

## The Role of Early Protestant Homiletics in the History of European and Hungarian Literary Thought

The epoch-making rhetorical turn in Wittenberg in the early 16<sup>th</sup> century and its close relationship to philosophical and theological initiatives of the Reformation is more or less known today: Melanchthon's initiative to complement, in the system of genres, the three genres of speech with a fourth one, education, had far-reaching implications in communication theory.<sup>1</sup> It is much less clear that the same generation of early reformers restructured the framework of discourse in the history of homiletics as well. Initiators of this process seem to be the University of Marburg – not Wittenberg – and the person of Andreas Gerardus Hyperius. Hyperius is at the starting point of new ideas about application, and these ideas opened the way for new systems of procedures for making connection with and finding meaning in the text.

The life-work of Hyperius has been in the focus of interest in international literature for quite a long time. He has been written about extensively in every major European language due to his Flemish origin, studies in France, stay in England, professorship in Germany, intellectual influence in Switzerland, and his influence on the formation of French- and English-language homiletics.<sup>2</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> Gábor KECSKEMÉTI, *Prédikáció, retorika, irodalomtörténet. A magyar nyelvű halotti beszéd a 17. században* (Preaching, rhetoric, literary history: Hungarian funeral oratory in the 17<sup>th</sup> century), Budapest, Universitas Könyvkiadó, 1998 (Historia Litteraria, 5) (hereafter: KECSKEMÉTI, 1998), 64–73, 76–79, 107–111.

<sup>2</sup> The history of 20<sup>th</sup> century research on Hyperius and its main achievements are summarised in eighty pages: Gerhard KRAUSE, *Andreas Hyperius in der Forschung seit 1900*, in *Theologische Rundschau*, N. F., 34(1969), 262–341 (hereafter: KRAUSE, 1969). The most important text publication since that: Andreas Gerhard HYPERIUS, *Briefe 1530–1563*, ed., übersetzt und kommentiert von Gerhard KRAUSE, Tübingen, Mohr, 1981 (Beiträge zur historischen Theologie, 64). From the newer literature: Gerhard KRAUSE, *Andreas Gerhard Hyperius. Leben – Bilder – Schriften*, Tübingen, Mohr, 1977 (Beiträge zur historischen Theologie, 56) (hereafter: KRAUSE, 1977); Peter BAYLEY, *French Pulpit Oratory 1598–1650. A Study in Themes and Styles, with a Descriptive Catalogue of Printed Texts*, Cambridge etc., Cambridge University Press, 1980, 61–62; Gerhard KRAUSE, *Die drei Epitaphia von Andreas Gerhard Hyperius auf den Tod des Erasmus von Rotterdam* (hereafter: KRAUSE, 1983) in *Reformation und praktische Theologie. Festschrift für Werner Jetter zum 70. Geburtstag*, Hg. von Hans Martin MÜLLER, Dietrich RÖSSLER, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck &

most frequently raised question in the literature is whether Hyperius belongs to the humanist or to the reformer tradition, and to which of these his ties are stronger.<sup>3</sup>

Besides his major work in homiletics, Hyperius wrote a humanist rhetorical handbook too.<sup>4</sup> It must be stressed that, covering invention, he presented the three genres of speech of antique origin: rules of genus demonstrativum, genus deliberativum, and genus iudiciale. He devoted the greatest attention, sixty pages to the first, writing ten pages on the second and fifty pages on the third. Thus, in his main work of rhetorical theory he ignored Melanchthon's rhetorical innovation: he did not build the fourth genre – educational speech – into his system. His work shows a remarkable classical bias in other respects as well: plenty of classical samples are used to illustrate the material. The most frequently mentioned is Cicero's *Pro Archia poeta*. As an example of stirring the three genera, not only laudation of persons, but many invention methods of any genus can be demonstrated in it, and from the steady references a systematic analysis could be assorted.

His *Topica*,<sup>5</sup> on the other hand, is a manual of invention of unique structure. It follows the internal order of the discipline of rhetoric, yet it attempts no less than biblical exegesis, drawing theological conclusions. The whole book demonstrates how much theological content included in or concluded from the Bible is influenced by the biblical way of expression. Thus, without rhetorical analysis dogmatic deficit may occur. Hardly may there be any closer integration of

---

Ruprecht, 1983 (hereafter: MÜLLER-RÖSSLER, 1983), 116–130; Olivier FATIO, *De l'utilité des examens en théologie. Un projet d'Andreas Hyperius* (hereafter: FATIO, 1984) in *In necessariis unitas. Mélanges offerts à Jean-Louis Leuba*, éd. Richard STAUFFER, Neuchâtel-Paris, Secrétariat de l'Université-Cerf, 1984 (hereafter: STAUFFER, 1984), 131–147; Robert JUTTE, *Andreas Hyperius (1511–1564) und die Reform des frühneuzeitlichen Armenwesens*, in *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, 75(1984), 113–138; Willem VAN'T SPIJKER, *Principe, methode en functie van de theologie bij Andreas Hyperius*, Kampen, Kok, 1990 (hereafter: VAN'T SPIJKER, 1990); Willem VAN'T SPIJKER, *Die Prädestination bei Hyperius* (hereafter: VAN'T SPIJKER, 1991a) in *Erbe und Auftrag. Festschrift für Wilhelm Heinrich Neuser zum 65. Geburtstag*, Hg. von Willem VAN'T SPIJKER, Kampen, Kok Pharos, 1991 (hereafter: VAN'T SPIJKER, 1991), 291–304; Olivier MILLET, *La Réforme protestante et la rhétorique (circa 1520–1550)* (hereafter: MILLET, 1999) in *Histoire de la rhétorique dans l'Europe moderne 1450–1950*, publiée sous la direction de Marc FUMAROLI, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1999 (hereafter: FUMAROLI, 1999), 259–312, 302–309; Matthew DECOURSEY, *Continental European Rhetoricians, 1400–1600, and Their Influence in Renaissance England in British Rhetoricians and Logicians 1500–1660. First Series*, ed. Edward A. MALONE, Detroit etc., A Brucoli Clark Layman Book–The Gale Group, 2001 (*Dictionary of Literary Biography*, 236), 309–343, 338.

<sup>3</sup> KRAUSE, 1969, *op. cit.*, 333.

<sup>4</sup> Andreas HYPERIUS, *De rhetorica liber unus* in Andreas HYPERIUS, *De dialectica liber unus. Item eiusdem alius De arte rhetorica liber alter*, Tiguri, 1562, 221–410. Later editions: Zürich, 1566, 1581; Sankt Gallen, 1581 (KRAUSE, 1969, *op. cit.*, 330).

<sup>5</sup> Editions: Zürich, 1561 (?), 1564; Wittenberg, 1565; Basle, 1573 (KRAUSE, 1969, *op. cit.*, 330). I refer to the Basle edition: Andreas HYPERIUS, *Topica theologica*, conscripta a clarissimo viro gravissimoque theologo, sacrarum literarum in inclitya schola Marpurgensi professore celeberrimo, Basileae, 1573.

rhetorical tradition and sacred content. Therefore we are justified in regarding Hyperius “a reformer with humanist education”.

Reviewing his biography we can clarify the question: where and amongst whom he acquired his humanist education; as well as the other, not less important, one: for what kind of purposes he mobilised his humanist erudition.

### *The Humanist and the Reformer Hyperius*

Andreas Gheeraerds (Gerhard, 1511–1564) was born in Ypern, Flanders – he used the name of his hometown in his humanist name. He got into contact with some leading humanists of his age, such as his master in Paris, Joachimus Fortius (Ringelbergh van Sterck, about 1479–1536) and Johann Sturm (1507–1589) of Strassburg; in England he belonged to the Erasmian circle of the 5<sup>th</sup> Count of Mountjoy, Charles Blount (1516–1544).<sup>6</sup>

The works of Fortius, which discussed grammar, dialectic, rhetoric, phraseology, stylistics, geometry, astronomy, astrology, even chiromancy, physiognomy, and interpretation of dreams appeared in an anthology in 1531, the year when Hyperius earned his magisterial degree. The book includes two letters by Fortius to Hyperius then only twenty years old. The form of address is “amicorum integerrime”. The master sends his greetings to his friend Erasmus through the young student: “Si te contigerit ad Desiderium Erasmus proficisci, illi quoque meo nomine salutem dicito.” Writing a letter is a good occasion for Fortius to work up pedagogical admonitions: “Ne insequaris vestigia plebis, quae semper optima consilia damnat: sed Ciceronem potius, qui in omni artium genere laudat exercitationem. Quid profuerit aliis, qui omnes autores in tenebris legunt, qui librorum ornatu et multitudine gaudent, si nihil docere aut scribere possint. Tu omnibus horis, omnibus locis exercendi quaere occasionem.” He even deals with some questions of life conduct appropriate for a humanist scholar: “Cogita, quod quum ex libro nostro de studendi ratione legisti, tum ex meipso saepe audivisti, vix fieri posse, ut quispiam peritus evadat, si semper in eodem loco desederit. Dic obsecro per Musas, quibus nos nostraque studia dedicavimus, penituit ne unquam literarum gratia te mutasse locum?”<sup>7</sup> The anthology contains an address given by Hyperius in front of the Senate of Paris. This extols Fortius as “caeleste potius quam humanum ingenium”: “Exactum et elimatum est quicquid colligit, subtilis ubique inventio, acre iudicium, aptum et concinnum quicquid ob oculos spectandum ponit.”<sup>8</sup> This is followed by a letter to the master packed with humble phrases of Hyperius, “qui clientulos inter postremos rogat annumerari”.<sup>9</sup> Among the authors of poems dedicated to and glorifying Fortius, Hyperius appears together with Erasmus, publisher and Hellenist of Basle Johannes Oporinus (1507–1568),

<sup>6</sup> FATIO, 1984, *op. cit.* in STAUFFER, 1984, *op. cit.*, 132.

<sup>7</sup> Joachim FORTIUS RINGELBERG, *Opera: Facsimile of the edition Lyons 1531*, Nieuwkoop, B. de Graaf, 1967 (Monumenta Humanistica Belgica, 3) (hereafter: FORTIUS, 1531/1967), the letters: 616–618.

<sup>8</sup> FORTIUS, 1531/1967, *op. cit.*, 672–681, the quotation: 675.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 681–682.

and Johannes Morisotus (Jean Morisot), a philologist, physician, and commentator of Cicero.<sup>10</sup>

It seems clear from all this that Hyperius was not a low-grade *clientulus* but a recognised, highly acclaimed member of the humanist community. The lasting influence of humanist linguistic and rhetorical principles absorbed in the circle of Fortius is clearly shown by the fact that his rhetoric published thirty years later faithfully follows the rhetoric of Fortius<sup>11</sup> in its principles, structure and every other important aspect. Melanchthon's rhetorical invention, that is, the introduction of genus didascalicum as the fourth genre of speech was already known when Fortius published his rhetoric.<sup>12</sup> Later it became widely accepted in Protestant circles. It may be for the influence of Fortius and his classification that Hyperius still adhered to the threefold structure. According to the Antwerpen master, dialecticum is a mere subgenus of demonstrativum, just like historicum and encomiasticum. Connecting genus demonstrativum and genus didascalicum is a frequent concept of 16<sup>th</sup> century rhetorical systems, while the actual stating of it can vary from registering analogies of them through recommendation of mutual applying their methods to the preference for one of them and incorporation of the other. The explanation of Hyperius' procedure with the highest interpretative gain, I believe, is that he reviewed and accepted Melanchthon's remarks on the usability of genus didascalicum in religious communication,<sup>13</sup> and made a clear distinction between secular rhetoric and the system of homiletics. He accounted for genus didascalicum as a genre of speech in homiletics, but inserted it in a brand new system of genres there.

This scheme of genres is the most important and original invention in Hyperius' theory of homiletics. To see its significance we need to give an overview of his theological work as well as his line of thought in homiletics.

Hyperius was a professor of theology from 1541 until his death in 1564 at the University of Marburg,<sup>14</sup> the first Lutheran university founded by Philip, Count of Hessen in 1527.

We cannot discuss here his irenic theological attitude, his dogmatic principles which show Philippist, Bucerian and Calvinist influence<sup>15</sup> and which

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 682–687. On the friends of Fortius: Melchior ADAM, *Vitae Germanorum philosophorum, qui seculo superiori, et quod excurrit, philosophicis ac humanioribus literis clari floruerunt*, Frankfurt am Main–Heidelberg, 1615, 85. On the epitaphs by Hyperius on the death of Erasmus: KRAUSE, 1983, *op. cit.* in MÜLLER–ROSSLER, 1983, *op. cit.*

<sup>11</sup> FORTIUS, 1531/1967, *op. cit.*, 249–282.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 64–65, n. 67.

<sup>13</sup> Philippus MELANCHTHON, *Elementorum rhetorices libri duo, recens recogniti ab autore. His adiectae sunt epistolae contrariae PICI et HERMOLAI BARBARI, una cum dispositione. Accessit demum index et rerum et verborum locupletissimus*, Lipsiae, 1556.

<sup>14</sup> On professors of theology in Marburg: FRANZ GUNDLACH, *Catalogus professorum Academiae Marburgensis. Die akademischen Lehrer der Philipps-Universität in Marburg von 1527 bis 1910*, Marburg (Hessen), N. G. Elwert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung–G. Braun, 1927 (Veröffentlichungen der Historischen Kommission für Hessen und Waldeck, 15), 3–20.

<sup>15</sup> FATIO, 1984, *op. cit.* in STAUFFER, 1984, *op. cit.*, 133; VAN'T SPIJKER, 1991a, *op. cit.* in VAN'T SPIJKER, 1991, *op. cit.*; MILLET, 1999, *op. cit.* in FUMAROLI, 1999, *op. cit.*, 301–302. The

earned him the name “Melanchthon of Hessen”. From our point of view his interest in pragmatic questions of pastoral theology seems much more important. It was Hyperius who, apart from teaching exegesis<sup>16</sup> and dogmatic theology<sup>17</sup> laid the foundation of scientific treatment of practical ecclesiastical life. He created the scientific discipline of practical theology<sup>18</sup> and gave a scientific description of it in his *De recte formando theologiae studio libri quattuor* (Basle, 1556; later editions with the title *De theologo, seu De ratione studii theologici* in Leiden, Basle, Strassburg). His interest in the practical needs of pastoral work went hand in hand with his reformer ideas in the education of ministers. In Marburg, practices in declamation and disputation had been introduced to students of theology as well, and Hyperius joined the trend whole-heartedly.<sup>19</sup> His methodological suggestions for the exams for ministers<sup>20</sup> contain questions compiled from practical and theoretical theology.<sup>21</sup> His efforts led directly to his work of homiletics that laid the foundation for Protestant thinking about the theory of preaching.

### *Hyperius' Theory of Homiletics*<sup>22</sup>

The homiletics of Hyperius appeared six times in the 16<sup>th</sup> century. It was printed also in French and English translation, the former already in Hyperius' lifetime.<sup>23</sup>

---

*Methodus theologiae* by Hyperius was a standard piece of the libraries of Hungarian Calvinist colleges in the 17<sup>th</sup> century.

<sup>16</sup> The first printed theological work by Hyperius was his commentary on St Paul's letter to the Romans (Frankfurt, 1548). More of his biblical commentaries were published after his death: on Isaiah (Basle, 1574) and on the letters of St Paul (Zürich, 1582–1584).

<sup>17</sup> His dogmatic works: *Theses theologicae de trinitate*, 1564; *Methodi theologiae sive praecipuorum christianae religionis locorum communium libri tres*, Basle, 1566; his catechism: *Elementa christianae religionis*, Basle, 1563; *De catechesi*, 1570, it was published even in the 18<sup>th</sup> century: Helmstedt, 1704, 1708.

<sup>18</sup> VAN'T SPIJKER, 1990, *op. cit.*

<sup>19</sup> KRAUSE, 1969, *op. cit.*, 331. On rhetorical views of Franciscus Lambertus (1486–1530): MILLET, 1999, *op. cit.* in FUMAROLI, 1999, *op. cit.*, 296. His possible influence in Hungary: Barna NAGY, *Méliusz Péter művei. Könyvészeti és tartalmi áttekintés, különös figyelemmel most felfedezett műveire s a forráskutatási feladatokra* (Works of Péter Méliusz: Survey of bibliography and of content, with special regard to his recently discovered works and to the tasks of searching of sources), in *A második helvét hitvallás Magyarországon és Méliusz életműve* (The second Helvetian Confession in Hungary and the works of Méliusz), ed. Tibor BARTHA, Budapest, Magyarországi Református Egyház Zsinati Irodájának Sajtóosztálya, 1967 (*Studia et Acta Ecclesiastica*, 2), 193–301, 244, 295.

<sup>20</sup> *De publico studiosorum in schola theologica examine consilium* in Andreas HYPERIUS, *Varia opuscula theologica*, Basle, 1570, 364–436.

<sup>21</sup> Some of them are cited by Wilhelm Zepper in his *Polittia ecclesiastica*, cf. FATIO, 1984, *op. cit.* in STAUFFER, 1984, *op. cit.*, 146.

<sup>22</sup> On the homiletics of Hyperius: Peter KAWERAU, *Die Homiletik des Andreas Hyperius*, in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 71(1960), 66–81; KRAUSE, 1969, *op. cit.*, 327–334.

<sup>23</sup> The Latin editions: Marburg, 1553; Dortmund, 1555; Marburg, 1562; Basle, 1563, 1573, 1579; we know of an 18<sup>th</sup> century edition, too: Halle, 1781. French: Geneva, 1563. English translation of John Ludham: London, 1577. Cf. KRAUSE, 1977, *op. cit.*, 135–139; Wilbur Samuel HOWELL, *Logic and Rhetoric in England 1500–1700*, Princeton N. J., Princeton University Press, 1956 (hereafter: HOWELL, 1956), 110–115.

The first book of Hyperian homiletics begins with the separation of scholarly and popular biblical interpretation. “Duplicem esse rationem interpretandi Scripturas in Ecclesiis usurpatam, alteram Scholasticam, alteram popularem, nemo ignorat. Illa est coetibus doctorum virorum atque studiosorum adolescentium aliquo usque in literis progressorum apta: haec ad instituendam promiscuam multitudinem, in qua plurimi rudes, imperiti atque illiterati, tota comparata est. Illa exercetur intra scholarum angustos parietes: haec in spaciosis templis locum obtinet. Illa concisa et adstricta est, philosophicam solitudinem, severitatemque redolens: ista expansa, libera, et effusa, necnon oratoria luce et quasi foro gaudens. In illa, pleraque ad Dialecticam brevitatem ac simplicitatem exiguntur: in ista, copia et ubertas Rhetorica plurimam adfert gratiam. Atque haud difficiliter hoc discrimen in multis veterum scriptis deprehendi potest.”<sup>24</sup> The prophets’ and Christ’s sermons belong to the popular explanation, as well as the “exhortationes, correctiones, consolationes” of St Paul and homilies, sermons, and orations of the Fathers. Scholarly explanation can be found in other writings of St Paul (“disputationes”), especially in his letters on justification, in commentaries of St Jerome, and in treatises of St Augustine. “Non minor est virtus aperte, simpliciter et populariter, quam docte, argute et graviter eloqui” – says Hyperius, making it clear that the difference of the two explanation methods is just of function, not of importance.<sup>25</sup>

The second chapter answers to the question, “Quibus rebus eum instructum esse oporteat, qui munus docendi in Ecclesia suscipit”.<sup>26</sup> It declares theological study and studia humanitatis to be equally important in the training of ministers. It is in this spirit, that he says in the fourth chapter: “multa sunt concionatori cum oratore communia”.<sup>27</sup> According to him, such common features are the five rhetorical operations, the three objectives, and the three styles. Disposition, elocution, and memory can be adapted from their rhetorical precepts; those ministers who have practised themselves in secular oratory, can use these with success in their new profession.<sup>28</sup> Church delivery is quite different from and has to be much more sublime than that of the profane oratory, and its customary variations can be acquired much more effectively from the imitation of local practice than from school precepts. Meanwhile, in the area of invention, the difference between the preacher and the lay speaker is so great – and it can be captured theoretically – that Hyperius wants to focus on this. Before its systematic exposition,

<sup>24</sup> I consulted and quote the first edition: Andreas HYPERIUS, *De formandis concionibus sacris, seu De interpretatione scripturarum populari libri II*, Marburg, 1553 (hereafter: HYPERIUS, 1553), 3r-v.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 22v.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 5v-12r.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 13r-14r.

<sup>28</sup> „Breviter, quicquid in dispositione, elocutione, et memoria est concionatori necessarium, accurate rhetores id omne in suis officinis tradiderunt: quocirca (meo quidem iudicio) multo commodissime concionatores easdem partes ex illis discent. Certi qui aliquo modo exercitatus in rhetorum scholis prius fuerit, quam in concionatorum recipiatur ordinem, is multis aliis instructor et magis idoneus adveniet.”

he gives some advice “de concionum forma atque partibus”. “Ne epistola quidem de rebus familiaribus ad unum privatim scripta, ordine partium destituta esse potest: quanto magis partes concionis, quae de rebus habent gravissimis, ad multitudinem universam, ordine collocari oportebit: Non tam discentes quam ipsi docentes iusta partium dispositione opus habent. Porro concionis partes sunt septem: Lectio sacrae scripturae, Invocatio, Exordium, Propositio seu divisio, Confirmatio, Confutatio, Conclusio.”<sup>29</sup> He discusses the features of these seven speech parts in different chapters, detailing the invention methods for each. The two last chapters of the first book cover amplification and governing of affects.

The second book is about the kinds of sermon and their invention in its entirety. The first chapter stresses the inadequacy of genres of secular speech for preaching purposes.<sup>30</sup> Instead of them, Hyperius suggests five genres for homiletic purposes based on and developed from St Paul’s biblical places (2Tim 3,16, 1Cor 14,3, Rom 15,4): “Ad haec genera quaecunque conciones sacrae referri possunt ac debent, multoque plura sub his comprehenduntur quam sub illis causarum generibus quae Rhetores tantopere vendicant. Quae enim Iudicialis sunt generis oratoribus, ea apte collocantur sub Redargutione, aut Correctione: quae autem deliberativi generis itemque Demonstrativi, sub Institutione: quod vero ad doctrinale itemque ad Consolatorium genus reducat, rhetores non habent, utpote qui universum docendi consolandique munus ad Philosophos Academicarum et Scholarum incolas liberali vacantes ocio devolverunt.”<sup>31</sup> The five genres also determine five different statuses.

From the genres he first expounds *De genere doctrinali seu didascalico*. It is about the genre concerned with the presentation of Christian ideas and religious instruction. This is genus didascalicum, which was developed by Melanchthon. Unlike Melanchthon, Hyperius treated it as a separate group only in homiletics. The second genre in homiletics is genus redargutivum, the kind of speech aimed at refuting incorrect views. However, it is not a negative image of genus didascalicum. Hyperius says it is a derivative of refutation in genus iudiciale. Institutivum (urging to follow exemplary behaviour) and correctorium (scolding improper behaviour) use mainly the tools of genus deliberativum and demonstrativum. “Ad genus institutum spectant inprimis omnia quae Rhetores collocarunt in genere deliberativo. Etenim suasiones, exhortationes, admonitiones [...]. Quae praeterea generis sunt demonstrativi atque encomiastici ad hanc classem rediguntur.” In church community there are the same three praisable things than in secular life: we can praise “vel personam, ut Abrahamum, Iobum: vel factum, ut [...] Machabaeorum: vel rem quampiam, ut beneficentiam erga pauperes”. The use of genus institutum makes it possible that “auditores, aut ad imitationem in

<sup>29</sup> HYPERIUS, 1553, *op. cit.*, 23r.

<sup>30</sup> „Frustra mihi videntur se torquere, atque iniuriam etiam non levem inferre Theologiae [...] qui conantur tria illa genera causarum (Demonstrativum, Deliberativum, Iudiciale) e prophano foro in [...] Ecclesiam inducere.” HYPERIUS, 1553, *op. cit.*, 76v.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 77r-77v.

communi vita, aut certe ad laudandum Deum [...] provocentur.” Genus correctorium also uses the invention methods of dissuasio and dehortatio from genus deliberativum and of vituperatio from genus demonstrativum, but it is connected to genus iudiciale as well: it condemns, reprobates just like redargutivum, but its primary aim is moral improvement, while that of the latter is theoretic controversy. There are possibilities of utilising genus iudiciale even in genus institutivum: “Adnotandum porro ad haec duo genera concionum, institutivum, inquam, et correctorium, iure adiici ea quae Rhetores in genere iudicali dicunt statum efficere qualitatis seu iuridicalem.”<sup>32</sup> The fifth genus is genus consolatorium, ordinarily not discussed in rhetorical systems, which, of course, can utilise numerous common tools of genus deliberativum.

After describing each of the five genera in homiletics, Hyperius says that in preaching there is another genre of speech, genus mixtum that is most frequently used. This genus includes two or more from any of the other five homiletic genera.<sup>33</sup> The notion that the genres can be mixed within the same speech had been commonplace in rhetoric from ancient times. What is new in Hyperius is that he speaks about the mixture of the five homiletic genres similarly to the mixture of the four secular genres. Every speech has its primarium genus, the other genera appear in different places in the structure of the speech and have local importance – they dominate certain parts of the speech. Hyperius is not very clear about the effects of a genus on a part of a speech, yet, some of his ideas can be exposed from the 11<sup>th</sup> chapter of the first book. There are some curious features of this lengthy chapter: it is inserted in the line of the seven speech parts, between divisio and confirmatio, but it does not describe any of them. Its topic is, “Qua ratione unamquaque concionem in locos certos apte possimus distribuere”.<sup>34</sup> Hyperius mentions the five homiletic genera in this chapter already, determining some speech parts. He recommends expounding two or three loci communes in every sermon, and confirmatio and confutatio can occur in expounding any point. Therefore four out of the five genera, didascalicum and redargutivum, or institutivum and correctorium, respectively, can dominate different parts of a sermon in any order, depending on the dogmatic or ethical nature of the locus communis in question.

To put it more simply: it follows from the theory of Hyperius that it is the genus that has a part of speech, not the other way round, not the part of speech has a genus. Dogmatic or ethical genera control the line of thought. Didascalicum and institutivum always require confirmatio, redargutivum and correctorium al-

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 119r. On connections with antique genera: John W. O'MALLEY, *Content and Rhetorical Forms in Sixteenth-Century Treatises on Preaching in Renaissance Eloquence. Studies in the Theory and Practice of Renaissance Rhetoric*, ed. James Jerome MURPHY, Berkeley etc., University of California Press, 1983, 238–252; reprinted: John W. O'MALLEY, *Religious Culture in the Sixteenth Century Preaching, Rhetoric, Spirituality, and Reform*, Aldershot, Variorum Reprints, 1993 (Collected Studies, 404) (hereafter: O'MALLEY, 1993), no. III, 249–250.

<sup>33</sup> HYPERIUS, 1553, *op. cit.*, 127r–128r.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, 35r–47r.



ways require *confutatio*. A certain genus can always build the same part of speech in any place in the text. At the same time there is no element in the structure that would always assign the same genus to itself, that is, that would determine some local value of modality. Nothing is known about the relationship of genera and the closing part of the sermon, conclusion.

### *The Development of Genera into Usus in European Homiletics*

According to a German church historian specialising in Hyperius, homiletics of the Marburg professor was the most often referenced textbook in homiletics up until the 20<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>35</sup> Its career was not exactly a straight line, however.

Among the Lutheran works in homiletics in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, those of Lucas Osiander (1534–1604), Jacob Andreä (1528–1590), and Aegidius Hunnius (1550–1603) follow Melanchthon and speak about the three ancient genera supplemented by *didascalicum* as the fourth genre of speech.<sup>36</sup>

Genera of Hyperius appear again in Calvinist theoretical manuals at the turn of the century. The homiletics of Herborn minister Wilhelm Zepper (1550–1607) published in 1598 presents the five genres of sermon following exactly Hyperian classification<sup>37</sup> just as Matthaeus Sutlivius (Matthew Sutcliff, 1550–1629) does in his homiletics (London, 1602).<sup>38</sup> Reappearance of Hyperian genera, however, was soon followed by reassessment of their scope and mode of application. This was probably motivated by considerations initiated by Erasmus.

Erasmus' theory of preaching also discussed five genres of speech instead of the traditional rhetorical genera, however, these are far from being identical with those proposed by Hyperius. In the Erasmian system teaching is not a separate genre of speech, on the other hand, all genres of speech are born from the way teaching and convincing is connected. Four out of the five Erasmian genera originate from *genus deliberativum* (*persuasio*, *exhortatio*, *admonitio*, *consolatio*), while the fifth, *laudatorium* (sc. laudation of the saints) from *genus demonstra-*

<sup>35</sup> „...in den homiletischen Lehrbüchern bis heute am häufigsten zitierte”, KRAUSE, 1969, *op. cit.*, 327.

<sup>36</sup> Lucas OSIANDER, *De ratione concionandi*, Tübingen, 1582; *Methodus concionandi*, tradita a celeberrimo Theologo Dn. D. Iacobo ANDREAE, Ecclesiae Tubingensis quondam praeposito, et eiusdem Academiae Cancellario dignissimo. In gratiam Theologiae studiosorum edita per Polycarpum LYSERUM S. Theologiae D. et aulae Saxonicae Dresdae Ecclesiasten primarium, Wittenberg, 1595; *Methodus concionandi, praeceptis et exemplis Dominicalium quorundam Evangeliorum comprehensa. Excepta in illustri Academia Marpurgensi ex ore reverendi et clarissimi viri, D. Aegidii HUNNII SS. Theologiae Doctoris, et hoc tempore Professoris in inclyta Academia VVitebergensi, Wittenberg, 1595.*

<sup>37</sup> Wilhelm ZEPPEL, *Ars habendi et audiendi conciones sacras. Hoc est: Quid ante, sub et post conciones sacras, tam concionatoribus, quam auditoribus facto opus sit*, Sigenae Nassoviorum, 1598, 38–42.

<sup>38</sup> Matthaei SUTLIVII *De recta studii theologici ratione; De concionum ad populum formulis, et sacrae Scripturae varia pro auditorum captu tractatione, libellus. Nunc primum in Germania in lucem editus*, Hanoviae, 1604, 111–120.

tivum.<sup>39</sup> Besides the five genera, teaching, as a common goal of all sermons, appears as a kind of metagenus, which postpones the preacher's choice of genus until the second half of the speech.<sup>40</sup> Erasmus' teaching on metagenus and his five homiletic genera are the first step in the history of homiletics towards a concept that accounts for realisation of the genera in the closing part of the speech. The five Erasmian genera have relevance in the final section of preparing the speech. These are, in essence, modes of application adapted to the composition of the audience.

It seems that certain Calvinist theory-writers in the late 16<sup>th</sup> century blended ideas of Erasmus and Hyperius. Regarding the five genera of preaching they voted for the system of Hyperius and they used his rhetorical principle of mixing genres within the same sermon. These writers, however, did not consider these genera components of the doctrinal part of the sermon as Hyperius did, but, in accordance with Erasmus' idea, they used them at the end of the sermon in a separate part. These points were constructed according to specifications of genera. Such a point they called *usus* and the part in which *usus* appeared one after another was called application or accommodation.

Thinking in communication theory in the framework of *genera usuum* instead of *genera orationis* is a seminal process in 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> century Protestant homiletics. We don't yet know certainly, who was personally responsible for initiating the idea, yet the process of its spreading and becoming a paradigm can easily be identified and traced using available data.

*Prophetica* of William Perkins (1558–1602) was first published in 1592. In this work<sup>41</sup> that unified advice from Hyperius with Puritan preaching practice in England, Hyperian genres are unequivocally species of application. There is a Ramist dichotomic grouping in this section: application can be theoretical (“*noëtica, quae mentem respicit*”) and practical (“*practica, quae ita et mores respicit*”), and there are two species in both groups. *Didascalicum* and *elencticum* are the theoretical applications, *paideia* and *epanorthosis* are the practical ones. The locus of *epanorthosis* is *admonitio*, while *paideia* has two loci: *exhortatio* and *consolatio*. Thus, the five parts of the Hyperian system can be

<sup>39</sup> John W. O'MALLEY, *Erasmus and the History of Sacred Rhetoric. The Ecclesiastes of 1535*, in *Erasmus of Rotterdam Society Yearbook*, 5(1985), 1–29; reprinted: O'MALLEY, 1993, *op. cit.*, no. VII.

<sup>40</sup> Similar views can be found at Melancthon, as well. According to his *De modo et arte concionandi*, there are only two genera in sermons. One of them is *doctrina*, which means catechesis (theological doctrine explained by the rules of dialectics) and *interpretatio scripturae* (connection of biblical text and loci). The other is *adhortatio*. Genera are not realised by the whole sermon, but by individual parts of speech following each other, respectively. However, instead of *adhortatio* at the end of every sermon, Erasmus advises a much greater generic variety for the conclusive parts. Cf. Jānis KRESLIŅŠ, *Dominus narrabit in scriptura populorum. A Study of Early Seventeenth-Century Lutheran Teaching on Preaching and the Lettische lang-gewünschte Postill of Georgius Mancelius*, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1992 (Wolfenbütteler Forschungen, 54), 51–64.

recognised on the third level of the dichotomy.<sup>42</sup> Dillenburg minister Bernhardus Textor published his manual for pastors in Herborn in 1599. He, after discussing structural components of the speech, turned to genres. He discussed the sixth, mixed genre after the five pure genera, devoting the biggest space and attributing the greatest importance and the widest usage to it (“genus omnium vulgatissimum”).<sup>43</sup> Discussion of mixed genre appearing here clearly shows the transitory state in which principles organising the closing parts of the sermon are forming from genera of the sermon. Since there are always many people present in the church with different spiritual needs, sermon should be “wie ein dietrich, hoc est, ut clavis omnibus seris aperiendis accommodata. Commisceri igitur genera concionum necesse est. Commistionem autem illam dum suadeo: nemo opinetur, me confusum chaos et scopas dissolutas ex concionibus facere. [...] Hoc igitur volo, ut ex uno genere concionis [...] fiat transitio per doctrinarum, usum et applicationis connexionem ad aliena genera, vel omnia, vel pleraque. [...] Commodissime igitur ex genere διδασκαλικῶ transitus fieri potest ad reliqua quatuor singula. Nam proposita, explicata, confirmata et illustrata vera doctrina: in usu eius ostendi potest, quomodo seruiat ad confutationem doctrinae falsae, ad studium virtutum, ad fugam peccatorum et ad consolationem...”<sup>44</sup> So, in Textor, didascalium does not seem to be usus yet but more a status of confirmatio. Followers of Perkins, on the other hand, form usus from all the five genera. This is the procedure followed in the *Ecclesiastes* by Guilielmus Bucanus dated 1602, also published in Transylvania in 1650. This distinguishes the five Hyperian species within applicatio.<sup>45</sup> Keckermann’s homiletics speaks about the same five species in presenting applicatio.<sup>46</sup>

Another sure sign of the transformation of homiletic genera into usus is that the fourfold system of rhetorical genera that includes didascalium slowly creeps back into theories of preaching and the authors don’t seem to see any inconsistency. Even Textor, who – as we have seen – writes *De sex concionum generibus*, in an earlier section of his homiletics declares that the four rhetorical genera

<sup>41</sup> HOWELL, 1956, *op. cit.*, 206–207; Klára KOLTAY, *Mester és tanítványa. William Perkins és William Ames munkássága* (The master and his disciple: the works of William Perkins and William Ames), in *Könyv és Könyvtár* (Debrecen), 16(1991), 39–57, 44.

<sup>42</sup> William PERKINS, *Prophetica*, Basle, 1602, 95–100. On Bisterfeld’s system which is similar to that of Perkins yet still more complicated: István BARTÓK, „Sokkal magyarabbul szólhatnánk és írhatnánk”. *Irodalmi gondolkodás Magyarországon 1630–1700 között* (Literary thinking in Hungary 1630–1700), Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó–Universitas Kiadó, 1998 (Irodalomtudomány és Kritika) (hereafter: BARTÓK, 1998), 194.

<sup>43</sup> Bernhardus TEXTOR, *Pandectae Sacrarum Concionum in tria volumina digestarum*, Herbornae Nassoviorum, 1599 (hereafter: TEXTOR, 1599), 64.

<sup>44</sup> TEXTOR, 1599, *op. cit.*, 69.

<sup>45</sup> Guilielmus BUCANUS, *Ecclesiastes, seu De methodo concionandi tractatus duo* (hereafter: BUCANUS, 1604/1650) in Abraham SCULTETUS, *Axiomata concionandi practica*, edita studio et operâ M. Christiani KYFERTI Goldbergensis Silesii, Várad, 1650 (hereafter: SCULTETUS, 1610/1650), 39–106.

<sup>46</sup> Bartholomaei KECKERMANI Dantiscani, in *gymnasio patrio philosophiae professoris eruditissimi Operum omnium quae extant*, I–II, Genevae, 1614, 33–37.

should operate in a sermon.<sup>47</sup> For Bucanus, who esteems the Hyperian genera as *usus*, there is no problem, of course, to speak of the four rhetorical genera concerning the sermon of mixed genus: preacher can utilise different genera “*etiam in unam eademque concione. Quando enim vult docere, utitur genere didascalico: Quando consolatur aut hortatur, aut dehortatur, deliberativo: Quando arguit adversarios, versatur in genere judiciali: Quando laudat personas vel facta, genus demonstrat[ivum] usurpat.*”<sup>48</sup> In the same way, rhetorical genera are mentioned by Scultetus when he gives common rules for discussion of any kind of topic, “*sive illud ad genus didascalicum, sive demonstrativum, sive deliberativum, etc. pertineat.*” According to him, there is only one part in a sermon where *usus* developed from homiletic genera diversify the invention method. Invention could be accomplished with the ever-same method till this one point, the application, without respect of the rhetorical genus of the topic: “*Errant igitur, qui in diversis causarum generibus diversis quoque methodis utendum esse putant. Variatio nulla est nisi in applicatione.*”<sup>49</sup>

Although theoreticians don't expect every *usus* to be used at the end of each sermon, in practice most sermons utilise several different *usus*. *Usus* have a major role in providing complexity and adapting to the heterogeneity of the audience in the sermon. The more or less permanent names of the *usus* indicate that this adaptation is attempted through pragmatic guidance.

Teaching and application in these homiletic systems are not simultaneous but are separate phases. One builds on the other. Their separation is a definite difference from Hyperius, the result of a period of change up till the end of the 16<sup>th</sup> century. It has far-reaching consequences in epistemology and hermeneutics. “*Reformers' dynamic and personal concept of the Word [...] is beginning to turn into a concept of the Word that can be described as more impersonal and static: [...] explicatio separates from applicatio, and this reflects the notion that the meaning, the *sensus* of the text, «testimony» as theological teaching, can be determined objectively before discovering and acknowledging its *usus*, gain, present validity, and need in our life.*”<sup>50</sup>

The influential Calvinist theoretician of the early 17<sup>th</sup> century, William Ames, a student of Perkins goes even farther. He popularises a theory of preaching in which even for the *usus* it is their intellectual nature that becomes prominent.

<sup>47</sup> TEXTOR, 1599, *op. cit.*, 27.

<sup>48</sup> BUCANUS, 1604/1650, *op. cit.* in SCULTETUS, 1610/1650, *op. cit.*

<sup>49</sup> SCULTETUS, 1610/1650, *op. cit.*, section III.

<sup>50</sup> Sándor CZEGLÉDY, A Heidelbergi Káté magyarországi magyarázatainak története 1791-ig (The history of the commentaries of Heidelberg Catechism in Hungary until 1791), in *A Heidelbergi Káté története Magyarországon* (The history of the Heidelberg Catechism in Hungary), ed. Tibor BARTHA, Budapest, Magyarországi Református Egyház Zsinati Irodájának Sajtóosztálya, 1965 (*Studia et Acta Ecclesiastica*, 1), 131–168, 138; cf. Timothy J. WENGERT, *Georg Major (1502–1574). Defender of Wittenberg's Faith and Melancthonian Exegete in Melancthon in seinen Schülern*, Hg. von Heinz SCHEIBLE, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag, 1997 (*Wolfenbütteler Forschungen*, 73), 129–155.

With them, explicatio is followed by another explicatio, and applicatio only appears in the third phase of the sermon.

Ames did not write an independent work on homiletics, but the 35<sup>th</sup> chapter of the first book of his masterwork, *Medulla theologica*, is to be considered as a brief ars concionandi. It was printed even in Hungary in Latin (Debrecen, 1685),<sup>51</sup> György Martonfalvi Tóth published a detailed Latin commentary on it in two volumes (1670, 1675),<sup>52</sup> and he translated it into Hungarian partially in his *Tanétó és czáfoló theologia* (1679).<sup>53</sup> Ames denoted theoretical gains with terms informatio and reformatio, practical gains with the terms institutio and correctio.<sup>54</sup> But he only counted these four among the gains from the Hyperian five. The fifth he did not consider a gain but a mode of application separate from the gains. He put exhortatio and dehortatio also among the modes of application. The basis of distinction is that while we speak about gains in general, in application we tailor what we have to say to our audience. Grammatically we express that we are turning to them by switching from the third person to the second person.<sup>55</sup> As it can be seen, Amesian application methods are identical with the loci of Perkinsian practical applications. While they hold a vertical building of theoretical structure at Perkins, Ames uses them for linear collocating of speech parts.

Lutheran homiletics followed the road taken by Calvinist theory of sermons. It can be proven through references that this happened under the influence of Calvinist theoreticians. The steps of genera turning into usus can be followed there too.<sup>56</sup>

The theory of usus developed from Hyperian genera has its history in Hungary, too. The methodology of preparing a sermon presented in the second table of the homiletics of Pál Medgyesi faithfully followed the classification by Ames: there

<sup>51</sup> Guilielmus AMESIUS, *Medulla theologica, editio novissima. Ab avthore ante obitum recognita et variis in locis aucta*, Debrecen, 1685. On the structure of sermon: 157–161.

<sup>52</sup> First book of Ames is discussed in the first book of commentary: MARTONFALVI TÓTH, György, *Exegesis libri primi Medvllae Amesianae, in qua, qvantum ad fidei articulos attinet, qvicqvid in sacro-sancta theologia reperitur secreti et ardui, qvicqvid in schola continetur orthodoxi et obscuri, qvicqvid ab hodiernis haereticis vocatur in controversiam, id fere totum, per qvaestiones, objectiones, responsiones, ita explicatur, ut sacro-sanctae theologiae cultoribus, praecipue disputaturis et concionaturis, commodissime inservire qveat*, Debrecen, 1670 (hereafter: MARTONFALVI TÓTH, 1670). On the structure of sermon: 896–906.

<sup>53</sup> György MARTONFALVI TÓTH *Taneto és czafolo theologiaja. Mellyet Amesiuss és Vendelinus szerint irt azoknak kedvekért, a' kik az igaz theologiat, és vallást, hamar kívánnyák megtanulni: és mellyet, ezen jó végért, a' Debreczeni Collegium, a' maga költségén nyomtattatott-ki* (Theology teaching and refuting), Debrecen, 1679. On the structure of sermon: 150–152.

<sup>54</sup> BARTÓK, 1998, *op. cit.*, 194, 209.

<sup>55</sup> MARTONFALVI TÓTH, 1670, *op. cit.*, 900.

<sup>56</sup> For details, see GÁBOR KECSKEMÉTI, *A korai protestáns homiletika szerepe az európai és a hazai irodalmi gondolkodás történetében* (The role of early protestant homiletics in the history of European and Hungarian literary thought), *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* (Budapest), 107(2003)/4–5, 367–398, 388–390.

are four kinds of gain, and three kinds of tailoring.<sup>57</sup> However, the third table is much simpler: the two degrees of gains and tailoring are missing, only the gains are present, six of them (institutorius, refutatorius, adhortatorius, dehortatorius v. admonitorius, reprehensorius, consolatorius).<sup>58</sup> The first table contains these same six gains, but it also includes tailoring with the remark that it can be added to gains, therefore it need not be always present as a separate part. The later homiletics of Amesian György Martonfalvi Tóth and Márton Szilágyi Tönkö also differ significantly from the theory of Ames.<sup>59</sup>

Data shows quite clearly the arc: Hyperian theory of genera became accepted among Calvinist theory-writers by the end of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, and it got back to Lutheran homiletics from them in the early 17<sup>th</sup> century. The road taken by the effect of Hyperius is obviously due to Hyperius' strong Swiss connections<sup>60</sup> and to his rediscovery by the Swiss reformation after his death.<sup>61</sup> Switzerland could be the starting point of the European career of Hyperian considerations. Classification of *usus* according to Hyperian types became general in Calvinist theoretical literature by the end of the century: they became the framework and permanent paradigm of thinking about functions of effects in preaching. They were reconsidered in many individual flavours stressing different points. This undoubtedly means that the genus theory of Hyperian homiletics was the root of the most enduring, most influential ideas in the Reformation's theory of preaching.

It is interesting that we can find transitory Hyperius-reception even in Catholic sermon theory. Spanish Augustinian monk Lorenzo de Villavicencio (†1581) plagiarised Hyperius in his *De formandis sacris concionibus* (1563, 1565) just as in his other works.<sup>62</sup>

<sup>57</sup> Pál MEDGYESI, *Doce nos orare, quin et praedicare*, Bártfa, 1650. On Hungarian terminology of Medgyesi: BARTÓK 1998, *op. cit.*, 209.

<sup>58</sup> These six gains differ from those of Georgius Laetus only in order: Georgius LAETUS [Jiří VESELSKÝ-LAETUS], *Consilium de formandis SS. concionibus* in SCULTETUS, 1610/1650, *op. cit.*, 107–125.

<sup>59</sup> György MARTONFALVI TÓTH, *Ars concionandi Amesiana*, Debrecen, 1666; Márton SZILÁGYI TÖNKÖ, *Biga pastoralis, seu Ars orandi et concionandi*, Debrecen, 1684.

<sup>60</sup> See, for example, Swiss disciples of Hyperius, Johannes Fabricius Montanus (1527–1566), and Tobias Egli (1534–1574), or his correspondence with Johann Wolf (1522–1571) in Zürich etc.

<sup>61</sup> See Basle editions of works of Hyperius in the first decade after his death: *Methodus theologiae* (1567, 1568, 1574), *De Sacrae Scripturae lectione ac meditatione quotidiana* (1569, later: 1581), *Varia opuscula theologica*, I–II (1570–1571), *De theologo* (1572, later: 1582), *Topica theologica* (1573), commentaries on Isaiah (1574), *Compendium physices Aristoteleae* (1574). His commentaries on the letters of St Paul were published in Zürich between 1582–1584. After these, again in Basle: *In Aristotelis ethica Nicomachica annotationes haud inutiles* (1586).

<sup>62</sup> John W. O'MALLEY, *Saint Charles Borromeo and the Praecipuum episcoporum munus. His Place in the History of Preaching in San Carlo Borromeo. Catholic Reform and Ecclesiastical Politics in the Second Half of the Sixteenth Century*, ed. John M. HEADLEY, John B. TOMARO, Washington, Folger Shakespeare Library etc., 1988 (Folger Books), 139–157; reprinted: O'MALLEY, 1993, *op. cit.*, no. VI.

In summary, I agree with American author Deborah K. Shuger who places Melancthon among 16<sup>th</sup>–17<sup>th</sup> century conservative church rhetorical systems, which continue *ars praedicandi* of the Middle Ages in a straight line. In contrast, she considers Hyperius an author starting a more liberal tradition in Protestant sermon theory, a tradition that follows *Ecclesiastes* of Erasmus. Shuger's term "conservative" can be connected to a realist philosophy of language that considers language an adequate framework of expression for rational-conceptual thinking. Her term "liberal" can be connected to the nominalist thesis of non-conceptual identification brought forth by emotional and aesthetic affects created through linguistic apparatus of expression.<sup>63</sup>

In this respect, the composition of Hyperius' references deserves some comment, too. The source base of his homiletics is composed mainly from authors of patristic theology. Numerous research experiences show that patristic components of 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> century church communication theory usually stimulate neo-classical tendencies (like, for example, in the case of Jesuit Nicolas Caussin).<sup>64</sup> In other contexts, however, the important aspect is the attitude of a significant portion of Old Christian theological literature that says that the valid way to capture the nature of God, his greatness, power and love is not through concepts but through living it emotionally. The same basic principle governs the so-called affective rhetorical systems of the 17<sup>th</sup> century,<sup>65</sup> which compete with argumentative-demonstrative rhetorical trends. It was also Shuger, who noted that these affective rhetorical systems had a role in preparing new conventions of literature by the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Homiletics, facing the problem of understanding and expressing *magnitudo* and *praesentia* at the same time, could

<sup>63</sup> Debora Kuller SHUGER, *Sacred Rhetoric in the Renaissance* (hereafter: SHUGER, 1993) in *Renaissance-Rhetorik – Renaissance Rhetoric*, Hg. von Heinrich Franz PLETT, Berlin etc., de Gruyter, 1993 (hereafter: PLETT, 1993a), 121–142, 123–127.

<sup>64</sup> Nicolaus CAUSSINUS, *De eloquentia sacra et humana libri XVI*, Paris, 1619; 1623<sup>2</sup>. Cf. Franz Günter SIEVEKE, *Eloquentia sacra. Zur Predigttheorie des Nicolaus Caussin S. J.* in *Rhetorik. Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte in Deutschland vom 16.–20. Jahrhundert*, Hg. von Helmut SCHANZE, Frankfurt am Main, Athenäum-Fischer-Taschenbuch-Verlag, 1974 (Fischer-Athenäum-Taschenbücher), 43–68.

<sup>65</sup> Heinrich Franz PLETT, *Rhetorik der Affekte. Englische Wirkungsästhetik im Zeitalter der Renaissance*, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 1975 (Studien zur englischen Philologie, N. F., 18); Rudolf BEHRENS, *Französischsprachige rhetorische Theoriebildung im 17. und frühen 18. Jahrhundert. Eine Auswahlbibliographie*, in *Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur*, 88(1978), 326–353; Volker KAPP, *Rhetorische Theoriebildung im Frankreich des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts. Methodologische Randbemerkungen mit Nachträgen zu einer Auswahlbibliographie von R. Behrens*, in *Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur*, 89(1979), 195–210; Rudolf BEHRENS, *Problematische Rhetorik. Studien zur französischen Theoriebildung der Affektrhetorik zwischen Cartesianismus und Frühaufklärung*, München, Fink, 1982 (Reihe Rhetorik, 2); Rüdiger CAMPE, *Affekt und Ausdruck: Zur Umwandlung der literarischen Rede im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert*, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 1990 (Studien zur deutschen Literatur, 107); Perrine GALAND-HALLYN, *De la rhétorique des affects à une métapoétique. Évolution du concept d'energeia* in PLETT 1993a, *op. cit.*, 244–265.

replace the analytical functioning of language only by extensively recommending tools of affectivity. Thus it vested sermon with an essentially epistemological function: the understanding born from the impressiveness of expression and with its irreplaceable ontological stake. This theoretical originality of homiletics would be pushed to the background by a cognition model of rational discourse and reflective consciousness by the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Parallel to the latter process, however – and this can be shown in European trends of development – it is poetics that moves towards theoretical and stylistic principles earlier used in homiletics.<sup>66</sup> Both its connections with patristic classicism and with rhetorical aesthetics of *nescio quid*, and *je ne sais quoi* are qualities of the work of Hyperius worthy of pride. This work is characterised by high originality, fresh and stimulating use of classical and patristic ideas, and as such, it is one of the most exciting, most inventive works of literary theory in the century.<sup>67</sup>

<sup>66</sup> SHUGER, 1993, *op. cit.* in PLETT, 1993a, *op. cit.*, 138–140.

<sup>67</sup> HOWELL, 1956, *op. cit.*, 115.