

HEINRICH LAUSBERG

Handbook of **LITERARY
RHETORIC**

A Foundation for Literary Study

EDITED BY

David E. Orton

R. Dean Anderson

FOREWORD BY

George A. Kennedy

BRILL

HEINRICH LAUSBERG

HANDBOOK OF LITERARY RHETORIC

A Foundation for Literary Study

FOREWORD BY
GEORGE A. KENNEDY

TRANSLATED BY
MATTHEW T. BLISS, ANNEMIEK JANSEN
DAVID E. ORTON

EDITED BY
DAVID E. ORTON & R. DEAN ANDERSON



BRILL
LEIDEN · BOSTON · KÖLN
1998

The original edition, published under the title *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*, by Heinrich Lausberg, is copyright © 1960 Max Hueber Verlag, Ismaning bei München. The translation is from the second German edition, copyright © 1973 Max Hueber Verlag, D-85737 Ismaning bei München.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Lausberg, Heinrich.

[Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. English]

Handbook of literary rhetoric : a foundation for literary study /
Heinrich Lausberg ; foreword by George A. Kennedy ; translated by
Matthew T. Bliss, Annemiek Jansen, David E. Orton ; edited by David
E. Orton & R. Dean Anderson.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 9004107053 (alk. paper)

1. Rhetoric, Ancient. 2. Rhetoric. I. Orton, David E.
II. Anderson, R. Dean, 1963– III. Title.

PA181.L313 1998

808—dc21

97-51646

CIP

Deutsche Bibliothek – CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

Lausberg, Heinrich:

Handbook of literary rhetoric : a foundation for literary study /
Heinrich Lausberg. Foreword by George A. Kennedy. Transl. by
Matthew T. Bliss ... Ed. by David E. Orton & R. Dean Anderson.
Leiden ; Boston ; Köln : Brill, 1998

Einheitssacht.: Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik <engl.>

ISBN 90-04-10705-3

ISBN 90 04 10705 3

This translation is © Copyright 1998 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands

*All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in
a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic,
mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written
permission from the publisher.*

*Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal
use is granted by Brill provided that
the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright
Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910
Danvers MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.*

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

FOREWORD

George A. Kennedy

In the second half of the twentieth century, scholars, of whom Heinrich Lausberg was a distinguished example, have rediscovered rhetoric as a systematic discipline that shaped literary composition from classical antiquity to the modern period. It also influenced readers' reception of texts in that study of rhetoric in schools and universities established expectations of invention, arrangement, and especially style, familiar to anyone with an education in the liberal arts. Great literature is never a mechanical application of rules, but at least until the romantic period the artistry of literary composition was often thought of as the creative imitation, emulation, and variation of treatment within the conventions of each genre. Classical rhetoric, and its medieval and renaissance restatements, provides the modern critic with a detailed structure and terminology to describe this art and an entrée into how writers and readers of the past regarded language use.

Major texts for understanding the traditional system of rhetoric include writings by Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian, but often the textbooks of the schools were practical manuals that laid out how to write a speech, a letter, or a poem. Many have survived in Greek, Latin, and early modern languages and are important sources for a full understanding of the tradition. Collections of some of them were published as early as the Aldine *Rhetores Graeci* of 1508, and dictionaries of tropes and figures appeared in the early modern period: the best known are Ernesti's *Lexica Technologica* of 1795-1797. The first attempt, however, at a comprehensive survey of the sources was published by Richard Volkmann in 1874 under the title *Die Rhetorik der Griechen und Römer in systematischer Übersicht*. A revised and enlarged edition appeared in 1885 and was later reprinted as part of Mueller's *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*. In 1974 Josef Martin's *Antike Rhetorik* was substituted for Volkmann's treatment in the *Handbuch* (vol. 2, part 3), but it has not proved entirely satisfactory.

Fortunately, Heinrich Lausberg had in 1960 published the first edition of his fine *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*, in which, as he explained in the Foreword, classical rhetoric is viewed as phenomena which present themselves throughout the course of European literature. In addition to its

more literary approach, the virtues of Lausberg's *Handbuch* include the author's sound judgment, its wide historical span, its clear organization, and its extensive indices. Lausberg's *Handbuch* has been the reference work to which I first turn for technical information about rhetoric, and I have been recommending it to my students and readers of my books for over thirty years. It has, however, never attained in the English-speaking world the status of a basic reference tool that it deserves. Thus the appearance of an English translation is a happy event for rhetorical studies.

It may interest readers to learn something about Heinrich Lausberg's career. I never knew him personally, but through the kindness of my friend Dr Alexandru Cizek in Münster I was put in touch with Prof. Dr. Arnold Arens in Paderborn, who knew Professor Lausberg well and who published an appreciative memorial of him in *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprache und Literaturen* in 1993 (vol. 230, pp. 1-5).

Heinrich Lausberg was born on October 13, 1912, in Aachen. He studied romance philology and Indo-European linguistics in Bonn (1932-33) and Tübingen (1933-37), and completed a dissertation on the dialects of southern Italy in 1939. From 1939 to 1941 he was on the staff of the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* in Munich, and from 1941 to 1945 served in the German army, first on the Russian front, then in Italy, where he was taken prisoner by the Allies. In Bonn he studied with E.R. Curtius, who encouraged his interests in rhetoric and after the war was instrumental in his appointment as lecturer in Italian there in 1946. In 1949 he was called to a professorship of romance philology at the University of Münster, where he remained for much of his career, primarily teaching medieval and modern French literature. He published a series of critical interpretations of Valéry, Camus, and other French writers and works on philology, including *Romanische Sprachwissenschaft* (1956).

Throughout his career, however, Professor Lausberg continued a project to provide students with much-needed access to rhetorical theory. Already in Bonn in 1949 he had published a short *Elemente der literarischen Rhetorik* as an introduction for students of romance philology; a new version of the *Elemente* appeared in 1963, expanded for use by students of classical, romance, English and German philology. Meanwhile, the first edition of the *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik* was published in 1960, with a revised second edition in 1973.

In 1972 Professor Lausberg surprised his friends – and, he claimed, himself – by retiring from his chair in Münster and moving to Paderborn to develop a program in romance languages at the new Pädagogische Hochschule there. He died April 11, 1992 after a long illness. From all accounts, he was a man of learning, culture, and wit who inspired the

admiration and affection of his colleagues, students, and friends, and he made major contributions to scholarship in linguistics, philology, literary criticism, and rhetoric.

In this translation it has not been possible to update the bibliography referred to in the 1973 edition of the *Handbuch*. Among many recent publications, the most important reference work is the *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, edited by Gert Ueding, Gregor Kalivoda, and Franz-Hubert Robling and published by Max Niemeyer Verlag in Tübingen. The first volume appeared in 1992 and the remaining eight volumes are scheduled at two-year intervals. Brill has recently (1997) published a useful *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period (330 BC – AD 400)*, edited by S.E. Porter. *The Present State of Scholarship in Historical and Contemporary Rhetoric*, edited by Winifred B. Horner (rev. edn, University of Missouri Press, 1990) is a useful bibliographical source. I have revised three earlier books in *A New History of Classical Rhetoric* (Princeton University Press, 1994). The International Society for the History of Rhetoric holds congresses at two-year intervals and publishes the quarterly journal *Rhetorica* with articles on many aspects of the subject.

PREFACE TO THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION

The publication of this volume completes a lengthy process initiated by Mr. Matthew Bliss, who first proposed the project to Brill Academic Publishers, and who prepared the first draft of the first half of the translation with Ms. Elisabeth Baldamus, assisted by Ms. Anette Bieligk. The editors and publishers are very grateful to him for his commitment to the project even through serious illness. The first draft of the second half of the work, with the indexes, was completed by Ms. Annemiek Jansen, to whom sincere thanks are also due. Dr. R. Dean Anderson acted as editor and consultant with regard to classical abbreviations and technical terms. Special thanks are due to Professor George A. Kennedy for his encouragement for the project and his willingness to write a Foreword for this volume. The final text of this edition is a revision of the complete translation by Dr. David E. Orton, who bears responsibility for any errors or inadequacies in the translation.

All translations of course are individual and subjective, no matter how empathetic the translator may be towards the content. Translation consists of a complex series of choices between alternative approximations to the sense of words and expression in the original, in varying degrees of equivalence, which often necessarily change according to context. In the case of a technical handbook such as the present volume, there are special restrictions on the translator's freedom to render a "dynamic" translation of the original, since many of the terms and their definitions are "fixed" in both the original and the target language. Inclusive language has been used where this was possible without significantly distorting the flow of the text or the flavor of the original. What emerges is necessarily something of a compromise in endeavoring to meet both the requirement for a clear rendering of the original into idiomatic English, and the special technical requirements of the standard reference work. It is the hope of the translators, the editors and the publishers, that a suitable balance has been achieved, and that this translation will adequately serve the needs of the present generation of anglophone scholars and students of ancient and classical literature and rhetoric.

It should be noted that the material from paragraphs 1247-1326, which were added as a supplement to the second German edition, has been

incorporated as appropriate (e.g. in the case of corrections) or inserted into the text as “supplementary notes” at appropriate points. The supplementary notes indicate in parentheses the paragraph numbers allocated to them in the second German edition.

DEO
Leiden
January 1998

FOREWORD TO THE 1990 REPRINT OF THE SECOND EDITION

Following Heinrich Lausberg’s publication as early as 1949 of a 93-page treatise on literary rhetoric entitled *Elemente der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Einführung für Studierende der romanischen Philologie* (München, Max Hueber; a completely revised version of the *Elementen* appeared in 1963, expanded to almost twice its previous length and now arranged as an introduction for students of Classical, Romance, English, and German philology, which is today in its 9th edition), he in 1960 presented the massive, two-volume *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik* with the subtitle *Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*.

The publication of this work was rated by experts as “a significant event for philological research.”¹ The fact alone that the *Handbuch*, so far as we can see, has been reviewed in no less than 15 academic journals² provides an eloquent testimony of the extraordinarily deep chord which this work, which

¹ H. Wolf in his review in *Muttersprache* 72 (1962), p. 30.

² H.-G. Beck, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 54 (1961), p. 165; A. Rüegg, *ZrP* 77 (1961), pp. 550–551; K.D. Seemann, *Germanistik* 2 (1961), pp. 194–196; R.M. Wilson, *Erasmus* 40 (1961), pp. 158–159; A.E. Beau, *Boletim de Filologia* 20 (1961/62), pp. 348–350; O.A. Dieter, *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 61 (1962), pp. 666–667; K. Dockhorn, *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 214 (1962), pp. 177–196; A.E. Douglas, *The Classical Review* 12 (1962), pp. 246–247; I. Lana, *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica* 40 (1962), pp. 312–315; J. Sofer, *Die Sprache* 8 (1962), pp. 126–128; H. Wolf, *Muttersprache* 72 (1962), p. 30; W. Kraus, *RF* 75 (1963), pp. 134–136; F. Munari, *Gnomon* 35 (1963), pp. 334–338; M.R. Mayenowa, *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 85 (1964), pp. 608–611; W. Schmid, *ASNS* 200 (1963/64), pp. 451–462. – In addition, mention should also be made of the reviews by M. Fuhrmann, *Gnomon* 37 (1965), pp. 415–418 and M. Sandmann, *ZrP* 83 (1967), pp. 89–90, which are devoted primarily to discussion of the *Elemente der literarischen Rhetorik*, but also go into detail on the *Handbuch*.

is today generally recognized as the standard work, has struck. In spite of the objections expressed in some reviews – essentially only regarding matters of detail – the high appreciation that has been shown for Lausberg's achievement may be recorded as the universal judgement. A. Rüegg, for example, stresses: "Lausberg's two-volume work is a testimony to tremendous industry, encyclopedic knowledge, and the power to tightly order and systematize. It offers an exhaustive inventory, a taxonomy not only of the theoretical rhetoric of antiquity (including of the French), of the formal poetical, linguistic-architectonic phenomena and rules, aspects and concepts of rhetoric drawn from the cultivated language of the great masters, but of the whole technique of manipulating language."¹ W. Kraus praises "the extraordinary usefulness of the immense work which L. has produced by critically incorporating the entire bulk of ancient rhetoric."² And finally W. Schmid, who will be the last critic quoted here, judged: "... sincere admiration is warranted by the manner in which the professor of romance languages and literature at the University of Münster ... has immersed himself in the broad field of ancient rhetoric in a way which makes his *Handbuch* a welcome tool, useful equally to philologists of classical as well as modern languages."³

Lausberg's contribution – and this cannot be overestimated – is first and foremost of a *foundational* nature. His achievement was that rhetoric, one of the greatest powers of European intellectual life, both in Germany and – without exaggeration one may add – in Europe, was rehabilitated and once again assigned its proper place. Prior to this, scant attention had been paid to how this, surely the most important subject of the European system of education, founded upon the seven liberal arts, had come to be banished during the last century from schools and universities as supposedly superfluous ballast. This disdain for rhetoric stood in striking contrast to its enormously powerful influence, which, as is generally recognized today, stretched from ancient times through the Middle Ages up to the modern era. – Actually, the story of the rediscovery of rhetoric already begins in the years between 1920 and 1936, during which time the Americans, obviously stimulated by the concepts advocated in the New Humanism, assumed the leading role. The works from this time deserving particular emphasis include D.L. Clark's *Rhetoric and Poetry in the Renaissance* (New York, 1922) as well as two studies penned by C.S. Baldwin: *Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic* (New York, 1924) and *Medieval Rhetoric and Poetic (to 1400)* (New York,

¹ *ZrP* 77 (1961), p. 550.

² *RF* 75 (1963), p. 135.

³ *ASNS* 200 (1963/64), p. 451.

1928). "Rhetoric was in the air," as K. Dockhorn aptly stated.¹

Nevertheless, an overarching investigation of rhetoric in its entire phenomenological breadth still remained a pressing consideration. Anyone requiring information on a few of the phenomena and figures of rhetoric would still have to refer back to the lexica of Johann Christian Theoph. Ernesti, *Lexicon technologiae Graecorum* (and *Latinorum* respectively) *rhetoricae* (Leipzig, 1795; and 1797 respectively), which at the time of their publication had wonderfully met the needs of research and teaching, but which in the meantime had become outdated. (These have now been made available again in reprints.) And for information on the historical development of rhetoric there remained only recourse to R. Volkmann's *Rhetorik der Griechen und Römer* (Leipzig, 1901; 3rd ed.). The words with which Basil Munteano, the secretary of the *Revue de littérature comparée*, characterized the status of rhetoric in research at the 7th Congress of the International Organization for Modern Languages and Literature in 1957, are certainly overstated, since they take no account of works published since the rediscovery of rhetoric; yet they still provide an eloquent testimony of the long disdain for this discipline whose full value has been restored once more by Lausberg:

Or, il existe une discipline qui, ayant assumé cette mission (de sonder la nature de l'homme), l'a menée à bonne fin. Cette discipline, hélas, j'ose à peine l'appeler par son nom. Songez qu'il s'agit de la plus démodée, de la plus décriée des sciences; d'une science où les modernes, – même les lettrés! – depuis un siècle environ, n'aperçoivent plus guère qu'un ramassis de tristes et plats "lieux communs" et qu'ils tiennent pour synonyme d'une verbosité vide d'idées, mais riche d'artifices d'expression et de pensée. Tel est le triste sort que l'on réserve ordinairement à la Rhétorique traditionnelle, car – vous l'avez sans doute deviné – c'est elle que je viens d'incriminer au nom de nos contemporains.²

Lausberg did not want his *Handbuch* to be a history of ancient, medieval, and modern rhetoric, as he clearly emphasizes in his Foreword. Such an all-embracing study of this kind would be scarcely feasible for an individual scholar, especially given that since the early Middle Ages idiosyncratic and unsystematic theoreticians had seized control of rhetoric. Rather, his concern was to present – as he himself put it – "an open-ended presentation of ancient rhetoric, with the Middle Ages and the modern era in mind" by seeking to represent its general theory. This task has been achieved in masterly fashion in the *Handbuch* – and with that we may address the author's *concrete*

¹ *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 214 (1962), p. 178.

² In: P. Böckmann (ed.), *Stil- und Formprobleme in der Literatur* (Heidelberg, 1959), p. 69.

contribution, now that we have mentioned his foundational contribution. With methodical originality and unusual organizational talent, such a wealth of material as all but surpasses comprehension is here treated, systematically structured and made accessible for both the scholar of literature and the linguist. Through the ancient rhetoricians (but not only these) – here Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria*, which until modern times was a compulsory part of the syllabus, occupies a central place beside Cicero – the individual rhetorical phenomena and terms are exactly described and verified by fitting examples gathered from Latin, French, English, and German literature to a degree of comprehensiveness previously unknown. The *Handbuch*, which is a testimony of striking erudition, is not only – as the subtitle suggests – a foundation for literary study, but it is also “a never failing source of advice”, “an exhaustive reference work,”¹ which more than takes the place of Ernesti's lexica. The index, with its more than 300 pages prepared with enormous diligence and arranged according to Latin, Greek, and French terms, provides valuable assistance for discovering its extensive information.

Since the publication of the *Handbuch*, and undoubtedly stimulated by it, discussion in rhetorical research has become very lively. Since then a wealth of essays and monographs have been devoted to the theme of rhetoric, in which explicit reference to Lausberg is made in almost every work. In the 2nd edition of the *Handbuch* which was published in 1973, Heinrich Lausberg, in the section entitled “Additions to the Second Edition”, updated his work in view of the then current state of research and supplemented the exposition of the 1st edition, expanding (especially in the bibliographical section) and making corrections at several points, even adding personal remarks.

In the meantime even the 2nd edition of the *Handbuch* has gone out of print, which has been deeply regretted by many philologists active in research and teaching as well as in classroom instruction, as the numerous letters and inquiries directed to Heinrich Lausberg – as well as to the writer of this foreword – demonstrate. For this reason, Franz Steiner Verlag's publication of a one-volume reprint (unaltered from the 2nd edition) of this universally esteemed and indispensable standard work is heartily welcomed.²

Telgte, Autumn 1989

Arnold Arens

¹ A. Rüegg in *ZrP* 77 (1961), p. 550.

² Perhaps some will have expected a 3rd revised edition which would include the results of research performed up to now in the field of rhetoric. Such an updating of the *Handbuch* is being carried out by us at present, but may require quite some time till its completion. And it would be almost unpardonable to withhold Lausberg's *Handbuch* from those interested until the conclusion of our work, especially as this intends and is able only to supplement and expand, but in no way to question, “the Lausberg”. What Lausberg has written can never be revised; it can only be updated.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

L'ancienne rhétorique regardait comme des ornements et des artifices ces figures et ces relations que les raffinements successifs de la poésie ont fait enfin connaître comme l'essentiel de son objet; et que les progrès de l'analyse trouveront un jour comme effets de propriétés profondes, ou de ce qu'on pourrait nommer: "sensibilité formelle"

P. Valéry, *Tel quel I* (Paris, 1941), p. 150¹

This handbook of rhetoric pursues an educational objective: it seeks to smoothe the beginner's way (*viam rationemque*: see below § 3) to a phenomenologically and historically meaningful study of the literary art and beyond this to be an aid to philologists engaged in the practice of interpreting texts.

This objective carries with it a need for limitation. For a start, it would be impossible to furnish a history of classical, medieval, and modern rhetoric. Such a history would have to encompass not only the systems of instruction but also the individual phenomena of doctrine and practice (as in "zeugma"; see below §§ 692–708), and this would only be feasible in a multi-volume treatment. On the other hand, to limit the work chronologically to the period of the Middle Ages or the modern era would raise questions as to its general usefulness, even for the Middle Ages itself or the modern era. Therefore this handbook will attempt an open-ended presentation of ancient rhetoric with the Middle Ages and the modern era in mind. The breadth of the phenomena in antiquity makes it possible to include the roots of post-classical individual phenomena which the interpreter of medieval and modern literature will come across. In any case, interpreters will find themselves on a sure foundation if they choose the classical world as their starting point.

The purpose of the present portrayal is to clarify this foundation. – The historical development of classical rhetoric is to be treated by Vinzenz

¹ I owe this quotation to Peter Ronge, who drew my attention to it in 1959. The text can be found in P. Valéry, *Œuvres, II, Édition établie ... par J. Hytier*, Paris, 1960, p. 551. Cf. also H. Lausberg, *Das Sonett "Les Grenades"...*, Opladen, 1971, p. 149, § 460.4b.

Buchheit in his *Historischen Einführung in die antike Rhetorik*, soon to be published by the same press.

The present work does not claim to be a complete description of ancient rhetorical phenomena and terms: available space alone has dictated a restriction to the best examples. On the other hand, there was also the need, in view of the literary significance of rhetoric, to go beyond the framework of rhetoric itself and at least sketch the neighboring areas of grammar and poetics. A separate "Handbook of Literary Dialectics"¹ is in preparation.

The value of this present attempt, which stems from ten years' experience of teaching literature in Münster, will have to be gauged in practice, particularly in the practice of the interpretation of texts. The lineage of rhetoric, which stretches back more than 2,000 years, is vigorous and fertile. It would indeed be astonishing if the steady efforts of ancient reflection over language and literature from c. 450 B.C. to c. A.D. 600 had not led to discoveries worthy even today of serious consideration, since the linguistic and literary education of antiquity stood in living contact with public life: the rhetorization of literature was a necessary consequence of this contact. Rhetoric became a "journalism" (taken completely seriously), the *creuset* of literature, philosophy, public life, and the schools. – Further, in the encounter between literature and rhetoric it is true to say that the interpreter of literature cannot get by with literary rhetoric alone, either as regards the literary formulation of ideas and language or, especially, as regards the content preserved in literature in the broadest sense. Instruction in literary rhetoric must be understood as an antidote, as protection against an all too rapid actualization of contact with the individuality of the work of art and its individual creator. Rhetoric seeks to show the *langue*, which is the conventional means of expression of the *parole*. A *langue* without *parole* is dead, a *parole* without *langue* is inhuman: language, art, social and individual life depict a dialectical interdependence between *langue* and *parole*. The task of the present handbook is therefore to facilitate a first overview of the phenomena of literary *langue*. – Cf. further § 1246ff; under *rhétorique*, *source*.

I wish to thank Wolfgang Babilas for his faithful assistance in supervising

¹ In the supplementary § 1247 Lausberg provides the following note referenced to this page: **(dialectic and dialogue-technique):** 1) dialectics is the performance of a dialogue for the purpose of gaining knowledge by deduction (as in Platonic dialogue). This dialectics may then (in the syllogism: § 371) be turned into monolog. The modern use of the terms "dialectic" in the sense of an "ontological contradiction" is derived from "dialogical dialectic". 2) Cic. *Brut.* 309 "(dialectica) quasi contracta et astricta eloquentia putanda est". 3) § 1244, colloqui, colloquia, dialectica; § 1245, διάλογοι; § 1246, dialectique (with bibliography), dialogue (with bibliography). Further bibliography is provided at the end of the main bibliography, immediately before the Indexes.

the printing, for valuable bibliographical information, and for productive critical collaboration on the material itself. I owe special thanks to Alfons Weische and Bernd-Reiner Voss for their supervision of the printing, and to Peter Ronge, Barbara Ronge-Tilmann, and Christa Kriele-Grothues, for the preparation of the indexes.

Note on the second edition

The present second edition has been extended by the supplementary paragraphs §§1247-1326.¹

I am grateful to Arnold Arens for his unstinting help.

My *Elemente der literarischen Rhetorik*, 4th impression, München, 1971, to which the reader is also referred, contains matters of systematization and other details additional to those found in the *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric*.

To the Memory of

FRANZ BECKMANN

¹ This material is now incorporated into the main text in the form of supplementary notes or as additions to the Bibliography. See the Preface to the English translation, above. § 1326, a brief terminological index to the supplementary notes, has been omitted since the terms concerned are in most cases already indexed from the discussion at the new location of these notes.

CONTENTS

Foreword by George A. Kennedy	xix
Preface to the English Translation	xxii
Foreword to the 1990 Reprint of the Second Edition (1973)	xxiii
Author's Preface	xxvii
Comments on the Technical Layout of the Book	xxxix
 Preliminary Remarks (§§ 1–31)	 1
1. The <i>artes</i> in General (§§ 1–11)	1
a) Definition of <i>ars</i> (§§ 1–8)	1
b) Classification of the <i>artes</i> (§§ 9–11)	5
2. The <i>artes liberales</i> (§§ 12–15)	9
a) Definition of <i>artes liberales</i> (§12)	9
b) Classification of the <i>artes liberales</i> (§ 13)	10
c) Relationship to Philosophy (§ 14)	10
3. Grammar (§§ 16–31)	11
a) Definition of Grammar (§ 16)	11
b) The Classification of Grammar (§§ 17–30)	11
α) <i>Recte loquendi scientia</i> (§§ 18–22)	11
β) <i>Poetarum enarratio</i> (§§ 23–30)	13
c) In Praise of Grammar (§ 31)	15
 Rhetoric (§§ 32–1155)	 17
Section One: Definition and Place of Rhetoric (§§ 32–41)	17
1. Definition (§§ 32–33)	17
2. Relationship to Poetics and Philosophy (§§ 34–36)	18
3. The Dialectic of <i>natura</i> / <i>ars</i> (§§ 37–41)	21
 Section Two: Organization and Description of Rhetoric (§§ 42–1155)	 25
Part One: <i>De arte</i> (§§ 44–1150)	26
Chapter One: <i>Materia artis</i> (§§ 46–254)	26
I. The Universal Applicability of the <i>materia</i> (§§ 47–52)	27
II. Division of the <i>materia</i> (§§ 53–138)	29
A. The Three Aristotelian <i>genera</i> (§§ 59–65)	30
B. The Three Classifications of <i>quaestiones</i> (§§ 66–138)	39
1. The Three Degrees of Complexity of the <i>quaestio</i> (§ 67)	39
2. The Two Degrees of Concreteness of the <i>Quaestio</i> :	

<i>Quaestio finita, quaestio infinita</i> (§§ 68–78)	39
3. The Four <i>status</i> (§§ 79–138)	42
a) <i>Status coniecturae</i> (§§ 99–103)	48
b) <i>Status finitionis</i> (§§ 104–122)	49
c) <i>Status qualitatis</i> (§§ 123–130)	57
d) <i>Status translationis</i> (§§ 131–133)	59
e) Other Divisions of <i>status</i> (§§ 134–138)	60
III. Treatment of the <i>materia</i> on the Basis of the Aristotelian <i>genera</i> and <i>status</i> (§§ 139–254)	62
A. <i>Genus iudiciale</i> (§§ 140–223)	63
1. <i>Status generis rationalis</i> (§§ 149–197)	65
a) <i>Status coniecturae</i> (§§ 150–165)	66
α) <i>An voluerit</i> (§§ 156–159)	68
I') <i>Causae</i> (§ 157)	68
II') <i>Consilium</i> (§§ 158–159)	68
β) <i>An potuerit</i> (§§ 160–162)	69
I') <i>Potestas</i> (§ 161)	69
II') <i>Facultas</i> (§ 162)	69
γ) <i>An fecerit</i> (§§ 163–165)	69
I') <i>Verba et facta</i> (§ 164)	70
II') <i>Signa</i> (§ 165)	70
b) <i>Status finitionis</i> (§§ 166–170)	70
c) <i>Status qualitatis</i> (§§ 171–196)	72
α) <i>Pars iuridicialis</i> (§§ 174–195)	72
I') <i>Qualitas absoluta</i> (§ 176)	73
II') <i>Qualitas assumptiva</i> (§§ 177–195)	74
A' <i>relatio</i> (§§ 179–180)	75
B' <i>comparatio</i> (§§ 181–182)	76
C' <i>remotio</i> (§§ 183–185)	77
D' <i>concessio</i> (§§ 186–194)	78
1' <i>purgatio (error, casus, necessitas, oblivio)</i> (§§ 187–191)	78
2' <i>deprecatio</i> (§§ 192–194)	79
E' <i>quantitas</i> (§ 195)	81
β) <i>Pars negotialis</i> (§ 196)	81
d) <i>Status translationis</i> (§ 197)	82
2. <i>Status generis legalis</i> (§§ 198–223)	84
a) <i>Scriptum et voluntas</i> (§§ 214–217)	92
b) <i>Leges contrariae</i> (§§ 218–220)	93
c) <i>Syllogismus</i> (§ 221)	95
d) <i>Ambiguitas</i> (§§ 222–223)	96
B. <i>Genus deliberativum</i> (§§ 224–238)	97
1. <i>Status coniecturae</i> (§ 231)	98

2. <i>Status finitionis</i> (§ 232)	99
3. <i>Status qualitatis</i> (§§ 233–236)	100
4. <i>Status translationis</i> (§ 237)	102
5. <i>Status legales</i> (§ 238)	102
C. <i>Genus demonstrativum</i> (§§ 239–254)	102
1. <i>Status coniecturae</i> (§ 249)	109
2. <i>Status finitionis</i> (§§ 250–251)	109
3. <i>Status qualitatis</i> (§§ 252–253)	110
4. <i>Status translationis</i> (§ 254)	111
Chapter Two: <i>Partes artis</i> (§§ 255–1091)	112
1. <i>Inventio</i> (§§ 260–442)	119
A. <i>Exordium</i> (§§ 263–288)	121
1. <i>Exordiorum genera</i> (§§ 265–281)	121
a) <i>Prooemium</i> (§§ 266–279)	124
α) <i>Iudicem attentum parare</i> (§§ 269–271)	125
β) <i>Iudicem docilem parare</i> (§ 272)	128
γ) <i>Iudicem benevolum parare (a nostra persona, ab adver-</i> <i>sariorum persona, a iudicum persona, a causa)</i> (§§ 273–279)	129
b) <i>Insinuatio</i> (§§ 280–281)	132
2. <i>Exordii virtutes et vitia</i> (§§ 282–283)	133
3. <i>Exordii usus</i> (§§ 284–287)	134
4. <i>Exordii partes</i> (§ 288)	135
B. <i>Narratio</i> (§§ 289–347)	136
1. <i>Narrationum genera</i> (§§ 290–292)	137
2. <i>Narrationis virtutes et vitia</i> (§§ 293–337)	140
a) <i>Virtutes necessariae</i> (§§ 294–334)	140
α) <i>Narratio brevis</i> (§§ 297–314)	141
I' <i>Quantum satis est</i> (§§ 298–308)	142
A' <i>Cognitio</i> (§§ 299–307)	142
1' <i>Narrationis initium</i> (§§ 300–301)	143
2' <i>Narrationis medium</i> (§§ 302–306)	144
a' <i>res</i> (§§ 303–305)	144
b' <i>verba</i> (§§ 306)	145
3' <i>Narrationis finis</i> (§ 307)	145
B' <i>Utilitas</i> (§ 308)	146
II' <i>Quantum opus est</i> (§§ 309–314)	146
A' <i>Narratio aperta</i> (§§ 310–311)	146
B' <i>Narratio probabilis</i> (§ 312)	147
C' <i>Narratio ornata</i> (§§ 313–314)	147
β) <i>Narratio aperta</i> (§§ 315–321)	148
I' <i>Res</i> (§§ 316–319)	149
A' <i>Ordo</i> (§ 317)	149