questions cannot be answered in full through a history which is largely based on textbooks but we can make a useful start on them. Medieval rhetoric was taught through five main types of textbook: texts of and commentaries on *Rhetorica ad Herennium* and *De inventione*; letter-writing manuals (*artes dictaminis*); preaching manuals; textbooks for the composition of poetry (such as Geoffrey de Vinsauf's *Poetria nova*); and classical and early medieval treatises on the tropes and figures (such as Bede's *Liber de schematibus et tropis*).[1] As we have seen renaissance writers made alterations to most of these types. Many new classical texts were discovered, circulated widely through printing and commented on. New versions of manuals on letterwriting, preaching and the tropes and figures were produced, which reflected better knowledge of the classical texts and adaptation to contemporary circumstances. Most significantly, especially in Northern Europe hundreds of new manuals of rhetoric were composed, widely circulated and used as the basis for teaching. A few of these manuals can be connected with the medieval arts of poetry (for example Erasmus's *De copia* teaches amplification in ways that partly parallel the *Poetria nova*) but for the most part they resulted from collaboration with dialectic and from attempts to absorb the teaching of newly discovered classical textbooks, especially Greek ones. None of the medieval rhetorical textbooks was widely printed. On the other hand Guarino's methods of teaching retain many medieval elements. The classical texts studied and the writing exercises undertaken at the Elizabethan grammar-school show considerable continuity with their medieval forbears, alongside changes in approach and in the writing textbooks employed. The most important changes brought about during the renaissance were the result of two centuries of change rather than of a sudden break with the past.

By the end of the sixteenth century a greater range of rhetorical ideas was far more widely available than in 1380. Although *Rhetorica ad Herennium* remained important as a teaching manual its teaching could now be supplemented by a much wider availability of other classical texts and by hundreds of new works. Ramus and Talon on one side and Soarez on the other offered alternative versions of the elementary rhetoric course; the former based on analysis of literary texts, topical invention, logical structure, the tropes and figures, prose rhythm and delivery; the latter providing more of the traditional syllabus (the five skills, the four parts of the oration, rules for the exordium), but focusing on the topics, amplification, deliberative

[1] Good starting points on medieval rhetoric would be J. J. Murphy, *Rhetoric In the Middle Ages* (Berkeley, 1974), Murphy ed., *Medieval Eloquence: Studies in the Theory and Practice of Medieval Rhetoric* (Berekeley, 1978), J. Ward, *Ciceronian Rhetoric in Treatise, Scholion and Commentary* (Turnhour, 1995) and the studies there listed by G. C. Alessio, M. Camargo, R. Copeland, K. M. Fredborg, M. Richardson, J. Ward and M. C. Woods. Further bibliography at V. Cox and Ward eds, *The Rhetoric of Cicero* (Leiden, 2006), pp. 475-520.

and epideictic oratory, the forms of argumentation, arousing the emotions, tropes, figures and prose rhythm. Some English grammar school pupils followed a course based on letter-writing, the tropes and figures, *copia* and the *progymnasmata*. Beyond these different elementary courses advanced teachers and graduates had the possibility of choosing between or combining the doctrines of many more widely available textbooks.

New developments in rhetoric were prompted by five main factors. First, the recovery and retranslation of Greek rhetorical authors, such as Aristotle, Hermogenes, Longinus, Demetrius and Menander gave access to important new ideas in many aspects of rhetoric, including emotion, epideictic and style. Second the close relationship between rhetoric and dialectic and the humanist approach to dialectic prompted new attention to the topics, a new understanding of the argumentative structure of texts and ways of questioning and improving established doctrines. Third, many doctrines were reformulated and reorganised as modern writers tried to produce simplified textbooks which would better convey the essential points of the subject to contemporary audiences, preparing them for learning through study of classical texts and through composing their own letters, themes and poems. Fourth, this practice of teaching through analysis Cicero's speeches and classical Latin poetry required intensive study of the practical application of traditional rhetorical teachings (such as the tropes and figures and the rules for exordia) and of their effects on audiences. Finally the new genres of textbook, such as the letter-writing manuals, which were adapted from medieval models, organised their discussion of the types of texts to be composed and the content of those texts in ways that were much better suited to contemporary reality than the traditional restriction of rhetoric to three types.

From the doctrinal point of view one could group renaissance rhetoric's major new and developed ideas in eight headings. First style continued to be a key part of rhetorical teaching. Indeed Talon and Vives treated it as the defining part of the subject. The tropes and figures were the subject of intense study, with a great deal of emphasis on studying their practical use by the great writers and several attempts to reorganise them on a more logical basis. These different ways of organising the figures direct attention to the striking differences among the figures, especially between figures which describe a pattern of words or sounds and those which suggest an attitude which a speaker might present to an audience. New handbooks of the tropes and figures proved to be very successful. A knowledge of the tropes and figures and their potential for effective expression was planted early in the grammar-school course and reinforced by teachers' oral commentary on the classical texts studied. The tropes and figures were not the whole of renaissance rhetoric's teaching of style but they remained the most important part, featuring largely in almost all manuals of the whole subject as well as many specialized manuals and grammar books. The wish to reform the medieval *cursus* and knowledge of Cicero's *Orator* prompted considerable further study of prose rhythm. In the course of the sixteenth century Greek ideas about style were absorbed and taught alongside the traditional Ciceronian three levels.

Secondly Erasmus's *De copia* affected the study of rhetoric in several different ways. *Copia* of words directed further attention to the use of the tropes and figures and facilitated a new intricate and exuberant style of expression. His examples of hundreds of increasingly bizarre ways of putting the same simple idea promoted a playful approach to the possibilities of expression. *Copia* of things suggests practical ways of using the topics of invention to generate more material, suggesting ways of thinking around a subject. Within this section Erasmus also gives valuable

instructions for writing descriptions and comparisons and for using proverbs and examples to decorate and reinforce an argument. He also provides a very influential account of the method of using a commonplace book in order to store maxims or stories from one's reading in order to keep them ready for use in one's own compositions.

Thirdly the study of the emotions and the ways of using arguments and expressions to arouse emotions in the audience became a much more important aspect of rhetoric in the sixteenth century thanks to the renewed availability of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and to attempts to absorb its teaching within modern handbooks of rhetoric. Most of these writers depended very heavily on Aristotle, though some tried to adapt his teaching so as to discuss a more Christian idea of emotion and to incorporate emotions likely to be useful in preaching. Practice in arousing emotions could also be linked to Greek ideas of style and to the sublime, but its main focus was on understanding the audience and developing arguments likely to appeal to that audience.

Fourthly letter-writing manuals presented simple instructions for composing texts suited to renaissance social conditions. In place of the three genres of rhetoric (which some writers, following Melanchthon increased to four) they proposed types of letter which reflected the types of message contemporaries were likely to want to convey. Teaching letter-writing relied on the imitations of arguments, structures and phrases from classical and neo-Latin letters. By asking pupils to begin letters by thinking about the nature of their relationship with the addressee and about the kinds of arguments and expressions which are appropriate to their relative positions, letterwriting manuals revive the study of self-presentation (*ethos*). Much of their advice on the different approaches one might take in, for example, asking for a favour or consoling someone for the death of a relative is as helpful in thinking about what one might say to someone in such a situation as it is as advice on how to write.

Fifthly renaissance rhetoric reinvigorated the study of disposition. Where Ciceronian rhetoric treated invention largely as a matter of composing in order the parts of the four part oration, allowing disposition to discuss occasions when one element might be omitted or the order might be changed, letter-writing manuals and the *progymnasmata* presented renaissance students with many different possible structures. Dialectical reading encouraged pupils to investigate the organisation of the texts they read. Agricola argued that the structure of the composition was something which the writer had to determine, having studied the context and audience of the speech and having worked out the arguments to be employed and the emotion to be aroused. That decision could always be assisted by study of classical and modern models.

Sixthly, epideictic oratory, speeches or texts composed for celebration, praise or blame, came to be seen as a much more important part of rhetoric. This development had already occurred in the Roman Empire but the classical texts which were most used in the early renaissance, *Rhetorica ad Herennium* and *De inventione*, reflected the earlier state of affairs, based on the Greek city-state, in which judicial and deliberative oratory were regarded as the most important types. This change in approach was prompted partly by the political situation, in which defended trials and open political deliberations were relatively rare, partly by the experience of writing

neo-Latin orations, which often involved praise, and partly by the recovery of Greek rhetoric texts such as Menander Rhetor.[2]

The seventh area is argument. The topics of invention had long been an important part of rhetoric but Agricola directed new attention to understanding the nature of the relationships expressed by the topics. He also promoted dialectical commentary on texts which aimed to recover the structures of argument underlying poems and speeches and directed readers' attention to learning from the ways in which Cicero and Vergil had employed the topics. Agricola also discussed the practical use of arguments in texts and the ways in which narratives could be written in order to support and convey arguments. Melanchthon and Ramus further developed the simplification of logic as a basis for the study of argument in practice.

Finally, imitation. Fifteenth-century Italian controversies about whether Cicero should be the only model for Latin prose were taken up and developed into practical instructions for the best ways to use reading in the great authors in order to improve first style and then other aspects of writing. Theorists developed the position that the textbooks of rhetoric and dialectic were only a starting point and that the real learning was done by analysing classical or modern texts and writing works of one's own.[3] Rhetoric provided a set of categories and principles which would enable the reader to begin the analysis but the analysis might show that the writer had made use of the repertoire of techniques in innovative ways. Imitation thus became a way of using great writers' works to go beyond the necessarily simple principles of the handbooks, rather than a matter of slavishly restricting oneself to the vocabulary and phrasing of a single author.[4]

The impact of rhetoric on particular sixteenth-century works and on renaissance writing in general has been the subject of many books and hundreds of articles. In the few pages which conclude this book I can only give a few indications and some suggestions for further reading. As our understanding of rhetorical theory improves, so the possibility for writing about the impact of rhetoric will change. In this brief indicative discussion I will consider the impact of renaissance rhetoric on reading, on practical behaviour and on culture, primarily visual and literary culture.

Renaissance rhetorical training taught techniques for reading. The graduates of renaissance schools were more active as readers than as writers. Schoolboys were expected to collect Latin vocabulary, phrases, sentences and narratives from their reading in order to keep them ready for reuse in their own compositions. Instruction and practice in compiling commonplace books inculcated the habit of asking of any passage read, first, is this striking enough to record, and second, under which of my headings should I place it. Both these kinds of reading have fairly been described as reading in fragments, but the montage of material in the commonplace book also suggests new connections between different works and between different sections of the same work, a form of reading based on theme rather than temporal sequence.

The intimate connection between reading and writing compelled students to read as fellow-practitioners, observing the way in which the writer used a particular

[2] O. B. Hardison, *The Enduring Monument* (Chapel Hill NC, 1962), A. Leigh De Neef, "Epidecitic Rhetoric and the Renaissance Lyric", Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies 3 (1973): 203-31, J. W. O'Malley, *Praise and Blame in Renaissance Rome* (Durham NC, 1979), B. Vickers, "Epideictic and Epic in the Renaissance", *New Literary History* 14 (1982-3): 497-537.

[3] In some respects this represents a return to Cicero's position in *De oratore*.

[4] M. L. McLaughlin, *Literary Imitation in the Italian Renaissance* (Oxford, 1995), T. M. Greene, *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry* (New Haven, 1982), V. Pineda, *La imitación como arte literario en el siglo xvi español* (Seville, 1994).

trope or figure, whose name they knew, and which they too employed. Reflecting on the ways in which different writers used the same technique suggested conclusions about the qualities of their writing. Training in techniques of amplification was reinforced by teachers pointing out stylistically elaborated passages in Cicero and Vergil. In their own reading pupils would notice passages of amplification and ask themselves about the writer's purpose in working up some passages and leaving others briefer and plainer. Being taught to construct and notice, for example, descriptions, comparisons, speeches for a character and commonplaces suggested ways to understand the contribution of different elements to a scene or chapter.

In contrast to the fragmentation involved in some types of rhetorical reading, other aspects of their training helped readers notice structures in texts. Dialectical analysis exposed the chains of syllogisms underlying a passage or attempted to show how a complete speech or poem presented an argument in response to a question. Practice in composing letters and *progymnasmata* made pupils aware of a wider range of possible structures for texts than the classical four-part oration. Structure was also a concern for teachers in their commenting on Terence, Cicero, Vergil, Ovid and Horace. Renaissance rhetoricians and teachers believed that the principles had always to be tested and improved by applying them to reading the great classical authors.

Reading texts rhetorically always involved thinking about the writer's purpose in writing and the way in which thinking about the responses of the audience shaped the way stories and arguments were presented. Renaissance authors of rhetorics and sermon manuals gave particular attention to self-presentation and arousing emotions in the audience. These types of awareness add to the resources of the reader. Rhetoric characteristically connects close observation of linguistic form with comment on its effect on an audience. This grip on the consequences of form, together with the fact that it was widely taught enabled rhetoric to provide tools of analysis to other forms of discourse. For example Patricia Rubin has argued that Vasari's categories for discussing painters are based on rhetoric, while Quentin Skinner has pointed out the impact of rhetorical ideas and terminology on Machiavelli and renaissance political thought.[5]

Rhetoric had a considerable impact on practical life because it taught people how to use language effectively for persuasion. We can find evidence of the practical use of rhetoric in notebooks, in which people recorded what they had read or heard, or planned out arguments which they would make, and in letters, where they sought to put across a point of view. Rhetorical advice on self-presentation and on effective ways of telling stories can be seen in action in court depositions of the period, where individuals give evidence and judges cross-examine them in order to establish the plausibility and honesty of their accounts. Cross-checking of apparently unimportant details serves as a check on a witness's broader credibility. As preparation for meetings of the privy council, Sir William Cecil collected arguments supporting and opposing a course of action, supporting them with whatever evidence, including precedents and maxims, he could find. Parliamentary orators constructed their speeches in logical sequences as replies to the arguments made by previous speakers but employed proverbs and narratives to drive their points home to the audience.[6] Studies by Wallace, Moss and Vickers have shown how rhetorical principles assisted

[5] P. Rubin, *Giorgio Vasari: Art and History* (New Haven, 1995), pp. 156-8, 332-3, 387-92, Q. Skinner, *The Origins of Modern Political Thought*, 2 vols (Cambridge, 1978), I, pp. 23-48, 152-86.
[6] Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric*, pp. 103-34, 176-252.

the development and presentation of scientific ideas from Galileo to the Royal Society.[7]

Less easy to quantify is the possible impact of rhetoric on behaviour. We know that renaissance letter-writing manuals drew attention to presenting oneself and making arguments suited to one's position in relation to the recipient. The figures of thought suggest different attitudes which the speaker's choice of words and tone might show to the audience. Rhetoric provides categories for describing a life and for determining what is useful or honourable, or suitable to different ages. We find evidence of this type of material being collected and presented in histories and romances. It is likely that these informal types of ethical teaching influenced people's behaviour but many of these ideas are so embodied in renaissance culture that it would be difficult to prove precise connections.[8]

High culture provides many instances in which rhetorical ideas can be seen in action, but here we must remember that, particularly for great artists, the norms of rhetoric offer a set of expectations or norms which writers can exploit in order to achieve their expressive effects. Huamnist histories frequently employ rhetorical ideas. So we find historians writing speeches which it would have been appropriate for Edward IV (Hall) or Paolo Antonio Soderini (Guicciardini) to have delivered. We find elaborated depictions of character, embellishing the subjects of epideictic with figures of amplification, descriptions of cities and landscapes, derived from *De copia*. Historians frequently comment on the general lessons illustrated by some failure of strategy or trait of character. They present their readers with models of behaviour and principles of political conduct.

Turning to responses to painting we find words with linguistic and rhetorical overtones like *copia* and variety, ornament and dignity. A good composition will above all show decorum in the depiction of the bodies and will be highlighted with effective use of colour.[9] We can see how ideas like ornament, decorum and proportion apply as easily to painting as to language. Some of the humanist observers of painting consider the portrayal of character and the impact on the audience of the manner in which an artist chooses to depict a figure. Ideas of harmony and structure are helpful in considering buildings. The appreciation of a building has a temporal element which can align it with rhetorical ideas about introductions and conclusions and about building a narrative towards a climax.

Rhetoric and dialectic contribute to the form and effect of renaissance literature. It is hard to imagine the mighty line of Marlowe's *Tamburlaine* without rhetorical notions of amplification. Sister Miriam Joseph and Brian Vickers have shown the evidence in Shakespeare's writing of a thorough understanding of the

[7] B. Vickers, "Epideictic Rhetoric in Galileo's *Dialogo*", *Annali dell'Istituto e Museo di Storia della Scienza di Firenze* 8 (1983): 69-102, "The Royal Society and English Prose Style: A Reassessment", in B. Vickers, N. Struever, *Rhetoric and the Pusruit of Truth* (Los Angeles, 1985), pp. 1-76, Jean Dietz Moss, *Novelties in the Heavens: Rhetoric and Science in the Copernican Controversy* (Chicago, 1993), Jeanne Fahnestock, *Rhetorical Figures in Science* (New York, 1999), Jean Dietz Moss and William Wallace, *Rhetoric and Dialectic in the Time of Galileo* (Washington, 2003).

[8] N. Panichi, *La virtù eloquente: la civil conversazione nel rinascimento* (Urbino, 1994), F. Whigham, "Interpretation at Court: Courtesy and the Performer-Audience Dialectic", *New Literary History* 14 (1982-3): 623-40, C. Bates, *The Rhetoric of Courtship in Elizabethan Language and Literature* (Cambridge, 1992), J. Richards, *Rhetoric and Courtliness in Early Modern Literature* (Cambridge, 2003).

[9] M. Baxandall, *Giotto and the Orators*, pp. 97-139, *Painting and Experience in Fifteenth Century Italy* (Oxford, 1972), pp. 122-4, 131-7, 150-1, J. Spencer, "Ut Rhetorica Poesis: A Study in Quattrocento Theory of Painting", *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 20 (1957): 26-44, C. van Eck, *Classical Rhetoric and the Visual Arts in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2007).

tropes and figures.[10] Terence Cave has argued that Erasmus's *De copia* influenced Rabelais's style and his elaboration of material.[11] Sonnets frequently exploit logical language, while falling into sections based on the development and exemplification of an argument or the conflict between two arguments. In Shakespeare's Sonnet 73 the parallel comparison of three vivid images (autumn, evening, embers) with the speaker's age pushes the reader almost beyond logic in understanding the relationship between imminent death and past life. In Montaigne and Shakespeare the resources of narrative and argument are enriched by practice in questioning, comparing and copia.[12]

Montaigne is rather critical of rhetoric, especially in *De la vanité des paroles* (*Essais* I, 51) but the ways in which he develops his arguments and reflections depend on rhetorical teaching about reading and composition.[13] His earlier chapters often begin from a grammar-school juxtaposition of narratives and axioms in response to a question (is defiance the best way to elicit mercy from a victorious soldier? Can lying succeed?), but in revision counter-examples are found and in turn moralised, earlier morals are questioned and newly found parallels between cases prompt further elaboration. Thus within a section on a liar needing a good memory, Montaigne can develop a series of partly playful reasons why it is a good thing to have a bad memory.[14] Dialectical techniques, such as differentiating meanings, questioning conclusions and finding contraries discover new material which can then be drawn out with examples from reading or techniques derived from *copia* of words and things. Incidents from his own life are brought in as evidence and then apparently subjected to the same type of questioning as the axioms and narratives taken over from reading. Some of the delight in reading a text like this comes from admiration of the writer's reasoning; some from the reader being encouraged to the same type of questioning of stories and conclusions. Perhaps it is because Montaigne turns in so many directions that very different readers (selectively) find themselves in reading the *Essais*. The special kinds of self-consciousness which we find in the renaissance derive partly from rhetorical awareness of the different *personae* one might attempt to project in order to win different arguments before different audiences. The sense that personality could be changed deliberately may have encouraged reflection like Montaigne's on the changeability of his own character from moment to moment.

The soliloquies in *Hamlet* present themselves as copiously worked up explorations of sentences or questions (My mother married my uncle so quickly; why can't I react to grief as this actor would?). Then other voices add in exclamations or objections. Hamlet turns on his own attempt to act like the player, accusing himself of being a whore or a coward. Claudius first persuades himself that grace is sufficient to forgive even a fratricide, before reminding himself that he would be required to repent and forgo the rewards of his crime. He resolves to attempt repentance but finds

[10] M. Joseph, *Shakespeare's Use of the Arts of Language* (New York, 1947), B. Vickers, "Shakespeare's use of rhetoric", in K. Muir and S. Schoenbaum eds, *A New Companion to Shakespeare Studies* (Cambridge, 1971), pp. 83-98, Russ McDonald, *Shakespeare and the Arts of Language* (Oxford, 2001).

[11] T. Cave, *The Cornucopian Text* (Oxford, 1979), pp. 3-34, 171-222.

[12] See my forthcoming *Rhetoric and Reading in Montaigne and Shakespeare*.

[13] T. Cave, *How to read Montaigne* (London, 2007), pp. 3, 22-4, N. Panichi, "Rhétorique", in P. Desan ed., *Dictionnaire de Michel de Montaigne* (Paris, 2004), pp. 873-6, F. Lestringant ed., *Rhétorique de Montaigne* (Paris, 1985), J. Supple et al. ed., *Montaigne et la rhétorique* (Paris, 1995).

[14] Montaigne, *Les Essais*, ed. J Balsamo et al, I 8, pp. 55-7.

himself incapable of it.[15] Where the dramatist succeeds in the obligation to portray an exciting story, ideas and alternatives can be explored fully without the audience losing the central drive of the performance. Claudius can enact guilt as well as think about it. Parallel situations, as in the revenges of Hamlet, Laertes and Fortinbras, enable us to compare the thinking and behaviour of different characters, with the result that the audience obtains an inside and outside view. So, although we are attracted by Hamlet's eloquence and intelligence, the overwhelmingly vivid depiction of Ophelia's madness and death forces us to realise that Hamlet never acknowledged his own guilt in the way that Claudius did.

Over the last thirty years a rich vein of studies has demonstrated the impact of renaissance rhetoric on literature after 1600. Marc Fumaroli showed how renaissance and especially post-Tridentine rhetoric affected the preaching, parliamentary and legal oratory of early seventeenth century France.[16] Peter France has examined Racine's use of rhetoric.[17] López Grigera, Marijke Spies and Bill Kennedy have studied the impact of rhetoric on Spanish, Dutch, Italian, French and English renaissance literature.[18] Tom Sloane and others have explored the use of rhetoric in seventeenth century English poetry and prose.[19] Brian Vickers has traced its use in the whole tradition of English poetry and in the modern novel.[20] Quentin Skinner, Victoria Kahn and Lorna Hutson have investigated rhetoric's contribution to political philosophy and law.[21]

But we still have an immense amount to discover, about the impact of renaissance rhetoric on people's lives and behaviour but also about textbooks and teaching. We need more studies of renaissance commentaries on classical rhetoric manuals (particularly Aristotle's *Rhetoric*), orations and poems. We need more studies of the effect of particular rhetoric textbooks in the teaching (and students' exercises) of individual schools and universities during particular periods. New editions of works by major rhetoricians like George Trapezuntius, Melanchthon, Sturm would give us valuable information about their use of sources and their revision of their teaching. New studies of the influence of particular classical texts (for example Cicero's *De oratore*, Quintilian, Hermogenes and Aphthonius)[22] would

[15] Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, ed. A. Thompson and N. Taylor (London, 2006), I.2.129-59, II.2. 484-540, III.3.36-72.

[16] Marc Fumaroli, *L'âge de l'éloquence* (Geneva, 1980), Pierre Zoberman, *Les Cérémonies de la parole* (Paris, 1998), Claudine Jomphe, *Les théories de la dispositio et le Grand Oeuvre de Ronsard* (Paris, 2000).

[17] P. France, *Racine's Rhetoric* (Oxford, 1965), *Rhetoric and Truth in France: Descartes to Diderot* (Oxford, 1972).

[18] L. López Grigera, *La retórica en la España del siglo de oro* (Salamanca, 1994), M. Spies, *Rhetoric, Rhetoricians and Poets* (Amsterdam, 1999), W. J. Kennedy, *Rhetorical Norms in Renaissance Literature* (New Haven, 1978).

[19] Thomas O. Sloane and R. B. Waddington eds, *The Rhetoric of Renaissance Poetry* (Berkeley, 1974), T. O. Sloane, *Donne, Milton and the End of Humanist Rhetoric* (Berkeley, 1985), N. Rhodes, *The Power of Eloquence and English Renaissance Literature* (Basingstoke, 1992).

[20] B. Vickers, *Classical Rhetoric in English Poetry* (London, 1970), *In Defence of Rhetoric* (Oxford, 1988), pp. 294-339, 375-434, P. Mack, "Rhetoric and Poetry", in T. Sloane ed., *Encyclopaedia of Rhetoric* (New York, 2001), pp. 603-12.

[21] Q. Skinner, "Thomas Hobbes: Rhetoric and the Construction of Morality", *Proceedings of the British Academy* 76 (1990), pp. 1-61, *Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes* (Cambridge, 1996), V. Kahn, *Rhetoric, Prudence and Skepticism* (Ithaca, 1985), Kahn and L. Hutson eds, *Rhetoric and Law in Early Modern Europe* (New Haven, 2001), Hutson, *The Invention of Suspicion: Law and Mimesis in Shakespeare and Renaissance Drama* (Oxford, 2007).

[22] On Aphthonius Manfred Kraus is preparing an up-to-date list of renaissance editions and has published some preliminary studies, including "Progymnasmata, Gymnasmata", in Gert Ueding ed.,

be very helpful. Thanks to Green and Murphy's *Renaissance Rhetoric Short-Title Catalogue* and to numerous studies by members of the ISHR we now have a much better idea of what remains for us to do.

Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik, VII (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2005), cols. 159-191, "Aphthonius and the Progymnasmata in Rhetorical Theory and Practice", in David Zarefsky and Elizabeth Benacka eds, *Sizing Up Rhetoric* (Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, 2008), pp. 52-67.