

DS Mayfield (ed.)
Proceedings

**“Rhetoric and Drama”, International Conference, FU Berlin,
February 11–12, 2016**

Rhetoric being processual, the ensuing proceedings are tendered by the present editor to provide the reader with a substantive description of the academic dynamics during the conference: its *actio*, energetic discussions, positions taken—both challenging and accommodating other views. In conducting to *memoria*, these synopses might serve as a heuristic *locus* for *inventio*.

Synopses of Papers Given (Feb 11–12, 2016)

**Kathy Eden (Columbia U, New York City)
“From the Refutation of Drama to the Drama of Refutation”
(Feb 11, 2016 · 4.30 – 5.30 p.m.)**

Précis

Eden’s presentation linked dramatic practice to legal procedure, specifically to that of refutation. She stressed that, from the earliest school days onward (sc. already in the *progymnasmata*), students would be (and were forced to be) familiar with this forensic basis. Referring to Quintilian, Eden accentuated that “it takes an artist to refute”—the *télos* being victory in court; moreover, Quintilian stresses that ‘it is easier to dismantle than to construct, easier to accuse than to

These proceedings were prepared by the present editor on the basis of immediate handwritten notes, which were checked against the summary minutes taken by the conference team: Andrea Dueñas Paredes, Lena Maria Hein, Anna Lena Schächinger (two assigned to each talk, all three to the final discussion). In addition to those by the speakers, the selected contributions to the discussions referred to below are by: Gasan Gusejnov, Natalia Sarana (HSE Moscow); Igor Candido (FU Berlin); Marie-Christin Wilm (Friedrich Schlegel Graduate School, FU Berlin); Gaia Gubbini, Tatiana Korneeva, Toni Bernhart, Gautam Chakrabarti, Sven Thorsten Kilian (all DramaNet, FU Berlin).

DS Mayfield, Freie Universität Berlin (Editor)



©2017 DS Mayfield.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 License.

defend'. In contrast to Plato (the Platonic 'Socrates'), Aristotle's pragmatics had emphasized that refuting is more important than being refuted.

Eden discerned a homology between forensic rhetoric and theater from the earliest beginnings of either. Euripides, for instance, is "most rhetorical". Moreover, various playwrights would "pit themselves against each other in a contest of words". While also adducing the *modus operandi* pertaining to proving or disproving a given event or action—for instance by eyewitnesses or hearsay, by signs (tokens)—Eden accentuated that, usually, there is a "dramatic back and forth", dynamic instances of defending (oneself), refuting and being refuted. In (partly very) long speeches of alternation (a sort of 'Q&A'), the aim was to highlight (the opponent's) inconsistencies. At times (as, for instance, in *Richard III*), there are moments of self-refutation, and also self-incrimination. Eden stressed that "Shakespeare is full of refutations and self-refutations", which are performed with equal artfulness.

Building on the fact that Greek rhetoricians draw from dramatists (and also vice versa), Eden highlighted "a deep structural homology between refutation in drama and in the forum"; formally, "alternation is a central feature in court and in drama". With reference to Plato's *Gorgias* (glossed as Plato's most dramatic and rhetorical, hence dynamic dialog), in which Socrates comically plays both parts in a dialog, Eden stated that (sophistic) rhetoricians "cater to the *óchlos*", which they seek to gratify. The character Socrates, however, states that 'he will be just as glad to refute as being refuted'—with the latter valued higher than the former (by the philosopher). The Platonic 'Socrates' therefore acknowledges rhetoric as agonal, contentious. Starting from the aspect of 'refuting the refutation', Eden highlighted the fact that refutation takes, and can take, several forms. The "rhetorical refutation of the law courts is worthless to Socrates", since it "depends on a large crowd (of witnesses)", the quantity of the audience is the distinctive quality; what matters in this form of (sophistic) refutation is the mass—while Socrates is in for singularity. He therefore wishes to reduce the (quantity of the) audience; ultimately, to "become our own most ardent refuters" (for personal benefit, insight). From this antagonism, Eden outlined the lovers of the *demos* on the one hand (*Gorgias*), and the lovers of philosophy on the other—with the latter aiming both at refuting and at being refuted (Socrates).

In the concluding part of her presentation, Eden stressed the fact that "Early Modern theater is full of refutations, both of self and others"—hence the metaphor of the "internal forum of the mind". Already Petrarch's confessions (the *Secretum*) might be read "as one long refutation, an elenctic dialog". Montaigne is "repeatedly refuting himself" in the *Essais*, placing a "higher premium on being refuted than refuting"—while Eden also acknowledged the fact that there

is a certain amount of “self-commendation in self-refutation” in Montaigne (the same as in Socrates).

Questions and Answers

- Most referred to the semantic range of the word *élenchos*, affirming that it not only signifies refutation (which tends to have a “negative” connotation), but also a “putting to the test”, which is more open in meaning (that is, ‘whether something be true’, here with reference to Sextus Empiricus, to Ancient Skepticism). The latter is particularly of import with regard to Montaigne (“essaying”).
- Eden, referring to Aristotle in particular (while not to Sextus), stated that there had been an “appropriation of legal terms”, which “carry a residue from the earlier meaning”; “the primary meaning is legal”; she stressed that this would not deny a (possible) change of meaning. Eden emphasized multiple cross-references between Aristotle’s *Poetics* and his *Rhetoric*, for instance with regard to *mimesis*, *praxis*, *páthos*—the latter being crucial qua experience; tragedy marks a real experience of suffering “done to us”; drama is both a “doing”, and a “having something done to us”. Eden stated that, generally, ‘drama became increasingly more rhetorical’, from Aeschylus to Euripides.
- Küpper agreed that “the device of refutation” is crucial during Early Modern times, but suggested a “secondary influence” for the “dialog with the self”, and one of high emotionality, namely Prudentius’ *Psychomachia*—hence a Christian background to the *praxis* and tradition of self-refutation. Montaigne tied in with the Classical model. In addition, Küpper asked about the absence of refutation as a device in the *Poetics*: “why does he avoid its explanation” there; and “to which elements, parts of tragedy” in the Aristotelian sense had Eden referred.
- As to *psychomachia*, Eden agreed that this would merit further scrutiny. With regard to Shakespeare’s Richard: “it is not his conscience talking to him”, hence this is “not a dialog, but more intensive”. She explained that Aristotle does not mention refutation specifically and explicitly in the *Poetics*, because he refers to it in his other works. On the whole, “drama has become increasingly more rhetorical”. With regard to the effect of refutation, Eden asserted that “it comes out of both kinds of experiences: doing the refuting, being refuted”, that is, ‘active and passive’, while the latter “seems more important” to Socrates, since it ‘leads to self-knowledge’.

Glenn W. Most (U of Pisa/U of Chicago)
**“Sad Stories of the Death of Kings: Sovereignty and Monarchy
 in Tragedy”**
(Feb 11, 2016 · 5.45 – 6.45 p.m.)

Précis

By way of introduction, Most stressed that it is impossible not to notice connections between drama and rhetoric: first, there are public speeches, and (references to) actions, and often violent ones; secondly, persuasion is a key aspect of either; thirdly, both are (performed) competitive(ly). In rhetoric as in drama, there is a tension between ‘accommodating’ tendencies and ‘dominating’ ones, while something that seems to accommodate may in fact tend toward domination, as well (sc. accommodation as a form of domination).

Most’s talk focused on the “exchange of stories” concerning “the sad death of kings” (referring to Shakespeare’s *Richard II*), where “the empty place of the king is occupied by Death”; in this context, he remarked that “the generic distinction between histories and tragedies is notoriously fluid”.

Most contrasted the Aristotelian *Poetics*’ implicit or tacit insistence on not once referring to *basiléos* or *týrannos* (“Aristotle’s stubborn silence”) with the “stubborn insistence” of Ancient tragedians on kings—there being “a king in every tragedy”. Yet a preference for emphasizing ethical aspects is discernible in Aristotle. The tragedians’ predilection is for the depiction of the “heroic age”, and in this sense one might say that “Greek tragedies are anachronous”—wherefore “historicization is not necessary” in this case. The last tyrant overthrown in Athens having been Hippias, kings were known to Athens either as Spartans or as Barbarians, respectively Persians.

Most proceeded to relate the chorus to the figure of the king: there is “no play without either chorus or king”, the chorus being “as essential as the king”. The latter prefers to interact via ‘intermediaries or directly’. The chorus’ distinctive features in terms of form and function are: it ‘sings, dances, moves, is plural, anonymous, and of a much lower status than a king’. In contrast to the king, “the chorus is always alive”, “cannot be killed”, but, “like the audience, remains alive”.

While “cooperative values”, “self-restraint”, “solidarity” are represented or imagined in the chorus, plays often represent the ambitious sons of kings, a king’s “individualism”, “arrogance, infatuation with power, disregard of the gods”, with the latter all coming to “one form or other of grief”—represented in a form of alternation. Generally (and with reference to Nietzsche), tragedy might

be said to explore the tensions between democracy (chorus) and monarchy (king).

Most stated that his emphasis was thus anthropological and political, with Greek tragedies ‘speaking to more than just 5th century BCE’ Athens. The “king’s freedom to pursue his ends is what makes him what he is”—there being “no one above him apart from the gods”. By contrast, “the chorus is bound up in all kinds of negotiations”; and, similarly to the chorus, the “spectators are transformed into a group”—the question being “with whom they identify”. Most stressed the fact that “every audience identifies with both the king and the chorus”, as well as with their actions—the latter being “presented in the extreme”, seeing that the emphasis of tragedy is on a “single moment of decision” (as per Aristotle). Moreover, in tragedy “human decision is never autonomous”, since there is always an ‘influence of the past’.

By way of conclusion, Most once more referred to the fact that, “at the end of a play, the king is often dead”. In Shakespeare’s *Richard II*, even this fact of being a king is cast into question, all sovereignty being (to some extent) fictional. Most stressed that this realization is often delegated to the chorus in Greek tragedy, since kings therein “all too often die before they can do so”.

Questions and Answers

- Küpper considered plausible the suggestion that tragedy functions as “democratic propaganda” in 5th century BCE Athens. In Early Modern times, there is no chorus, hence “no dichotomy between cooperative and competitive values”, ‘no discussion of democracy’. As regards Aristotle, Küpper agreed that the *Poetics* “depoliticizes drama”, and tragedy in particular (focusing on *kátharsis*, *hedoné* in terms of function)—the question being, whether this be conscious on Aristotle’s part.
- In response, Most accentuated that there is almost no space given to the chorus in Aristotle, “and none to the gods”, while he “sees tragedy primarily in ethical and rhetorical terms”, which are taken “from his other works almost wholesale”. Accordingly, Most’s “guess is, that it is really just Aristotle” himself, who valued tragedy rather positively in the *Poetics*. Plato had “attacked tragedy”, particularly since he feared that “emotions would get worse and worse, get out of hand”. Historically, tragedy had the function of “state regulation” in politics; but “Aristotle in his *Poetics* pays no attention to the political or religious aspect”. Most therefore emphasized that Aristotle’s ‘de-politicization of tragedy’ is in reaction to “Plato’s political and religious view”.

- Eden inquired further into the aspects of “political and autonomous sovereignty” in Plato in contrast to Aristotle, and their ‘varying responses to Greek tragedy’.
- Most replied that Plato is intensely focused on “sovereignty in ways Aristotle just is not”. “Plato is sensitive to sovereignty”, but reacted to “tragedy with intensity”—thinking “that everybody else reacted in the same way”. Aristotle “did understand tragedy”, while not being as sensitive to “sovereignty”.
- Kilian asked whether the distinction between history (play) and tragedy is not an “artificial genre distinction”.
- Most replied that the use of the term “historical” in Shakespeare is a “publishing issue”; the generic boundaries are relatively “fluid”.
- Wesche commented that Schiller thought the “chorus is not democratic”, that it was to ‘protect drama from reality’, and that Scaliger “avoided speech of the people”; hence Wesche inquired: “what is the rhetoric of the chorus”.
- Most said that he was *de re* “dissatisfied with Schiller’s account”, seeing that “no chorus is needed to protect tragedy from reality”; he again emphasized that “Aristotle hardly mentions the chorus”; to the question, Most answered that “the chorus has no rhetoric, except for the figural language, which is rhetorical”.
- With reference to the relation of rhetoric to (plot) logic, Gusejnov asked whether “pathos in Aristotle is not just an attribute”; for, in (plot) logical terms, the “king must be killed because of pathos”.
- Most stressed the aspect of “suffering” in this respect, not simply that of “experience”. The “subject of suffering is not the same” as that of “learning”.

Martha Feldman (U of Chicago)
“The Castrato as a Rhetorical Figure”
(Feb 12, 2016 · 09.00 – 10.00 a.m.)

Précis

By way of introduction, Feldman stressed the performative, social (qua event) and rhetorical aspects of the castrato phenomenon and the opera—‘opera being fundamentally rhetorical’, and “the aria a dynamic oratory”, ‘with an ear (at)tuned to the audience’ (and vice versa). Unlike Burmeister, she would not

transform Quintilian into music—her emphasis being a Ciceronian one, where a “performative stage star still retains *decorum*”; with regard to the “musical *téchne*”, the “most important one is the voice”.

Castrati were able to “produce a high pitched” tone with a “far reach of tremendous range and nuance”, and with the “highest level of intensity and self-assurance”. They had to “practice daily” to achieve range and scale, and a “very well-wrought” *elocutio*, “perfect diction”, as a “key device for punctuating language”; they were forced to ‘constantly rework, hone, rewrite’—in terms of the *ornatus* of their voice. They were “singing masters”, whose skills were described (and criticized) by means of rhetorical terms, such as *invenzione*, *variazione*, *decoro*. The castrato singer might be termed “the ideal orator”; his libretti combine “singing and writing”. As all students at the time, castrati were schooled in rhetoric, and were told to “cultivate rhetoric” and grammar (sc. “where the periods should be put”) also in their singing. Feldman emphasized that “rhetorical precepts continued to be present and were not wiped out altogether” (also not later). Moreover, the “orator and the dramatic actor had the same performance training”.

Farinelli, in ‘leaping between registers’, “carves out a space for brilliance”: that is, for vocal or musical *ornatus*, in terms of a “reprise with ornaments” (variations)—‘creating beauty from variety. Some pieces were “excessively ornamented” (the “*bravura* arias”) and reduced later, with regard to *decorum*. In terms of function, “*ornatus* was a relief or balance”; but, as Feldman added, “*ornatus* only works so long”. Generally, this also pertains to shifting vogues, for instance that “from theatricality to rhetorical *virtù*”. During the Enlightenment, castrati went out of fashion, not least due to a “reconceptualization of music as truth and contemplation”—in line with judging singing as a ‘work of autonomous art true to nature’.

Questions and Answers

- Bloemendal asked how trustworthy the accounts of the singing of castrati might be; and whether one were dealing with “descriptions, ideas, or fictions”.
- Feldman accentuated that these accounts are “very much to the point”, and “described in very precise terms”, while ‘not being too idealized’.
- Most highlighted the “application of rhetorical theory” to opera, “the work of castrati”—rhetoric being “prestigious”, having a “long history”; thus, a time-honored, “long tradition” is applied to a “new institution” (for

- “legitimization”). With regard to the traditionally emphasized “masculinity in the *orator*” qua “*vir (bonus)*”, Most stressed those tropes that “made fun of effeminate” speakers, asking how this might relate to the castrato phenomenon.
- Feldman answered that “castrati were considered the ideal stand-in for the sovereign”, which might seem “almost inexplicable”. The only critique thereof came from France and the theologians (opposing castrati). Feldman stressed that the “theatrical illusion”, the theatrical “register”, was foregrounded (and “accepted”); moreover, “only castrati were capable of doing” what they did in terms of music, of “voice”, therein having their “own reserves of power”. Rhetorically, Feldman ventriloquized the question pertinent to the time as follows: “does it really matter what they are in real life”. She stressed, however, that this complex “starts to be thematized later in the 18th century”—particularly via a “satirical register”.
 - Eden, replying to Most’s comment, accentuated that the “*orator* in Cicero” is distinguished from the “military man” and his “force”: “a double value is already built into rhetoric”, and “rhetoric has already taken a step back from the manly”—visible, not least, in the fact that the root of “*persuasio* is sweetness”.
 - Most, conceding the “ambivalence of rhetoric”, again pointed to the fact that the ‘rhetorical tradition is being used to explain what is being done’, while ‘the detractors might then use other parts of rhetoric’: “the defenders of castrati use the rhetorical tradition as do the accusers”.
 - Küpper commented that, with regard to “tragedy and rhetoric”, it is about “convincing someone” (the forensic, for instance, has a “pragmatic” function, “for real life”, and drama a political or ethical function), while “opera is not about convincing”, but about “*stupore, admiratio*” (particularly, as a result of the *ornatus*); one is dealing with “a device of aestheticization”, while there is no ethicization, no ethics.
 - Feldman replied that, especially at this time in Italy, “it is about admiration” indeed; even so, “there is some attention to being convincing”—for otherwise “you lose the audience”. Moreover, “the job of a singer is to collectivize”, as in drama; for the “space of theater is fragmented”—hence the ‘need (while it is hard) to collectivize’: “*persuasio*” is crucial.

- Korneeva remarked how close to power, to the sovereign, the court, the castrati were, asking whether the nexus “rhetoric–drama–politics is reflected on the textual level”.
- Feldman responded that “Farinelli is not a typical, but an exceptional castrato” in being ‘close to power’. The sovereign might ‘give (some) castrati a stage and platform’, as a result of which they are “seen as that figure” of power with “influence”; this affects the libretti in content and form.
- Sarana inquired into a “religious rhetoric” with regard to the opera.
- Feldman agreed that these were “very much parallel phenomena” (a church setting and opera, also in social terms, at the time). There were “many oratories”; and ‘operas with a religious theme were enjoyed’.

Maria Galli Stampino (U of Miami)

“Family, City, State, and Theater: Carlo Gozzi and the Rhetoric of Conservatism”

(Feb 12, 2016 · 10.15 – 11.15 a.m.)

Précis

By way of introduction, Stampino emphasized that “anyone schooled in Italy is still (to this day) influenced by the rhetorical, specifically via Jesuit influence”. She highlighted that the play under scrutiny pertains particularly to the “epideictic genre”, the setting being Venice in the carnival season. Moreover, one is not dealing with a “court setting”, but with a decidedly “commercial, economic function and value”; the “private gain” of merchant families is in the forefront, hence the aspect of “mass appeal”, the rhetorical function of *delectare*, so as to “make more money”.

In the specific case, this mass appeal was furthered by Goldoni’s proclamation in a “*prologo* printed and distributed at the end of the previous season” to be producing “one new play a week”—the result being in fact “16 new plays, 2 per week”, which were immediately “sold out”. Rather than writing “not fully written-out plays in the *commedia dell’arte*” tradition (causing ‘a fluidity of texts and authors’), Goldoni “wants to be the author”, wishes his ‘text to be fixed’, and “also for economic reasons (not just originality)”.

Stampino analyzed a play by Gozzi “rediscovered in 2003, published in 2011, unperformed”, which “features his real-life antagonists”. In terms of style, she judged it to be “very wordy”; and, ‘if performed, a little overlong’. It is a comedy,

hence the nexus to “epideictic rhetoric” is pronounced; it is ‘built on dualities, alternations’, also “refutation”. The setting is “remote” (Mississippi, although it looks like Venice), while the time is contemporaneous, featuring Goldoni and Chiari as characters, who are supported by their factions; in this sense, it is an “agonistic” play (concerning the “tension between authors”), with a “face-to-face confrontation”—hence “the back and forth in comic terms”. The “*carnevale*” setting also features a “latent violence”—people being so “close to each other”; a ‘challenge to a *guerra alla veneziana*’ ensues in terms of content.

Accordingly, the ‘particular performance of the mass scenes in the play is important’: “the whole play is a critique of excess”, although “some theater is necessary for the communal welfare”, as Stampino explained along Gozzi’s lines—this being the “epideictic moment”. Gozzi thus issues “a caveat about the excesses of theater”, although the “Venetians are too enamored with theater to drop it”. Historically and in terms of genre, this play marks a ‘moment of change in theater traditions’, which is accompanied by a change of the rhetorical technique when contrasted with the previous tradition.

Questions and Answers

- Most, commenting on the fact that “the main characters are playwrights”, stated that this does appear in Greek drama, “but hardly later”; he moreover inquired into the “legal implications” (at the time) of staging “two living authors”; and whether this is connected to the fact that there was “no circulation” of the play.
- Stampino replied that referring to real-life persons is “one of the tools Gozzi uses” with a view to “timeliness”; she affirmed that there were “laws against slander”, and that this was a “big accusation to make”; ultimately, the play is “very polemical in intent” (while “pointing to a moral responsibility”). Even so, Stampino hypothesized that “he wanted it performed”: Gozzi had “first written it in prose”, and had provided “versification for some scenes”.
- Korneeva added that Goldoni and Chiari also did something to this effect.
- Stampino emphasized that Goldoni put out his plays immediately. With regard to the “laws of the *Commedia dell’arte*”, she stated that they have “become archeological texts”, since “one can only imagine how they would have been staged”; for “the actor families did not want their tricks to be written down”.
- Wesche asked whether there is “a didactic impetus in Gozzi”, and whether this is “linked to gender”.

- Stampino replied that there are “many women present”, as well as “a lot of characters, and many strata”, a “citywide” representation, “for the whole society”; they also voice opinions concerning the theater. Gozzi is indeed interested in the “citywide impact of theater”. The audience might “vicariously live the tension of other people dealing with the *agón* of the playwrights”—seeing that the play stages performances, a sort of meta-drama. It being “1750”, servants “need to express the likes and dislikes of their masters vicariously”.

- Küpper noted that Gozzi is “the most rhetorical of all writers today and yesterday” (sc. mentioned during the conference), his “basic device” being “allegory” (“the apogee of rhetoricity” as per Quintilian’s *aliud . . . aliud*). There is also a pronounced “emphasis on pleasure”, the *delectare* (it “provides fun”), while the “message import is reduced”. Küpper referred to ‘Aristotle’s emphasis on *hedoné*’, ‘with which Gozzi is in line’, here.
- Stampino argued that “even the fact that he [sc. Gozzi] says ‘innocent *divertimento*’ implies that he points to the excesses”—meaning, that *docere* is also implied: “a teaching occurs there”, a “warning”. She judges that “he kind of has it both ways”, while Gozzi does in fact “talk about *divertimento*”. Yet Stampino also stressed that “there seems to be a message always in all plays” (particularly as regards Italy during this time).

- Sarana referred to the fact of “speaking like a commoner”, according to the “social strata” in the play, and inquired as to the “register”, and whether there was a theoretical discussion thereon (or a “polemical” intent).
- Stampino replied that, intratextually, there seems to be no special problem with this matter, Goldoni having “written in Venetian dialect” (historically); nor is Venice a “monolingual community”. Gozzi, however, does “go toward the *lingua franca* Italian, which no one uses in Venice”.

- Eden referred to the *triás* of “teach, delight, move” (in terms of intent), and questioned how one might ‘get from one to the other’. She also requested that the “epideictic agenda” here be clarified, seeing that it “comes in two flavors: praise and blame”—asking whether it is not mostly “the vituperative part, blaming rather than praising”.
- Stampino agreed with the assessment as “vituperation”, there being “no *docere* in the play” itself; “playwrights were not morally (socially) equipped for ‘*docere*’”. By contrast, there are “other plays that are more allegorizing”.

**Jan Bloemendal (Huygens Institute, The Hague/Amsterdam)
 “Rhetoric and Neo-Latin Drama: The Two Tragedies by the
 ‘Polish Pindar’ Simon Simonides/Szymon Szymonowic
 (1558–1629): *Castus Ioseph* and *Penthesilea*”
 (Feb 12, 2016 · 11.30 a.m. – 12.30 p.m.)**

Précis

By way of introduction, Bloemendal stressed that his emphasis is on his dealing with “Early Modern Latin drama”, and that “every piece of literature is rhetorical in Antiquity and Early Modern drama”—seeing that “everyone” was taught rhetoric “in school”, using the respective “stylistic devices” (including “prosopopeia, impersonation”, which was “part of the schooling”). As a consequence, there were “many rhetorical handbooks in Early Modern times” (“more than 1000”), which were also used for “letter writing”, for instance—the result being that “rhetoric invaded everyone’s minds, and was ubiquitous”. It was also part of what “preachers had to learn—Erasmus wrote a theoretical and practical manual for preachers”; likewise, the “Jesuits were very productive” (referring to the “*ratio studiorum*”). Hence “both in practice and in theory—rhetoric was everywhere”.

In terms of drama, “Seneca the Younger was omnipresent”, and “Senecan tragedies are (still) considered to be very rhetorical” (in having a “short, pointed style”, using “stichomythia”). The use of the “*varietas verborum*, the *copia verborum*”, including the “use of *sententiae*”, was ‘the kernel of a good Senecan drama’. The “display of learning”, the “Asianic style”—“all this is present in Neo-Latin drama also”, Bloemendal accentuated. Even so, a “‘rhetoric of drama’ is difficult to find”, due to rhetoric’s (and the rhetorician’s) “Protean character”.

With regard to the author under scrutiny—Simon Simonides, appointed poet Laureate by the Pope in 1590—Bloemendal stressed the ‘inter- or supra-national scene of Humanists’, into which he was embedded (he knew Justus Lipsius, for instance). The play itself, *Castus Ioseph*, is judged an “extraordinary play”, seeing that—contrary to audience expectation, “used to seeing Joseph as a comedy”—the spectators are not given “a comedy, as was typical for *fabulae* from the *Old Testament*” performed “in Terentian fashion”. Instead, “Simonides wrote a Senecan tragedy”, which “focuses heavily on the emotions of Potiphar’s wife”.

In terms of form, Bloemendal accentuated the use and value of “standard elements, set pieces in all of Neo-Latin drama”, a ‘structure always present’. These “dramatic conventions”, as well as the *lingua franca* “Latin” (present “all over, also in the colonies”), and the “omnipresence” of the system of “rhetoric”,

decidedly “helped the movement of texts” (three factors very useful for the DramaNet context, as Bloemendal highlighted).

Bloemendal proceeded to a close reading of a passage, in which he identified a plethora of stylistic devices (such as synonymy, emphasis, *correctio*, *accumulatio*, *sententiae*, *anaphora*, *variatio*, *antithesis*, *chiasmus*), as well as ‘persuasion via emotionality’ (*movere*) in terms of the effect of the integration of form and content.

Building on the latter aspect, Bloemendal expounded that “school theater” depended particularly on “emotionality”, was “very pathos-ridden”, so that, “even if the audience did not understand”, it would take the message from the “context”. Comprehension was further facilitated by “stock characters”, which were to produce the effect of “we know it from the *Bible*”—from “that general intertext” (at the time). Bloemendal repeated that it was “more about passion than about ‘*dran*’ qua action” in the Senecan tradition. ‘Rhetoric (emphatic of *páthos*, here) is thus also used to define the *ethos* of a character—to identify and characterize them’.

Tying in with previous talks during the conference, Bloemendal stressed that “there is no king, but Ioseph is a prince to be” (see Most’s presentation); and he highlighted the “Senecan feature” of “addressing one’s mind” (see Eden’s presentation).

In conclusion, Bloemendal laid particular weight on the fact that “from Poland to Spain, from Holland to the Black Sea, from the Baltic to Italy, they did have a common rhetorical tool kit, and a common language (Latin)”, which enabled and accelerated the “mobility of certain phrases”, set pieces. He suggested the metaphor of rhetoric as at once “the dressing and the salad bar”: one might “choose which ingredients” one desires; as an alternative image, Bloemendal proposed that of “rhetoric as the glue in a worldwide web”.

Questions and Answers

- Gusejnov inquired whether the aspect of “inter-artiality” (in architecture, for instance, “the building of cities as rhetorical acts”) mattered in the “context of creation” (emphasizing *actio*).
- Bloemendal replied that rhetoric “functions in so many contexts”, also in ‘the social, the linguistic (Latin), the political’, etc. (‘of a city, locality’).
- Gubbini suggested the lives of Saints (in Latin, in the vernacular) as a possible formal, generic intertext for the *Ioseph*.

- Bloemendal, referring to the author’s background, said his was an “Armenian-Jewish context”, and that “Christ is not mentioned”; but that, “yes, it is possible”, seeing that there is often a “typological interpretation in Neo-Latin drama”, specifically in “martyr drama”—only that “Joseph is not killed”.
- Eden suggested that one might explore a connection between Most’s and Bloemendal’s papers via the nexus of kings (including Joseph qua prince) and Christ—that is, between the political and the religious (the typological).
- Bloemendal agreed that Christ is a “presence in absence”.

- Küpper referred to the “*koiné* Latin” and the “*téchne* of rhetoric” as very fruitful perspectives, while highlighting also the fact that “Neo-Latin drama” was highly “standardized”, facilitating a “floating of cultural” material—its “mobility” (“traveling through Europe”). He inquired into the “context of rhetoric” for Neo-Latin “Protestant authors” in particular, seeing that the *New Testament*’s style is considered “*humilis*”, and “exterior decoration” would thus be “refuted” by Protestants.
- Bloemendal mentioned Protestants who were Humanists (such as Grotius, Heinsius) and wrote Senecan drama: “the Humanist wish prevailed—they wanted to write tragedies”. With regard to the comment, Bloemendal again emphasized the ‘traveling of books’, of “traders, ecclesiastical” men etc. (“texts, companies, merchants, rulers”, among others), and that it was a “very dynamic” time, with agents “traveling a lot”—“Early Modern Europe” not having been “as static” as perhaps hitherto believed.
- Kilian added that the German type of Protestant rhetoric at the time was mainly that of “Protestant propaganda”.

- Most referred to the “substitution of Biblical characters for Greek heroes” performed by the Church Fathers, and inquired into the use of Ancient drama in schools: “were they performed” or typically “*Lesedramen*”.
- Bloemendal agreed that “Early Christianity had to find its space”, but that such “substitution was no longer necessary” once Christianity had consolidated. With regard to drama, Bloemendal stated that “Seneca’s dramas were used as *Lesedramen*”, but also “for declamation”, and sometimes for performance. Neo-Latin plays, often written by the headmasters themselves, were “performed by school boys”. The “scripts were often quite loose”; so “the Latin and the vernacular versions are very different”, at times (‘accommodated to the respective needs’).

- With regard to the adoption, transformation, and substitution processes on the part of Early Christianity, Eden highlighted that “differences were erased in the process”.
- Küpper adduced the use of the “priority thesis” by the Church Fathers (Ancient pagan materials were thought of as ‘disfigured, distorted’ from their supposedly ‘original’ Jewish qua proto-Christian source, the *Old Testament*).
- Bernhart asked about a nexus between the *Volksschauspiel* and Neo-Latin drama being translated into the vernacular, and about the “influence of Neo-Latin drama on European literature in general”.
- Bloemendal stated that this is being looked into, with further study in this respect being a desideratum. He particularly mentioned the *Everyman* in its various stages of reception: there were many “translations, imitations” into Latin, Dutch, English. The “extent of the influence” deserved further attention, he noted. ‘Vernacular plays were often first translated into Latin’ qua mediating language, ‘and then into other vernaculars’.

Jörg Wesche (U Duisburg–Essen)
“Verse Games in German Baroque Plays”
(Feb 12, 2016 · 2.45 – 3.45 p.m.)

Précis

By way of introduction, Wesche stated that he wished to refute the notion of the “frozen artificiality of German Baroque drama”—his endeavor being the analysis of “stylistic devices”, of “linguistic aspects” from an interdisciplinary perspective, with the aim of demonstrating, first, “the rhetorical power of meter”, its ‘persuasiveness’; and, secondly, its “interactional, acoustic” effect.

In terms of the interrelation of discourse and form, Wesche accentuated the aspects of “self-contained verse”, “metrical repetition” and “repetition mirrored metrically” as elements of a ‘verbally composed Baroque Neo-Stoicism’—a ‘persistent steadiness and steadfastness’ (*Beharrlichkeit*) against “the temporal progress of time”.

As to the acoustic effect, Wesche stressed “the might of rhythm, overpowering the audience”, with “spoken language as the basis of meter”: “talking in verse is talking, and verbal art”, it is ‘interactionally useful’, reflecting a “vitality in verse” (as the “effect of stage play in language”). Gryphius particularly “uses the oral technique”. In the “dialogical, interactional use of

meter”, the “use of ellipsis” is crucial; it facilitates “speedy changes”, rendering dialogs ‘dynamic’: there can be “a lot of interactions in a single line—an intensity via meter”, producing “an *in situ* effect”. With regard to ‘metrically interrelated’ “question and answer constellations” in *Gryphius*, Wesche stressed the “persuasive use of verse in the speech duel of Love and Death”—including the occasional rhetorical question qua appeal, *apostrophé* to the audience.

Moreover, Wesche accentuated the ‘persuasiveness of rhymes’, the use of ‘antithetic and alternating structures to distribute between roles’, the use of stichomythia—and, generally, “the high degree of metrical stylization”. He concluded that, consequently, “meter” is particularly “adapted to drama”—its “utility” being its exceptionally ‘persuasive’ function.

Questions and Answers

- Feldman inquired into a possible connection to Petrarchan poetics, particularly the sonnet, in this context.
- Wesche concurred, stating that the link is via Opitz and Opitzian writers, respectively the translations of Petrarch.
- Küpper stressed that one is dealing with *Lesedramen* in the case of *Gryphius*: “these dramas are no longer staged” and “no longer (actively) received in the German context” (in contrast to the Spanish plays from the same period); moreover, “rhetoricized drama” has gone “out of fashion”, except for the case of Shakespeare, who is still “most popular in the German” language. Consequently, Küpper suggested that there are “different degrees of rhetoricalness” (in general, and specifically in Baroque drama), and that “certain variants are considered obsolete”—the reason being the “end of rhetoric, Romanticism”.
- Wesche replied that, indeed, “German poetics cut off the 17th century tradition”; Shakespeare remains “popular and survives, because he was de-rhetoricized”; as to *Lesedramen*, he emphasized that there was “school theater” also, and that “*Gryphius*’ plays were staged, in schools, for instance”—with a “focus on aspects of interactional, declamatory speech”.
- Eden (also replying to Küpper’s remark concerning ‘degrees of rhetoricalness’) commented on the “development of verse”, the connections between “poetics and rhetoric” in terms of ‘meter’ in the former, and ‘the power of rhythm (*numerus*)’ in the latter (as emphasized by Cicero). Even so, “Shakespeare gave up rhyming couplets, on the whole, at the end”, while

“verse meter is a different matter, specifically in drama”. She confirmed that there is a “spectrum of rhetoricity”.

- In general, Wesche pointed to “doggerel, satire”, and various “mixtures of traditions” (Aristotle, Scaliger); to “mixtures of Latin and Roman traditions in all of German poetry of the 17th century”. He also stated that, despite its “rhymes”, “Goethe’s *Faust* is not so boring”.
- Most confirmed that “Shakespeare survives the end of rhetoric by being de-rhetoricized”; rhetoric also survives by being ironized as a result of a “skepticism about rhetoric” (“when people are consciously rhetorical, they are always ironic about being rhetorical”), stating: “You don’t have to hammer if there’s no resistance”. Ultimately, Romanticism ‘geniusified’ Shakespeare. With regard to meter, Most commented that it is “not just self-persuasion, but also the practice of expressing (something) well”.
- Wesche agreed as to Shakespeare. With regard to rhyming, he referred to Opitz stating that one ‘is free in organizing the sequence of rhymes’.
- Bernhart asked for clarification about the particular persuasiveness of meter.
- Wesche replied that poetics was conceived of as the “sister art” of rhetoric (and vice versa)—“*oratio ligata* is *oratio*” (“a special form of *oratio*”), hence aims at (is “linked” to) “persuasion”.
- Eden returned to the aspect of ‘Shakespeare having been de-rhetoricized’; referring to Samuel Johnson, she said that the latter changed the perception of Shakespeare as “a poet of *téchne*, art” into the “natural poet Shakespeare”—this, however, were still “an appropriation of a rhetorical category”, regarding the “*phýsis/téchne*” dichotomy. She asserted that Shakespeare is “no less rhetorical than (the) other authors (of the period)”, but that the “audience does not have the sense that he is using it”. So the question would have to be: “how is it that Shakespeare uses the rhetorical devices so that the audience does not notice, and accepts them”. She asked: “if there is a rhetoric of drama, how does Shakespeare have a longer shelf life?”—and suggested that “literary theory de-rhetoricized him”, while he does sport a “highly artificial language”.
- Küpper rejoined that this would not yet clarify the “structural difference (of Shakespeare) to German Baroque drama” (particularly Gryphius, here) in terms of (rhetorical) form.

Joachim Küpper (FU Berlin)
“Towards a Network Theory of Cultural Production”
(Feb 12, 2016 · 4.00 – 5.00 p.m.)

Précis

Küpper formulated his decidedly ‘function-oriented’ theory of culture qua “networks”—enabling “processes of reception”, and “specifically in drama”—in opposition to the “national culture theory”, to the cult of “ingenuity and genius on the part of Romanticism”.

Outlining other metaphors—for instance the ‘structuralist tree’, or the ‘post-structuralist rhizome’—he considered them to be still ‘too naturalistic, too structuralist’. Moreover, Greenblatt’s notion of “cultural circulation” leaves unanswered the problems of “contingency or dependency”, of “agency”, of ‘differences in circulation’; at the same time, it is problematic in its being ‘recipient-focused’ as regards ‘material forms’—for there is also a ‘transportation’ in the non-literal sense, and “other things are dragged along also”. Latour’s conception is said to have some utile features, while Küpper opposed the notion of an “agency of objects on their own”. The ‘network’ is able to map an “a-teleological” dynamics, representing “the specificity of cultural dynamics” qua contingent: it “holds on to the (human) agent”, considers how ‘materials are affected’, includes “literary phenomena”.

The notion of the network in Küpper’s acceptance has the following characteristics: it is “non-hierarchical”, “without center”, “created with a view to” (sc. ‘purposive’), “may be destroyed”, is “never complete”; “networks tend to be refunctionalized, they do not cease”; they “enable the transfer of material, anywhere and everywhere”, and “potentially endlessly”; they have a tendency to “extend and ramify”, and are “not necessarily stable, and usually virtual”, flexible; the “cultural network” comprises also the “books, paintings” etc. themselves—it “needs a physical substratum”, including human agents, such as “spouses, courtiers, armies” for “traveling, transfer processes”; it includes “stories, narratives migrating” (with the ‘original’ intent typically not being retained or remaining ‘the same’); the network has a “transport capacity”, may be “interrupted temporarily” (for instance by censorship); it features a “control logic: power, money, prestige, etc.”; there is always “material floating in a net” (“based on existing material, also from other environments”); it is “inconsumable”, retained “while humankind persists”; materials are “then shaped” via “recombination” (for instance in the novel), to different degrees of

“formal shaping” and “reshaping”, followed by a ‘reinsertion’ into the net; the material’s functions include “didactics, entertainment, reflection”.

Applied to Early Modern times in particular, the “virtual network also propelled a ‘Renaissance’ in the literal sense”. At the same time, “visual culture as a mass medium” defined much of the materials in the net, while “redefining what literature is meant to be” (in terms of function); for instance, Senecan and Terentian drama “differ significantly” from one another. Early Modern drama was thus geared towards “mass appeal” (and “no longer bound to ritual”); “drama” was “first”, in this respect, while “narrative” followed “much later”. The network approach is to “free the texts from being considered only in national” terms, so as to ‘account for the reception’ throughout Europe, to explain the traveling of the “fundamental level of formal structures and shapes”, of “discursive constellations” present (all but) simultaneously throughout Europe—the “importation of cultural practices” based on a “local demand”. Thus ‘differences in the manner of extraction of material at different places, but at the same time’, might be investigated and described by this approach. Finally, the “standard two-text comparison” is to be surmounted by the approach of seeing “items floating in a virtual net”.

Questions and Answers

- Most voiced “an objection” to the network theory in that “it does not explain production”, while it does “make it possible”; he invoked “an archive with many different stages of actualization”.
- Küpper replied that an “archive is not flexible enough” in his view, while also not able to explain “how to travel between archives”; moreover, the term ‘archive’ may suggest the notion of “national literatures” as conceived of by “Romanticism”, while Küpper wished to distance himself from this mindset—it being a “fact that cultural products travel from one culture to another”. As to the objection, Küpper agreed that “the network does not explain the individual works, but their condition of possibility” (*Bedingung der Möglichkeit*). The model suggests ways of theorizing, conceptualizing ‘exchanges’, and of accounting for the fact that ‘culture (cultural material) travels’. The concept of the network provides the basis and background for a process of “assembling”, but “the respectively factual production cannot be explained by this model”—its emphasis is on the aspect of “cultural exchange”. In terms of the relation between “social processes and cultural production”, there is “much more cultural exchange than *ad hoc* creation”.

- Most conceded that this network theory is “not a poetics”, but provides “indications for the conditions of possibility”. He still maintained that a, or the respectively particular, poetics “is what we are really interested in”.
- Eden commented on the fact that, in Küpper’s view, the “rhizome and tree are still naturally conditioned”, while Küpper wished to place “emphasis on humans”; and to “maintain (human) agency in productivity”, as “conditioned by time and place”. She expounded that “the agent, artist produces by going to the net”, where he “selects and assembles”; this would reflect a ‘technical understanding of agency, of *ars*’.
- Küpper clarified that he “used the term ‘assembling’” (and “‘re-assembling’, perceived as new”), but “avoided ‘creation’”; his emphasis was on the fact that authors, agents “take all these bits and pieces, pieces that preexisted the assembling” process. He expressed doubts whether one might “explain creativity” (*per se*). Moreover, he accentuated the role of “contingency”: for instance, the year 1492, the discoveries, changed the “conditions of cultural production” (as had the printing press).

Concluding Discussion (Feb 12, 2016 · 5.30 – 7.30 p.m.)

Guiding Questions · DS Mayfield

To provide the conference with a potential conceptual framework and initiate the discussion, the following guiding questions and hypotheses were pre-circulated to the speakers, and presented to the general public in the present editor's introductory remarks during the conference; the concluding statements and plenary discussion addressed certain aspects thereof.

- 1) In which ways may rhetoric apply—or be conducive—to a specific (literary) genre; in other words: is there a (particular) rhetoric of drama; and, in a diachronic view: have there been commonalities and differences in the application of rhetoric to (or in) drama since Ancient times, and specifically again during the Early Modern Age.
- 2) In terms of the long histories both of the art of rhetoric and the genre of drama, a mutual or bilateral influence seems plausible; in which ways has drama (and dramatic practice) influenced the rhetorical tradition generally conceived.
- 3) As to the development of drama and the history of rhetoric, might there be a particular relation regarding the factors of orality and textuality.
- 4) Approaching drama in terms of rhetoric, and by recourse to rhetorical *termini technici*, may shed additional light on an Aristotelian, plot-emphatic approach; moreover, Aristotelian(izing), pragmatic 'poetics of effect' might be seen as downright rhetorical.
- 5) Both rhetoric and drama are (at least usually) geared toward (re)presentation, *mise-en-scène*, *actio* (*pronuntiatio*): does the (partial) application of the rhetorical system in (a given) drama also provide a frame of reference for the (specific) production on stage.

Concluding Statement · Kathy Eden

First, Eden referred to the question whether there is “a rhetoric of drama”, replying that there is no distinctive rhetoric particularly of drama: “there is rhetoric, drama is deeply rhetorical, but no rhetoric is exclusively dramatic”. The common rhetorical ground is produced by a “fairly stable common schooling”, a “rhetorical education”.

Secondly, Eden tackled the question of the different tendencies, or “impulses”, of the rhetorical tradition: on the one hand, rhetoric seeks to “accommodate”; on the other, it “is deeply adversarial”. She highlighted the fact that “rhetoric has movable parts”, which “can be put to other uses”, under “differing circumstances”. She renewed her claim that “public, forensic rhetoric can be accommodated to the private” (the *essai*, for instance); this “accommodation” would also take place in the “*ornatus*”, specifically with regard to “voice, delivery (facial expressions, in terms of gesture)”, as well (with reference to Feldman’s talk). Rhetoric is “adversarial” in terms of ideology (such as “democracy, monarchy”, with reference to Most’s talk); in terms of form or structure, “stichomythia is very adversarial” (with reference to Wesche’s talk). She concluded that rhetoric is “both adversarial and deeply accommodating”.

Concluding Statement · Glenn W. Most

Most highlighted four points in his concluding statement. First, “rhetoric came back from the dead” (he suggested that “no one would have come to this conference 30 years ago”, and he himself “had no idea it [sc. rhetoric] would come back, 32 years ago”)—but really, “rhetoric was always there (except during Romanticism, where it died a painful death)”; “the return of rhetoric” corresponds to “the end of Romanticism”.

Secondly, Most discerned a “nostalgia in literary studies for a foundational system, theory, or science”—also for purposes of “communicability”; and this “basis can be imagined as having been there”. Thirdly, and connected thereto, he accentuated that rhetoric is “not only a system, but also a terminology”, which is used for effect (also to display or feign erudition: a form of “pseudo-scientificity”), not least of all.

Finally, he stated: rhetoric “is a real grab bag—despite the claims to systematicity”; it “can be used to show anything”; the wish for “anchoring in some aspect” remains strong (likewise in metaphysics or theology).

Concluding Statement · Martha Feldman

Feldman affirmed the value of rhetorical “accommodation”, of “accommodation as embodied”; in this context, she referred to Castiglione’s *Courtier*, its ‘ideal courtier *persona*’ as a “rhetorical figure” that would require further attention in this context, and, more generally, in terms of the nexus of “court and rhetoric”.

Secondly, she indicated that a move “away from the purely textual, or intertextual, towards the oral” would be necessary, particularly in favor of a focus “also on voice, presence, figure”. Likewise, she encouraged “to think more about the audiences, differing audiences to whom rhetoric was directed, the cultural reception and translation”; in this line, she suggested to be speaking of a “rhetoric of exchange, agonism, of the audience”. At the same time, Feldman conceded that “to move outside the text is hard to do: for what we have are texts, archives”; it is “a great big iceberg”, with the ‘tip being the text’, and the remainder pertaining (mostly) to an “oral tradition”.

Concluding Statement · Maria Galli Stampino

Stampino emphasized drama as “agonistic”, and as a “lab for testing, trying out different solutions without consequences” (in comedy, for instance)—in contrast to the “forensic” setting. With regard to the “de-rhetoricization of Shakespeare”, she suggested one inquire as to “how he retains the appeal”; in the same vein, she urged that one think about the questions: “what Shakespeare are we talking about, which Shakespeare are we reading”; for he was “rhetoricized in a different way in nineteenth century Italian translations”—with a view to “nineteenth century Italian audiences”—when compared to other contexts of reception. In line therewith, she stressed that, “in the network, the receiving context, the linguistic context, is important”. Finally, she encouraged that one should be “thinking of rhetoric in the concrete application”, and to “de-absolutize” it: “the rhetoric manifested in the text” is only one aspect.

Concluding Statement · Gasan Gusejnov (Guest)

Gusejnov (standing in for Bloemendal during the concluding discussion) took up the question of “why rhetoric came back”, and confirmed “some similarity between Early Modern times and today”, primarily “in analogy to the book culture”. His emphasis was on the fourth part of rhetoric, *memoria*. As “is the case now”, the “collective memory was weakening” in the Early Modern Age, due to a

“shift from *mnéme* to the visual”, and partly to “the acoustic”. He accentuated “the salvational aspect of rhetoric”: “memory is under threat—that is why rhetoric is back”; and he urged: “we have to look back, some recuperation has to take place”. As a prospect, he also considered it a desideratum to be looking at the *actio*, specifically with regard to the modern virtual world, which is “active without effects, and only produces emotions”, while agents “do not remember what was yesterday”—thereby tying in with his initial emphasis on memory.

Concluding Statement · Jörg Wesche

Wesche treated four points pertaining to the “limits of rhetoric and drama”. First, he highlighted the “correlation between poetics, rhetorical handbooks, and the praxis of drama”; in Early Modern handbooks of poetics, rhetorical *dispositio*, tropes, techniques provide a “universal tool kit” for purposes of “accommodation”. In this vein, it would be necessary to reflect on “the medial conditions of rhetoric in dramatic performance”, and to investigate to what extent such a reflection took place in the respective handbooks. Secondly, he considered whether there is a “hiatus between rhetoric and drama”, despite the fact that there are (significant) overlaps in “*memoria*, *actio*”. Thirdly, Wesche addressed the “latitudes of *parrhesía*, the *licentia poetica*”, asking: “what is specific to drama”. Moreover, he questioned “how the chorus fits into drama”; and whether there are “certain licenses” there, as well.

Lastly, Wesche tackled the general limits: with regard to rhetoric, “what does not fit in with drama”. He expressed doubts whether, for instance, ‘self-interrogation, *revocatio*, *refutatio* were fit for being put on stage’, asking: “can a revocation be put on stage in public”—or is it “not adjustable to drama for material limits”. In concluding, he referred to “rhetoric as *materia*” (it being “everywhere”, at “schools, universities”), while asking: “where is rhetoric itself put on stage”, in terms of a “meta-reflection on rhetoric”. Wesche accentuated that these two aspects ought to be differentiated.

Concluding Statement · Joachim Küpper

Küpper singled out three aspects. First, he called for a differentiation and an accentuation: “to what extent should we level the differences between forensic (political) rhetoric (and discourses) and drama”; for “it is about convincing someone” indeed—but, in the former, this ‘is a different form of convincing (at times pertaining to questions of life and death)’, while, “theoretical, ethical

questions are at stake in drama”; this makes for a “difference in function”.

Secondly, Küpper returned to the aspect of “degrees of rhetoricity”, questioning whether there is “a generic aspect” to it; “in opera and poetry”, for instance, a higher degree is taken to be “acceptable”, a “higher tolerance” for rhetoricity—the basic pattern of both music and rhetoric being “recurrence with repetition”. He stressed that there are conventional(ized), “preconceived notions of what is acceptable” in this respect (which are contingent, hence changeable). At the same time, and in terms of form, music is sequential, based on “time”, while drama (as per Aristotle) focuses on “action”.

In conclusion, Küpper asked: “what about rhetoric in drama after the age of rhetoric” (that is, in the 19th and 20th century); he stated that “Beckett and Brecht are full of rhetoric”, also “allegory”, and are “extremely stylized”—although “perhaps not according to the Ancient theory”. He wondered whether there is not “a certain intrinsic affinity of drama to rhetoric”, which is relatively “higher than in narrative”; if this be so, the question would be: “why is drama more rhetorical (than other genres)”.

Concluding Plenary Discussion (Selected Contributions)

- Generally, Gusejnov submitted that “rhetoric is a representation of knowledge, while music is a representation of emotion”.
- Chakrabarti emphasized that “cultural production is flexible, fluid, and does not need an archetype”. He highlighted a need for the recourse to examples “other than European, of the Asian world”, for instance. With regard to India, he stated the importance of the “oral manner” (sc. in terms of *elocutio*), “oral transfer” (sc. in terms of *memoria*).
- Concerning the discussion of (cultural) memory, Küpper stressed its ‘high degree of selectivity’; one is ‘free to recombine, reassemble, without being aware of the (or any) limits to one’s creativity’.
- Candido remarked: “rhetoric keeps coming back”; and that “only rhetoric destroys rhetoric (and not logic, dialectics)”—highlighting the fact that ‘rhetoric is built on language’ (with emphasis on the ‘importance of *elocutio*’); referring also to Küpper, Candido confirmed that “memory also restricts what you can say or choose”.
- Eden accentuated that “Romanticism was using rhetoric, was using words, to counter or destroy rhetoric”. The claim that Romanticism was not rhetorical, the “absence of rhetoric”, is ‘an idea that would never have been accepted by the Ancients—it would have made no sense to them, since they (the Romantics) are using words’.
- Most rejoined that the Romantics “only thought they were” destroying rhetoric without using rhetoric.
- Kilian inquired into the aspect of a “second degree rhetoricity” qua “message to the audience”: ‘drama not being traditionally linked to one voice, but more voices, *delectare* and *movere* take place on more levels’; and there may be “*movere*, *delectare*, even if there is no *docere*”.
- With regard to the network theory, and replying to a question from the student audience concerning “how the selecting process goes by”, Küpper stressed that “access increased with certain cultural techniques, technologies”; at present, there is “access to all kinds of things”, which are “heterogeneous”, while the interaction with them, “the working through”, is “not as intense” as it used to be in Early Modern networks. Moreover, novel

“publishing techniques”, with not only “manuscripts”, but also “books” floating—that is, the “material conditions of access”—must be taken into account, as well. The quantity of “material accessible is much larger now”, while the “level of formal shaping is much lower now”. In previous days, there was a “limited number of texts”—leading primarily to “imitation with variation and refinement”.

- Wilm tied in with the fact that ‘the purpose of rhetorical speech is to convince others that your opinion is true’; this, however, is different in drama as per Wilm, seeing that it “demonstrates different” views and “possibilities”, without necessarily showing “which is the wrong, which is the right position” (she referred to Schiller’s *Maria Stuart*). The ‘rhetorical material may be the same, but the result differs’ (in terms of function, effect).
- With reference to historical plays (here: Shakespeare’s *Julius Caesar*), Küpper mentioned “possible speeches that could have taken place”, which are geared towards “different attitudes of the audience, its disposition”, its various (historical) circumstances of reception. Generally speaking, in a “political speech, the focus is on the message” (or its ‘philosophy’), while in drama the focus is also on “the form of the message”.
- Expounding on the “hiatus” he had mentioned, Wesche outlined different antagonistic tendencies between rhetoric and drama: “monolog vs. dialog”, “convincing vs. intrigue”, “*claritas, puritas* vs. ambiguity, ghosts” (sc. irrational occurrences), etc.—concluding that “this does not fit together”. With regard to Aristotle’s poetics and the desired effect of *kátharsis*, Wesche stated that one might read this as signifying: ‘in drama, you have passion and pain to become free from it’, while, before a judge (in the forum), one “is not allowed to provoke emotions” as might be detrimental to one’s case.

