

TERESA MICHAŁOWSKA

Warszawa

THE NOTION OF LYRICS AND THE CATEGORY OF GENRE IN ANCIENT
AND LATER THEORY OF POETRY

In his *Republic* Plato discerned three elementary modes of molding the linguistic level (λέξις) of a poem: the "imitative", the "simple tale", and the "mixed" one combining the former two; their analysis resulted in an outline of the general literary categories that would be much later labelled as the genres (*modus, genus*)¹. Each of them presupposed a different manner of "behaviour" of the subject of a poetic utterance, identified by Plato with its author and called "the poet". In the first case the poet would be completely "hidden behind" the presented personages whose speech he would "imitate"; this was the essence of the Platonic notion of "imitation", or rather of the specific connotation of μιμησις relevant in the discussed fragment of the *Republic*². In the second case the poet addresses his audience directly in a monologue uttered by nobody else but himself. Finally, in the third case, the two modes would be mixed: the poet himself is the speaker but sometimes he resorts to "imitation", quoting *in extenso* the statements of his personages.

As illustrations of the "imitative" linguistic structure Plato adduced the comedy and the tragedy; as an example of the mixed form he pointed to the Homeric epos³. The structure called "the simple tale" (ἀπλὴ διήγησις) requires a more extensive comment; in its description Plato referred to the fragment of *Iliad* in which Homer related about the arrival of Chrisos to Agamemnon with a request for a relea-

¹ Plato, *Republic*, 392 d; cf. T. Michałowska, *The Beginnings of Genological Thinking. Antiquity — Middle Ages*, "Zagadnienia Rodzajów Literackich", vol. XII, No. 1 (22), pp. 5–9, and the references there quoted.

² Plato, *Republic*, 393 c–d; the connotation presented here does not exhaust, of course, all the problems related to μιμησις in Plato's system. On the different approaches to and definitions of imitation cf., among others, P. Vicaire, *Platon critique littéraire*, Paris 1960, p. 213 ff. (In the present paper we shall mean by μιμησις only the connotation employed in the fragment of *Republic* here quoted.)

³ Plato, *Republic*, 394 b–c.

se of his daughter⁴; at another place Plato mentioned the dithyramb⁵. In the *Laws*⁶ and also in *Ion*⁷ he placed the dithyramb (διθύραμβος) among such species as the hymn, the threnode, or the paean (ὕμνος, θρήνος, παιάν), in contexts discussing other matters than the modes of shaping of the sphere of λέξις.

Here we are at the source of the ambiguity which would be later many times echoed in various conceptions of the third "genre", so bewildering for the critics. It came to be commonly called "lyrical", or simply the "lyrics" in the modern theory of literature as it continues, more or less unaware, some of the traditional themes of the ancient theory of poetry.

Now, let us get back to Plato. A narrative fragment of an epos, a dithyramb, and also — if we reconstruct correctly the intentions of the author of the *Republic* — a hymn, paean or threnode, are examples and models of the poetic performance constituting linguistic structures called "simple tales". In the first of these cases, the monologuing poet relates in his message the actions of the presented personages (e. g., Chrisos arrives to Agamemnon, asks him to release his daughter, etc.). The songs, however, made equal here with the epic fragment, had a quite different character. The hymns, according with Plato's description, contained prayers to the Gods; the paeans were sung to thank Apollin for his benevolence; the threnodes were funeral songs; the dithyramps were exalted Dionysiac songs. In each of these varieties the poet spoke himself revealing his own feelings and thoughts. He addressed his presupposed or actual audience either directly or indirectly, taking them, as it were, for witness of and participation in his monologue directed to one of the Gods. In neither case, however, was he concerned, like Homer, with the presentation of persons in action. Since the quoting of the personages' utterances was essentially not involved in any of these species, they remained out of the scope of the notion of "imitation"⁸.

Plato's conceptual heritage was significantly reinterpreted in Aristotle's *Poetics*. Discussing the "manners of imitation" Aristotle made use of two Platonic structures, i. e. the "mixed" and the "imitative" ones, building with them two generic categories: the "epic" and the "dramatic"⁹. The "simple tale" was handled here as an element of the "mixed" structure.

Such species as the dithyramb and hymn, mentioned a few times in the treatise,

⁴ *Op. cit.*, 392 e — 393 b.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, 394 c.

⁶ Plato, *The Laws*, 700 b.

⁷ Plato, *Ion*, 534 c.

⁸ Many controversies were raised in literature by the issue of dithyramb, cited by Plato as a typical example of the "simple tale", while it had already been a diversified and evolving form, approaching the "mimetic" structure. Dithyramb is considered as one of the sources or even as the prototype of tragedy. Cf. Vicaire, *Platon*, pp. 240—242.

⁹ Aristotle, *Poetics*, 3, 1448 a 2—3; cf. Michałowska, *The Beginning of Genological Thinking*, pp. 9—13, and the references there quoted.

have been connected, with the rest of poetry, with the concept of "imitation"¹⁰. A mimetic character has been ascribed to them, but in the Aristotelian sense of the term *μίμησις*, quite different from the Platonic connotation. Aristotle did not mean by imitation the reconstruction by the poet of the utterances of the characters represented in the poem, but a peculiar epistemological relationship between what was represented in it and its "model", being the non-artistic reality¹¹. Thus the species considered by Plato as handy illustrations of the non-imitative linguistic structure of "simple tale" have been included by Aristotle into the conceptual framework of mimetic art.

It can be seen that both Plato and Aristotle knew and referred to such poetic species which would be later considered as "lyrical" (e. g., dithyramb, hymn, threnode, paean), but they did not employ the term "lyrics". It would be even difficult to find in their theoretical systems some other notions functioning as general categories integrating the specific structures just listed. In Plato, such function was probably intended by the concept of *μέλη*, as opposed to *ἔπη*, but its usage was hesitant and ambiguous¹². Even more doubts are raised by the notions of "auletics" and "kitharistics" (*αὐλητική καὶ κιθαριστική*) in Aristotle¹³.

Perhaps even before the term "lyrics" appeared, the noun describing a lyrical poet had emerged (*λυρικός*, or "lyre player"). At any rate, the designation functioned during the Hellenistic epoch in connection with what was known as the canon of nine lyricists. Some scholars have been associating the formulation of the canon with the names of eminent philologists and grammarians from Alexandria, Aristarchos of Samothrace (217–145 B. C.) and Aristophanes of Byzantium (257–188 B. C.). However, Tadeusz Sinko argues that recent researches point to a later origin of the canon, ascribing it to Atticistic lexicographers of the 1st century A. D.¹⁴ The following poets were included into the list of the nine lyricists, considered as the most perfect models for imitation: Alcman, Stesichorus, Alkaios, Sappho, Ibycus, Anacreon, Simonides of Ceos, Pindar, Bacchylides. H. Färber argues that the term *λυρικός* has been since associated mainly with the canonic poets, while the elder but parallelly employed term *μελικός* referred to those who did not belong to the canon¹⁵.

¹⁰ Aristotle, *Poetics*, 1, 1447 a 2–3; 4, 1448 b 8.

¹¹ R. Ingarden, *Uwagi na marginesie „Poetyki” Arystotelesa (Some Remarks on Aristotle's "Poetics")*, [in:] *Studia z estetyki*, vol. 1, Warszawa 1966, p. 365 f.

¹² Vicaire, *Platon*, pp. 236–238; I. Behrens, *Die Lehre von der Einteilung der Dichtkunst vornehmlich vom 16. bis 19. Jahrhundert*, Halle/Saale 1940, p. 8 (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie, Heft 92). A related term *μέλος* was sometimes used by Plato as a substitute for *ποίημα*.

¹³ Aristotle, *Poetics*, 1, 1447 a 2–3; cf. Behrens, *Die Lehre*, p. 5 (Aristotle's concern for the species of this poetry is evidenced, e. g., by the collection *Pythionikai*).

¹⁴ T. Sinko, *Literatura grecka (The Greek Literature)*, vol. II, part 1, *Literatura hellenistyczna (Hellenistic Literature)*, Kraków 1947, pp. 130–131; Behrens, *Die Lehre*, pp. 6–7.

¹⁵ The consequences of H. Färber's work (*Die Lyrik in der Kunsttheorie der Antike*, München 1936) are related here after Behrens (*Die Lehre*, p. 7).

A term corresponding to the concept of "lyrics" could be sporadically spotted by that time: in the 2nd century B. C. it was employed by Dionysius Thrax (170–90 B. C.) in the form *λυρικὴ* together with terms designating species such as tragedy, comedy, elegy, epos and lamentation; in the form of *λυρικά* it could be found in the 1st century writings, e. g. in Philodemus of Gadara (100–30 B. C.)¹⁶. It seems, however, that during the Hellenistic epoch the abstract term was used on rare occasions only. Thus if we want to avoid the fallacy of anachronism, we should perhaps do without it and employ only the description *λυρικός* and the concept of "poetry of the lyricists".

The canon of nine lyrical poets constituted a vital element in the literary awareness of Roman poets, as well as theorists of poetry and of rhetorics. This is pre-eminently evidenced by poetry of Horace¹⁷. In many of his odes we can find references to Pindar (e. g., IV, 2; IV 9), Sappho (II, 13; IV, 9), Alkaios (II, 13; IV, 9), Simonides of Ceos (IV, 9), Stesichorus (IV, 9) or Anacreon (IV, 9), mentioned with high reverence as matchless poetic ideals.

When speaking of himself and his own art, Horace employed the term *fidicen*¹⁸. He also made use (but in a remarkable context indeed!) of the term *lyricus*. At the end of *Ode*, I, 1, addressed to Maecenas, we read:

Quodsi me lyricis vatibus inseres
Sublimi feriam sidera vertice¹⁹.

Horace thus requested explicitly that he were considered as a "lyricist", and thereby that he were made equal with the company of the canonic poets.

We can also find mentions of the Greek lyricists in writings of the theorists of rhetorics and diction, e. g. in Cicero, Pseudo-Longinus, Demetrius or Dionysius, but most notably in Quintilian²⁰ who left the first more extensive discussion of the canonic poets in Book 10 of his *Institutionis oratoriae libri XII*:

Novem vero lyricorum longe Pindarus princeps spiritus magnificentia, sentiis, figuris, beatissima rerum verborumque copia et velut quodam eloquentiae flumine; propter

¹⁶ Behrens, *Die Lehre*, pp. 3, 17 f.

¹⁷ On Horace's attitude towards the Greek lyricists and on his theoretical concepts in general, see among others: C. O. Brink, *Horace on Poetry. Prolegomena to the Literary Epistles*, Cambridge 1963, p. 153 f.; J. W. H. Atkins, *Literary Criticism in Antiquity*, vol. II, London 1952, pp. 47–103; Behrens, *Die Lehre*, pp. 19–23; K. Morawski, *Vergilius i Horatius*, [in:] *Historia literatury rzymskiej za cesarza Augusta*, Kraków 1916, pp. 147–163; M. Brożek, *Historia literatury łacińskiej (History of Latin Literature)*, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1969, pp. 276–282; 306–312 etc.

¹⁸ E. g., *Epistolae*, I, 19, 32–33:

Hunc ego, non alio dictum prius ore, latinus
Volgavi fidicen [...]

(emphasis by T. M.).

¹⁹ Horace, *Carmina*, I, 1, 35–36.

²⁰ Cf. e. g. M. T. Cicero, *Orator*, LV, 183; Pseudo-Longinus, *On the Sublime*, 10, 13, 31, 33 etc.; Demetrius, *On Utterance*, I, 132; III, 140, 148 etc.; Dionysios, *On the Linking of Words*, 19, 23 etc.

quae Horatius eum merito credidit nemini imitabilem. Stesichorus quam sit ingenio validus, materiae quoque ostendunt, maxima bella et clarissimos canentem duces et epici carminis onera lyra sustinentem. Reddit enim personis in agendo simul loquendoque debitam dignitatem, ac si tenuisset modum, videtur aemulari proximus Homerum potuisse; sed redundat atque effunditur, quod ut est reprehendendum, ita copiae vitium est. Alcaeus in parte operis aureo plectro merito donatur, qua tyrannos insectatus multum etiam moribus confert in eloquendo quoque brevis et magnificus et dicendi vi plerumque oratori similis; sed et ludit et in amores descendit, maioribus tamen aptior. Simonides, tenuis alioqui, sermone proprio et iucunditate quadam commendari potest; praecipua tamen eius in commovenda miseratione virtus, ut quidam in hac eum parte omnibus eius operis auctoribus paeferant²¹.

In a later part of his considerations on poetry Quintilian expressed his admiration for Horace, acknowledging him as a Roman "lyricist" on equal footing with the Greek canonic poets:

At lyricorum idem Horatius fere solus legi dignus. Nam et insurgit aliquando et plenus est iucunditatis et gratiae et varius figuris et verbis felicissime audax²².

What, then, was the Hellenistic notion of "poetry of lyricists", or of poetry by the nine canonic Greek poets, subsequently enriched by the output of Horace? To answer this question in an exhaustive manner, we would have to perform two parallel tasks: (1) to analyze the "poetry of lyricists" and to study its inherent poetics; this task, however, is far beyond the possibilities and intentions of the present paper; (2) to reconstruct those elements of this poetics which found their way to the theoretical awareness of the epoch and found their explicit formulation in statements concerning poetry. Within the limits of the second task we shall deal with those issues only which, as it seems, are likely to shed direct light upon the genological problem formulated in the title of this paper. Thus, such matters will be discussed as: (1) the general characteristics of the "poetry of lyricists"; (2) the store of specific structures of that poetry; (3) the relation of the "poetry of lyricists" to the Platonic and Aristotelian genological categories functioning in the theoretical awareness of the epoch.

It was the elements of the general theory of poetry integrated into a new whole which made up the notion of the "poetry of lyricists" in the Hellenistic theory. The views of Horace, as well as those of Demetrius, Dionysius, or Quintilian — as those authors are of primary interest for us — concerned the problems of function, character of creative inspiration, emotional mood and style of "lyrics"²³.

Hellenistic theories, while by no means always advocating the utilitarian and educative function of poetry, accepted without reservations the view that it affect-

²¹ M. F. Quintilianus, *Institutionis oratoriae libri XII*, cf. 10, 1, 61–64.

²² *Op. cit.*, 10, 1, 96. (Beside Horace, Quintilian mentioned there Caesius Bassus).

²³ On the Hellenistic theory of poetry in general see W. Tatarkiewicz, *Hellenistyczna teoria sztuki i poezji* (*The Hellenistic Theory of Art and Poetry*), "Kultura i Społeczeństwo", 1957, No. 4, pp. 3–30; W. Tatarkiewicz, *Estetyka starożytna* (*Ancient Aesthetics*), Wrocław 1960, pp. 273–303 (*Historia estetyki* [*The History of Aesthetics*], vol. 1); Atkins, *Literary Criticism*; Brink, *Horace on Poetry*.

ed the reader or listener by giving him pleasure (*voluptas, delectatio*) and by moving his feelings (*commotio*)²⁴.

Horatian applied psychology of poetic impact, suggesting that the minds of the audience are guided by poetry ("et quocumque volent animum auditoris agunto")²⁵, and that their souls are affected by it, seems to have been based on the traditions of musical aesthetics, as well as on those of rhetorics and poetry. It absorbed the cathartic motive of the Orphic anthropogony²⁶. Horace affirmed that Orpheus' songs led out mankind from a state of savageness and cruelty²⁷. Orpheus as the symbol of opposition against bloodshed had indeed appeared even in earlier theorists of poetry, e. g. in Neoptolemus. In Horace, Orpheus and Amphion appear in connection with lyrical poetry as tokens of psychological and cathartic concepts and contents, according to which lyrics had the purifying effect upon the souls of the audience.

The same mythological symbols are employed, on the other hand, to bring forth the magical and illusionistic idea of lyrics: Orpheus is said to have tamed tigers and lions, while Amphion had moved stones and induced them to follow him by the sound of his lyre alone²⁸.

The magic impact of poetry, most commonly described as its "spell" or "enchantment", belonged to very ancient themes of aesthetics. The concept appeared as early as the archaic Greek poets, but it was brought into relief and elaborated somewhat later: by the Pithagoreans in their conception of the musical *ethos* and by Gorgias in form of the belief in illusionistic effect of words in poetry and in rhetorics. According with this view, a spoken word exerted a magical or even demoniac power upon the listener; it could cast a spell upon him (*γοητεία*), deceive him, lead him astray, bring illusion (*ἁπάτη*) upon him²⁹.

Thus the main functions of the "poetry of lyricists" were, for Horace, delectare and commovere conceived as the raising of gentle feelings, as well as the conjuring or "seducing" the audience. Similar potentialities were ascribed by Quintilian to the poetry of Simonides of Ceos; he wrote about it that it raised "feelings of pity" (...eius in commovenda miseratione virtus...)³⁰.

²⁴ Tatarkiewicz, *Estetyka starożytna*, p. 279; Atkins, *Literary Criticism*, pp. 76–77.

²⁵ Horace, *De arte poetica*, 99.

²⁶ W. Tatarkiewicz, *Estetyka nowożytna (Moderne Aesthetics)*, Wrocław 1967, pp. 42–44; 99–100; 118–119 (*Historia estetyki*, vol. 3); Atkins, *Literary Criticism*, p. 77; Brink, *Horace on Poetry*, pp. 132–133; on the Orphic anthropogony in general, see T. Sinko, *Zarys historii literatury greckiej (An Outline of the History of Greek Literature)*, vol. 1, Warszawa 1959, pp. 187–190.

²⁷ Horace, *De arte poetica*, vv. 391–396.

²⁸ *Ibidem*.

²⁹ Tatarkiewicz, *Estetyka nowożytna*, pp. 99–100; 118–119; K. Svoboda, *La conception de la poésie chez les plus anciens poètes grecs*, [in:] *Charisteria Thaddaeo Sinko*, Varsaviae 1951, pp. 349–360.

³⁰ Quintilianus, *Institutio oratoria*, 10, 1, 64.

However, there are elements in the Horatian theory of poetic impact (*ψυχᾶ-γωγία*) pointing to his propensity towards the utilitarian and educative merits of lyrical poetry (*docere, probare*). Some species of lyrics were supposed to encourage to fight or revolt against oppressors (Alkaios and Stesichorus had been praised by Quintilian for the same merit), others could help in winning the favours of the powerful, or serve to spread definite moral standards (similarly Quintilian on Alkaios)³¹.

The Hellenistic theory of the poetic creative process emphasized the "divine inspiration", "enthusiasm" (*ἐνθουσιασμός, enthusiasmus*) thereby continuing the Greek tradition, already present in archaic poets, but represented above all by the Platonic concept of *mania*. Enthusiasm was a concept opposed to "wisdom" (*sapientia*)³². The further source of poetry was the gift (*natura, ingenium*) opposed to "art" conceived as the craft or skill of writing and composing of verses (*ars, studium*)³³. It is remarkable that Horace and the other theorists of poetry of the epoch eagerly sought for the opportunities to soften the contradictions within each of those pairs of oppositions, looking for half-way formulas and solutions³⁴.

However, in what concerned the "poetry of lyricists", divine inspiration and gift of the poet predominated, as it seems, in theoretical considerations. Quintilian's statements on Pindar and Stesichorus (*princeps spiritus magnificentia; ingenio validus*) and numerous mentions of the canonic poets, mainly of Pindar, Sappho and Alkaios, in Horatian *Odes* certainly have to be interpreted along these lines. In *De arte poetica* Horace ascribed *ingenium* to the Greeks in general, he described Orpheus and Amphion as "divini vates", while Orpheus was, besides, "sacer interpres deorum"³⁵.

One of the significant oppositions in the system of the Hellenistic literary and aesthetic conceptions was the opposition of the "sublime" and "graceful" as separate emotional tones or moods in poetry, connected either with the evoking of admiration for beauty (*καλόν*), or else with raising the feeling of pleasure (*ἡδύ*). Both of these were ascribed by Hellenistic theories to the "poetry of lyricists"; it was said to be graceful, bland and agreeable (*iucunditas; iucunditas et gratia*), as well as sublime, splendid and dignified (*dignitas, magnificentia*). According to Quintilian, grace and blandness were the qualities of Symonides and Horace, while sublimity and dignity marked Pindar and Stesichorus³⁶.

³¹ Horace, *De arte poetica*, vv. 402—406; Quintilianus, *op. cit.*, 10, 1, 62—63.

³² Tatarkiewicz, *Estetyka starożytna*, p. 286; Atkins, *Literary Criticism*, p. 76; Svoboda, *La conception de la poésie*, p. 355; Vicaire, *Platon*, pp. 214—215.

³³ Tatarkiewicz, *Estetyka starożytna*, pp. 288—289; Brink, *Horace on Poetry*, pp. 218—221, 268—269 etc.

³⁴ Tatarkiewicz, *Estetyka starożytna*, p. 286, 288; see also e. g. Pseudo-Longinos, *op. cit.*, 2.

³⁵ Horace, *De arte poetica*, vv. 323, 400, 391; Quintilianus, *op. cit.*, 10, 1, 61—62.

³⁶ Tatarkiewicz, *Estetyka starożytna*, p. 289; an opposition of these categories can be found, e. g., in Dionysius, *op. cit.*, 12; in Demetrius, *op. cit.*, 2, 36—127; 3, 128—189 etc.

According with the principle of *decorum*, those moods ought to be expressed by stylistic means proper for each of them: the "high" style was thought to be adequate in the former case and the "middle" style in the latter. Hellenistic theorists, however, did not definitely favour any of these styles. They ascribed to the "poetry of lyricists" in general a rich and elaborate language, ample and beautiful vocabulary, most conspicuously in poems by Sappho, Pindar and Horace.

It seems that the lack of uniformity of mood and style was related with the principle of *varietas*, proved to have anti-classicist character by Stefania Skwarczyńska³⁷, the principle instrumental even by that time in the formation of the concept of lyrics. This principle attained its full significance in Renaissance poetics.

Hellenistic theorists devoted relatively little attention to the metrical and strophical properties of lyrical poetry, important indeed for the literary practice. Structures of verse elaborated by the Greek "canonic lyricists" were transplanted into the Latin poetry by Horace (mainly the "eoliac" metres and strophes derived from Sappho and Alkaios), similarly like somewhat earlier, in the poetry of the neotericians, and particularly in Catullus, the traditions of the Greek Alexandrine verse could be heard. These structures became a significant hallmark of the "poetry of lyricists" for the contemporaries. Horace established them in a specific manner, raising "[...] to the status of a canon what in the Greek history of those verses had come to be more and more typical and employed in practice either most commonly or exclusively [...]"³⁸.

The store of species of the "poetry of lyricists" was very ample, though not quite well defined. Canonical poets wrote monodiatic and choral odes, lay and sacral poetry. Let us mention a few, relatively most clearly defined varieties. Among monodiatic songs there were special forms for such occasions as a wedding, a farewell, a feast, or expressing the feelings of love or rebellion. Among the choral species of sacral poems there can be mentioned: paeon, dithyramb, hymn, and among lay forms: epinicion (a song in honor of an Olympic winner), enkomium (an eulogy), threnode, hyporchema (a song for dance)³⁹.

³⁷ S. Skwarczyńska, *Kariera literacka form rodzajowych "silva"* (*A Literary Career of the Generic Forms of the "silva"*), [in a collective volume:] *Europejskie związki literatury polskiej* (*European Connection of Polish Literature*), Warszawa 1969, pp. 47–48; on the style and language of poetry of the lyricists see Quintilian, *op. cit.*, 10, 1, 61–64; 10, 1, 96.

³⁸ W. Strzelecki, *Zarys metryki łacińskiej* (*An Outline of Latin Metrics*), [in a collective volume:] *Metryka grecka i łacińska* (*Greek and Latin Metrics*), Wrocław 1959, p. 123; see also pp. 113–123; H. Sądziejowa, *Zarys metryki greckiej* (*An Outline of Greek Metrics*), *ibidem*, pp. 7–71 *passim*.

³⁹ Informations on the species of Greek lyrics are based mainly on the following works: Sinko, *Literatura grecka; Antologia liryki greckiej* (*An Anthology of the Greek Lyrics*), ed. by W. Steffen, Wrocław 1955 (BN, S. II, No. 92). See also S. Skwarczyńska, *Wstęp do nauki o literaturze* (*An Introduction to the Study of Literature*), vol. 3, part 5: *Rodzaj literacki. A. Ogólna problematyka genologii*, Warszawa 1965, pp. 282–287, for a valuable discussion on the archaic lyrical species as forms "born by a link of literature with music and dance".

Since Horace had been included to the Pantheon of lyricists, the Hellenistic store of lyrical species was extended by new forms or by modified versions of earlier varieties. It is of course the Horatian form of the song (*carmen*) which comes to the fore; it was in part a continuation of the archaic Greek models, mainly Sappho and Alkaios, as well as Pindar, but it brought in peculiar structural and aesthetic features of its own; it was due to the latter that the Horatian *carmen* would become the main model of lyrical poetry in later centuries.

Horace as a theorist brought forth the following species of lyrical poetry which he considered as the most important: hymn, enkomium, epinikium, *carmen eroticum* and *convivalia*. We can read about it in the following short fragment of *De arte poetica*:

Musa dedit fidibus divos puerosque deorum
Et pugilem victorem et equum certamine primum
Et iuvenum curas et libera vina referre⁴⁰.

However, in theoretical considerations concerning the "poetry of lyricists" the problem of its genological classification was not clearly stated, even though since Plato and Aristotle generic categories have been constituting vital and significant elements of literary awareness.

As we remarked at the outset, Plato, describing the linguistic structure ἀπλῆ διήγησις adduced the example of the dithyramb though the poets eventually labelled as "lyrical" had not used this form. However, there is no evidence at all that the "simple tale" or any of the other two structures had been identified or even associated with the notion of the "poetry of lyricists" not only by Plato or Aristotle, as they could not know the latter notion, but also by their Roman successors, the Hellenistic theorists. The concepts of a "generic" category and of the "poetry of lyricists" belonged to different levels. The former referred to the structural and linguistic aspect of poetry in general, while the latter denoted a historically defined variety of poetry, evolved in Greece and Rome and including a number of poetic species marked out by a few aesthetic properties common to them all, as the Hellenistic theorists believed. The inherent heterogeneity of the two concepts caused that not only they were never identified, but even no relationships between them were suspected.

The way in which Plato mentioned the dithyramb as an illustration of the properties of the ἀπλῆ διήγησις structure was thus, for him and for his successors, the only possible manner to establish any link between a generic category and the particular lyrical species, or even the "poetry of lyricists" considered as a whole. If it was the *genus* which was in the focus of attention, its properties could be dis-

⁴⁰ Horace, *De arte poetica*, vv. 83–85; on some generic properties of Horace's lyrics see Morawski, *op. cit.*, pp. 147–164; Božek, *op. cit.*, pp. 276–282; K. Zarzycka-Stańczak, *Z badań nad pierwszym zbiorem "Pieśni" Horacego (A Contribution to the Study of the First Collection of "Carmina" by Horace)*, Wrocław 1969 (Archiwum Filologiczne).

cussed by taking one of the species as an example; if, however, the "poetry of lyricists" was considered, then its several species or even single poems could be analyzed from the point of view of their generic features.

It was at this point that the matters were becoming confused. Indeed, even at a cursory glance at the "poetry of lyricists" it turns out that it has been by no means uniform with respect to the structures of the level of *λέξις* present in it. Beside the pure structure *ἀπλῇ διήγησις*, sometimes appearing in form of a narrative (e. g., in Stesichorus, for that reason compared by Quintilian to Homer), "utterances of characters" appeared frequently, so that the poems belonged to the "mixed" or even purely "mimetic" types⁴¹.

Such generic heterogeneity of the "poetry of lyricists" placed it in a very differentiated literary context. When the poet spoke on his own behalf or about himself, the poem approached the convention of rhetorics, or sometimes even that of philosophical prose; when he related some events, his work was similar to that of a historian; when he combined his own monologue with utterances of the presented characters, he remained within the traditions and artistic conventions of the epos and its related forms of narrative; when, finally, the poet chose to "hide" himself wholly behind the utterances of his personages, he entered in close relations with the conventions of dramatic poetry.

The generic heterogeneity of the "poetry of lyricists" had been remarked and exposed rather early. A theorist of the 4th century A. D., Diomedes, already employing the term and concept of "lyrics" (*lyrica*), included it to the mixed genre (*genus mixtum*) placing it beside heroic poetry, i. e. the epos⁴².

Our phrase "included it to the *genus*" is significant, since it was Diomedes who, among the Western European authors, seems to have been the first who deformed the Platonic conception of the generic classification of poetry, for which he substituted a sort of a hierarchy of *genera* and *species* related by subsumption and inclusion. The "genres" (*genera poematis*) were construed by Diomedes as the vast parts of poetry, in turn divided into so many *species*. Such type of genological approach would later frequently reverberate in Mediaeval and Renaissance poetics, becoming a source of many routine beliefs, still present in many of our contemporary theories of literature. However, the artificial and misleading character of such a classification can be readily seen and need not be dwelt upon. Indeed, the systematics of Diomedes did not at all reflect the real connections and relationships existing in literature; it was no more than a dry sophisticated construct reminding of the later scholastic niceties.

⁴¹ We observe this phenomenon in the poetry of Horace (e. g., *Carmina*, I, 28; III, 9; III, 27 etc.) and in some archaic poems by Greek lyricists, e. g. in Sappho, Simonides or Bacchylides.

⁴² On the genological classification of Diomedes in general, see Michałowska, *The Beginnings of Genological Thinking*, pp. 15–17.

Thus, as we have remarked, lyrics found its place within the hierarchic network not at the side of *genus enarrativum* (the "narrative" genre, being a distortion of the Platonic ἀπλὴ διήγησις), but at the side of the genre represented by the poems of Homer and Vergil. We read:

Κοινὸν vel mixti poematis species: prima est heroica ut Iliados et Aeneidos; secunda lyrica ut est Archilochi et Horatii⁴³.

It is remarkable that the authors chosen to stand for the models of lyrics, Archilochus and Horace, the latter already glorified by Quintilian, did not belong to the canon of the "nine". It was Horace as the author of *Carmina* who would become the main model of lyrical poetry for future theorists. We shall illustrate with two examples the process of gradual identification of lyrics with the Horatian poetry.

At the beginning of the 12th century Honorius of Autun listed in a treatise *De animae exsilio et patria* four main varieties of poetry: tragedy, comedy, satire and lyrics; about the latter he wrote:

[...] lyrica, quae odas [...] resonant, ut Horatius⁴⁴.

The most eminent theorist of poetry and prose of the 13th century, John of Garlandy, also referred to the authority of Horace in his treatise *De arte prosaica, metrica et rithmica*, when in the chapter *De differentia carminum* he gave the following general description of lyrics:

[carmen] lyricum quod est de potatione et commissione vel commissatione et amore deorum⁴⁵.

It was with such a load of tradition that the idea of lyrics was included into the stock of concepts of the Renaissance theory of poetry. As late as the beginning of the 16th century a Horatianist Jodocus Badius Ascensius referred directly to the conception of Diomedes when he wrote about the mixed genre in his commentary to *De arte poetica* (1500):

[Genus] 'coenon' vel 'coine' est in quo poeta ipse loquitur et personae loquentes introducuntur, ut est scripta *Ilias* et *Odyssea* tota Homeri et *Aeneis* Virgilii. Huius species sunt duae: prima heroica ut *Ilias*, *Aeneis*; secunda lyrica ut Archilochi et Horatii. Item nunc quoque elegia ut Ovidii *Fasti*, de quibus omnibus suo loco latius differemus⁴⁶.

The interest of Renaissance theorists for lyrics proceeded along two lines. On one hand, they were contributing to the empirical knowledge of lyrical species.

⁴³ Diomedes, *De arte grammatica*, Coloniae 1533, p. 118 r.; here and in further quotations emphases by T. M.

⁴⁴ Quoted after Behrens, *Die Lehre*, p. 42.

⁴⁵ *Poetria magistri Johannis Anglici De arte prosaica, metrica et rithmica*, ed. G. Mari, "Romanische Forschungen", vol. XIII, 1901, p. 927.

⁴⁶ Jodocus Badius Ascensius, *In artem poeticam Horatianam familiaris interpretatio*, [in:] Q. Horatius Flaccus, *De arte poetica, Sermones, Epistolae*, Paris 1511, p. 112 r. (first printing 1500).

by reconstructing their origins in Greek and Roman literatures and by describing their structures. At the same time they were doing their best to find a uniform definition for the whole field: they attempted to arrive at the precise meaning of the concept of lyrics which was gaining the status of a general poetic category. It was by then almost exclusively Horace who became the artistic "lawgiver" of lyrics. Among the Greek canonic authors Pindar enjoyed most recognition. Contemporary European poetry in vernacular languages with its easily recognized antecedents in the Mediaeval Provençal melics or in the *dolce stil nuovo* movement remained practically outside of the scope of theoretical considerations; the only exception was made for Petrarca. So as the key-authors for the epos were Vergil and Homer, so were Horace and Pindar for lyrics.

On the other hand efforts were made to place lyrics within the general system of poetry by establishing its position in the network of genological classification. Hence a synthetic definition of lyrics was attempted by defining its relation to the category of a poetic genre.

The latter kind of efforts, which is of primary interest for us because of the direction of its inquiries, two positions can be roughly discerned. The first one, rooted in the Mediaeval and early Renaissance tradition, was based on the belief that lyrics "belonged" to the mixed genre; the second one, more close to the ancient tradition and continuing the suggestions, already mentioned here, of Greek theorists and mainly of Plato, could be reduced to a search for relationships (individually defined and interpreted in each case) between lyrics or even the particular lyrical species and the structure of "simple tale".

The first approach found its full expression, among others, in a late-Renaissance theorist, a Jesuit, Jacobus Pontanus. In his *Poeticarum institutionum libri III* (1594), in the chapter *Tres poematum modi eorumque appellationes et species*, we can find at the outset, as a matter of fact, an extensive fragment discussing the Platonic trychotomy of linguistic structures in poetry, but his further discussion proves that he conceived and accepted this conception in a manner determined by the Diomedean tradition of hierarchic classification. *Modi poematum* turned out to be sets including poetic species. Among the three genres: *enarrativum* (*enuntiativum*), *imitativum* (*activum*) and *mixtum*, lyrics found its place next to the heroic epos.

About *genus mixtum* we read:

Hic continet *Iliadam*, *Odyseam*, totam *Aeneidam* ad summam poesim epicam [...] Et lyricam quae si Horatium nostrum spectes (plures enim non habemus) aequae sub primum subiici potest⁴⁷.

In the last resort, even within such a pattern lyrics turns out to be generically heterogeneous, sometimes revealing the properties of *genus enarrativum* and thus partly "belonging" to this genre.

⁴⁷ Jacobus Pontanus, *Poeticarum institutionum libri III*, I, 8.

The second view can be traced back to the half of the 16th century and the Aristotelian current in the Italian Renaissance poetics. The tendency to make the notion of lyrics approach the concept of "simple tale" is found as early as the treatise by A. Minturno *De poeta* (1559). It is very probable that Minturno's suggestion has been the first in modern poetics along these lines and that it has become the germ of the conception which would finally win an approval of later theorists and which is sometimes, even now, ascribed to the ancient poetics, or even to J. W. Goethe⁴⁸.

Minturno accepted the Platonic trichotomy essentially undistorted, conceiving its terms as forms of linguistic shaping of poetry⁴⁹. Discussing the particular *modi narrandi*, however, he changed and extended the exemplification of *narratio simplex*. Here is his full formulation:

Ac si modum narrandi consideremus, triplicem ponemus narrationem. Una est simplex, ut heri Gauricus dicebat, qua dithyrambici lyricique utuntur, cum ipse poeta sic loquitur, ut personam cuiusquam non sumat. — Altera est quaedam imitatio, quae et tragicorum et comicorum est. Cum personam poeta ponit suam, induit vero alienam. — Tertia est utroque modo coniuncta. In qua heroici versantur, cum partim per se ipsi, partim per eosdem illos quidem, quos loquentes inducunt, exponunt⁵⁰.

Minturno's position is even more remarkable, since he used to be fully aware of the traditional Mediaeval relationship between lyrics and *genus mixtum*, which he had expressed in an extensive fragment devoted to lyrical poetry⁵¹. However, he was not quite consistent in his conception of a genre as *modus narrandi*; in the opposite, some of his statements concerning the classification of poetry are evidence that he was apt to accept the notion of a genre as a "part" (*pars*), being a set of smaller units, i. e., of species. Within this type of classification three basic "parts" could be discerned, described as *epica*, *scaenica* and *melica*; the latter concept was related, though not identical, with lyrics and dithyrambics⁵².

Thus lyrics was on one level associated with the structure of *narratio simplex*, while on another one it was advanced to the status of a "part" of poetry conceived as a set of species.

In J. C. Scaliger's *Poetices libri septem* (1561) the notion of "genre", called by him *genus* or *modus* (*modus imitandi*, with reference to the Aristotelian concept of "manners of imitation") grew essentially from the Platonic traditions.

Sane genus pars est specierum, comprehendit enim eas praedicatione, non ambitu⁵³.

⁴⁸ These views are discussed in: H. Markiewicz, *Rodzaje i gatunki literackie* (*The Genres and Species of Literature*), [in:] *Główne problemy wiedzy o literaturze* (*The Main Problems of the Study of Literature*), Kraków 1966, pp. 147–148.

⁴⁹ I was trying to elucidate those problems in a paper: *Genological Notions in the Renaissance Theory of Poetry*, "Zagadnienia Rodzajów Literackich", vol. XII, No. 2 (23), pp. 11–12.

⁵⁰ Antonii Sebastiani Minturni *De poetica libri sex*, Venetiis 1559, p. 114.

⁵¹ Minturno, *op. cit.*, p. 386.

⁵² Minturno, *op. cit.*, p. 27, 417.

⁵³ Iulii Caesaris Scaligeri *Poetices libri septem*, I, 3.

Such a position accounts for all the hesitations and apparent ambiguities found in the genological classification offered by the treatise. Scaliger could not make a clear-cut "division" of genres into species, because according with the Platonic and Aristotelian tradition he meant by "genre" a structural-linguistic aspect of a species or of a single poem. If he wanted to remain fully consistent, he could not divide genres into species at all. If, however, he failed to be so consistent, it was certainly in a large measure a result of the influence of the Diomedean model of genological thinking⁵⁴.

In his classification of poetry by the "modes of imitation" (*modi imitandi*) Scaliger mentioned three basic possibilities of molding the sphere of *verba*:

[modus qui] in narratione simplici consistit [e. g., *De rerum natura* by Lucretius], [modus] [...] in collocutionibus positus [e. g., comedy and tragedy], [...] [genus] mistum [!] [...], in quo et narrat poeta et introducit collocutiones [e. g., epos]⁵⁵.

Among the species related with the several genres Scaliger did not mention lyrical poetry. This omission has become a source of many ambiguities. Suggestions concerning the generic interpretation of lyrics can be found in supplementary Book VII (*Epinomis*) in connection with the problem of imitation. We read there:

Ad haec multa sunt genera carminum, multa poematum, quorum nullum iam hoc in censu reponeretur lyrica, scolia, paeanes, elegiae, epigrammata, satyrae, sylvae, epithalamia, hymni, alia; in quibus nulla extat imitatio, sed sola nudaque ἐπαγγελία [!], id est enarratio aut explicatio eorum affectuum, qui ex ipso proficiscuntur ingenio canentis, non ex persona picta⁵⁶.

This fragment evidences an intention of relating the lyrical species with the structure of "simple tale". Besides lyrics, according to Scaliger, similar generic characteristics mark out such species as epigram and satire, as well as the already mentioned philosophical poetry as represented by the poem by Lucretius.

Thus the lyrical species were not conceived by Scaliger as the only poetic forms shaped in their linguistic layer according with the model of *narratio simplex*; hence, lyrics could not be identified with that generic category ([*modus qui*] in *narratione simplici consistit*) nor indeed with any other one.

Scaliger assessed the rank of the lyrical species within the general system of classification of poetry in still another aspect. He established a hierarchy of species from the point of view of "nobility" (*nobilitas*) of objects represented in them; as the most dignified he recognized hymns and paeans as paying homage to the Gods; next were *mela*, odes and *scolia* as praising *viros fortes*; after them was the epic poetry presenting heroes and minor characters; the rear was brought up by

⁵⁴ See Michałowska, *Genological Notions*, pp. 12–14, and the references there quoted.

⁵⁵ Scaliger, *op. cit.*, I, 3.

⁵⁶ Scaliger, *op. cit.*, VII, 1, 2. (*Imitatio* is there conceived as an imitation of the characters' utterances, i. e., in the Platonic manner).

tragedy, comedy, satire, *exodium*, *lusus*, *hymenaeus*, elegy, monody, *cantiones* and *epigrammata*⁵⁷.

Thus Scaliger veiled up the generic, i. e. structural-linguistic heterogeneity of lyrics by associating it one-sidedly with *narratio simplex*, and at the same time he brought into relief the heterogeneity of objects represented in the several lyrical species. This *varietas* eventually grew to the status of a general aesthetic postulate for lyrics; we shall return to this matter at a little later.

Another theorist who attempted to associate lyrics with the structure of "simple tale" was A. Viperano in *De poetica libri III* (1579). He interpreted the Aristotelian "modes of imitation", called by him *modi fingendi*, in a Platonic vein as three different possibilities of shaping the linguistic level of a poem. Accordingly, poetry was represented as divided into three *genera*. The genre or *genus* called ἐξηγηματικόν or *narrativum* is such that

[...] poetae solam personam sustinet, sicut lyrica poesis et dithyrambica saepe [...] ⁵⁸.

However, in the chapter entitled *De generibus poeticae* Viperano apparently called in doubt the merits of such a division. He wrote that it referred to the "modes of imitation" (i. e., to only one aspect of poetic creation) rather than to poetry as a whole; moreover, he emphasized that actually it had no grounds in the authority of Aristotle. In the last resort he offered a division of poetry into *genera* conceived as "parts" being sets of smaller units (*species*):

Tandem igitur poetica in haec genera abiit: epicum, tragicum, comicum et dithyrambicum sive melicum. Nam (si Tzetzi credimus) olim dithyrambici iidem erant cum melicis sive lyricis, aliquanto tamen altiores aut non certe absurdum videtur, quod in melica poesi praestantissimum est, id potissimum nominasse, quando et ipsum melicum genus a lyrae suavitate et praestantia lyricum nominetur⁵⁹.

In the end lyrics (identified with melics and dithyrambics) turned out to be one of the four basic sections of poetry; the mode of imitation most fit for it, or perhaps even the only proper one, was identified as the structure of "simple tale".

An original conception of genological division of poetry was suggested by the last of theorists interesting for us here, a Pole M. K. Sarbiewski in *De perfecta poesi* (ca. 1626)⁶⁰.

⁵⁷ Scaliger, *op. cit.*, I, 3. This fragment follows immediately the description of the *genus mistum* (!), and since there was a tradition of including epics together with lyrics into this *genus*, it could be supposed that Scaliger wanted to "ascribe" the lyrical species to the mixed genre. This supposition, however, does not account for the fact that in this classification the dramatic species were included.

⁵⁸ Joanni Antonii Viperani *De poetica libri tres*, II,1.

⁵⁹ Viperano, *op. cit.*, I, 7.

⁶⁰ On the sources of Sarbiewski's views, and on his theoretical system in general, including his conception of lyrics as "objectless poetry" see Z. Szmydtowa, *O księdze I "Poetyki" Sarbiewskiego* (On the 1st Book of Sarbiewski's "Poetics"), [in:] *Poeci i poetyka* (Poets and Poetics), Warszawa 1964, pp. 410-436; see also St. Skimina, [an Introduction to:] M. K. Sarbiewski,

Concerning the theory of genre (*modus imitandi*) he followed essentially the Aristotelian tradition but he developed and modified it in his own specific manner. It is remarkable that Sarbiewski's theoretical vocabulary can be associated with terms of Platonic origin, already discussed here (e. g., *narratio simplex*), but both the semantic interpretation of his concepts and his way of handling the generic categories discourage the guess that the author of the treatise might have felt the impact of the Platonic tripartite model.

According with Aristotle, Sarbiewski mentioned two main "manners of imitation"⁶¹. The first he called *sermo apertus* (*narratio simplex*), being a manner of speech used in epos or margites (!). Here a poet relates the actions of his characters. We can see that underlying the terms "direct" or "simple tale" is actually the model of the Platonic mixed structure. The second manner is *imitatio*, i. e. reconstruction of actions and utterances of characters presented in a poem, as it appears e. g. in tragedy, comedy or in a mime.

Sarbiewski's own contribution was the third "mode of imitation" labelled by him as "reasoning (*ratiocinatio*). We read about it:

Tertium addo modum ratiocinationis, qui accedit ad oratorium, qualis est in lyrica poesi, in elegia et epigrammate, quamquam haec etiam narrationem admittere possunt, immo etiam interdum admittunt dialogum, cuius generis est oda apud Horatium lib. III ode 9: "Donec gratus eram tibi..."⁶².

The third *modus imitandi* allows for several conclusions and remarks. Without a direct reference to Plato, Sarbiewski produced indeed a correlate of the Platonic ἀπλῇ διήγησις structure. According to him, the similarity of *ratiocinatio* and rhetorics consisted in the use of "simple tale". As it seems, it was his versatility in the theoretical problems of rhetorics which suggested to Sarbiewski the idea of the third "generic" category.

Ratiocinatio was proposed as the proper mode of expression for lyrical poetry, elegy and epigram. However, lyrics has been never a uniform linguistic-structural set; it could as well make use of the other modes of imitation, i. e. *sermo apertus* or even dialogue (*imitatio*)⁶³. For Sarbiewski, the artistic justification for such variety was the Horatian poetry, considered, beside the Pindaric, as the highest authority in this field of the verbal arts.

Following the better traditions of European poetics, Sarbiewski did not consider the category of genre (*modus imitandi*) as a set of species, but he saw in it a definite aspect of a poem, and consequently he could not possibly make a schematic classification of "genres" into "species". Within such an approach, the species

De perfecta poesi sive Vergilius et Homerus, translated into Polish by M. Plezia, edited by St. Skimina, Wrocław 1954, pp. XXXIII-LV; St. Skimina, [an Introduction to:] M. K. Sarbiewski, *Praecepta poetica*, transl. into Polish and edited by St. Skimina, Wrocław 1958, pp. XV-XXXVII.

⁶¹ Sarbiewski, *De perfecta poesi*, I, 7.

⁶² *Ibidem*.

⁶³ *Ibidem*.

were historically defined varieties of poetry, differing by many features of objects and means of imitation (e. g., topics, presence and types of characters, types of eventually presented actions, emotional mood, properties of style, metrical forms, etc.). Their relations with the generic category consisted in the fact that one of the three *modi imitandi* must have been employed in them. Within such a framework lyrics was by no means a genre, but it was rather a species (or more precisely a set of *specierum*) in which the structure approaching the rhetoric monologue, *ratiocinatio*, was the most frequent form of utterance.

In spite of individual differences in approach, the problem of the relationship between the two notions: "lyrics" and poetic "genre", was fairly uniformly visualized by theorists of the 16th and early 17th centuries.

In the first place, "lyrics" was not identified as a "genre" (*modus*) as it was assumed, following the Platonic tradition, that the genre is but a structural-linguistic aspect of a poem. An identification of the two concepts was possible only if the Platonic and Aristotelian genological approach was abandoned in favour of the essentially Diomedean one, conceiving "genre" as a "part" of poetry. This kind of theory could be found, e. g., in Minturno and Viperano, and even there it was not consequent and remained inconsistent with their other statements.

Secondly, in spite of some hesitations concerning the generic structure of lyrics and the attempts to point to its heterogenous character in this respect (e. g., in Ascensius, Pontanus, Sarbiewski), the form of the "simple tale" (*ἀπλῆ διήγησις*, *narratio simplex*, *modus simplex*, *genus enarrativum*, *ratiocinatio*) was rather arbitrarily ascribed to it as its main manner of the shaping of its linguistic layer.

We have thus established that within the theoretical system of Renaissance theories lyrics was not a "genre"; even less could it be a species (though in some cases it was given this name). What was it, then? If it was a number of species that had been so labelled, and we know that that was the case, what were their common properties? In other words, what was the conotation of the name "lyrics" by then?

Renaissance theorists were fond of speaking about it. We shall try to grasp the essential elements of their interpretation of the term. It must be pointed out that their considerations concerned mainly those properties which might have determined the *differentia specifica* of lyrical poetry (if we take the concept of poetry as a whole as the *genus proximum*)⁶⁴.

In all definitions of "lyrics" it was taken for granted that what the name denotes was not a single *specimen* but rather a set of genological objects identified as species (*species*, *genera*). The set was limited but in a manner far from precision. *Lycorum genera multa...*, wrote Scaliger, rather vaguely⁶⁵. The set included,

⁶⁴ Such an attitude frequently led to an avoiding of general theoretical problems (like those of poetic inspiration, discussed within the analysis of the notion of poetry in general), and to the focusing of attention only on the properties of lyrical species connected with their themes, style, construction, metrical patterns etc.

⁶⁵ Scaliger, *op. cit.*, I, 44.

first of all, the species cultivated by the Greek canonical poets, recognized as "lyrical" as early as the Hellenistic epoch, e. g. hymn, paean, threnode, epinikium, *convivalia erotica* etc. In connection with the tendency to bring out to the fore Horace and Pindar as the paramount artistic models in lyrics, it was the Horatian carmen and the Pindaric ode which, as we have remarked, acquired special import.

At the beginning of the 17th century Sarbiewski revised the traditional denotation of the term, suggesting an extension of the established set of lyrical species. To the group of lyrical poets he included the "divine prophets" (*divini vates*) of the Bible: David, Solomon, Job, Moses, Deborah, Judith, Zacharias, Isaias and Habakkuk⁶⁶. In this way a new list of "nine lyricists" emerged, related with the Judaeo-Christian cultural tradition, and even this was further extended so as to include the tenth person:

Postremo ostensuri eramus inter lyricos — wrote Sarbiewski — principem fuisse Divino spiritu instinctam D. Virginem Matrem in sacro epinicio, quo Deum suum magnificat [...]⁶⁷.

From the genological standpoint it meant that the set of lyrics would include such church species, like psalms or hymns.

Finally, a separate problem arised concerning the species which had long been functioning in the secular Mediaeval and early Renaissance literature and found their ultimate artistic vindication in works by poets already recognized as law-givers of modern vernacular lyrics, mainly by Petrarca. Petrarca's Italian poetry, early glorified by P. Bembo, was frequently analyzed in separate treatises (e. g., *Letzione sopra 'l principio del Canzoniere del Petrarca*, 1587, by Giovanni Talentoni), and besides it appeared in disquisitions on lyrics in treatises on poetics by such authors like A. Minturno or M. K. Sarbiewski. The "Petrarchian" species, as a sonnet, ballad, *canzona*, *mandriale* (*madrigal*), *sirventes*, were discussed and analyzed in all their aspects, e. g. in the treatise by G. G. Trissino *La Poetica* (1529)⁶⁸; attempts were made to link them with the European tradition of lyrical poetry, and their relations with ancient forms were sought for.

The conotation of lyrics was established largely in an *a priori* manner, arbitrarily attempting to build up a uniform and general aesthetic category. The task of integrating the manifold specific structures in one whole was in itself artificial indeed, but even more difficulties were raised by the ambiguous character of some of the general theoretical concepts and notions. As examples we may take the problems of the "mimetic" and "poetic" qualities of lyrics. The questions were asked, whether lyrical poetry arised in effect of "imitation"? Or was it at all poetry?

The problem of the mimetic character of lyrics was subject to discussion and offered an opportunity to utter many incompatible opinions. Roughly speaking,

⁶⁶ Sarbiewski, *Characteres lyrici*, III, 11, [in the volume:] *Praecepta poetica*, p. 158.

⁶⁷ *Ibidem*.

⁶⁸ *Trattati di poetica e retorica del '500*. A cura di B. Weinberg, vol. 1, Bari 1970, pp. 21-158.

there were three distinct positions regarding this problem, related with the three different meanings of the term "imitation".

The first of them followed from an acceptance of the Platonic conception, according to which "imitation" consisted in reproducing the speech of the presented characters; i. e., it was related with a definite kind of linguistic structure. For example, this was the assumption underlying the approach of J. C. Scaliger who wrote, as we remember, that lyrics arises without any imitation (the author of *Poetices libri* referred to the relation of lyrical poetry and the "simple tale" structure)⁶⁹.

The second position, represented mainly by A. Minturno, followed from his acceptance of the Aristotelian conception of *μίμησις*. By imitation he meant a representing of nature (but not at all necessarily its strict reproducing). So conceived, imitation marked poetry in general and it was also underlying lyrical poetry. However, according to Minturno, lyrical imitation is different from epic one:

Quia vero plerumque personam lyricus tenet suam, videndum est, nunquid tum etiam imitetur. Nam Aristoteles docet imitationem adhiberi non modo in agendo cum omnino nostram ponimus personam, sed etiam in narrando, sive induamus alienam, sive nostram geramus. Ac sane is mihi quidem imitatur, qui probe vel corporis formam effingit, vel exprimit affectus, vel mores notat, seu quid aliud ita describit, ut oculis subiectum id putes. Eiusmodi sunt Horatii carmina illa fere omnia, in quibus nemo inducitur⁷⁰.

The peculiarity of lyrics consisted, accordingly, not so much in reproducing the actions of the characters (as e. g. in epos or drama), but rather in "expressing the feelings", "defining the personalities" and, finally, in describing various objects. Another author of a poetics, A. Viperano, emphasized in his discussion of imitation that the object of lyrical *imitatio* has the property of generality (*universalitas*):

Aliis videtur satis illam imitari, dum hominum mores et affectus exprimit; et quamvis interdum vera pronuntiet, tamen in singularibus personis, non secus atque Epopoetam [!] et tragoediam actiones effingere universales⁷¹.

According with this position, lyrics was an imitative kind of poetry, capable of reproducing nature in its universal dimension.

The third position, also arising from the Aristotelian concept of *μίμησις* tended to limit the scope of the notion of "imitation". Here, the term meant only the imitation of actions of the characters. At the same time, the imitative character was considered as a precondition of the "poetic" quality. Thus, since poetry does not employ fiction, it cannot claim to be poetry at all. Such a position was presented by A. Viperano as follows:

⁶⁹ Scaliger, *op. cit.*, VII, 1, 2; this approach is incompatible with the general conception of *imitatio* as formulated by Scaliger, e.g., in book I, 3, according to which imitation, as reproducing of nature, is a property of poetry at large. The complicated issues related to imitation in Scaliger's system are discussed by B. Weinberg, *A History of Literary Criticism in the Italian Renaissance*, vol. 2, Chicago 1961, p. 744 f.

⁷⁰ Minturno, *op. cit.*, p. 587.

⁷¹ Viperano, *op. cit.*, III, 10.

At videtur quibusdam nullam esse lyricam poesim, quoniam in ea nulla est humanarum actionum imitatio [...]⁷².

M. K. Sarbiewski upheld a similar, though much more mild position⁷³. He did not expel lyrics from the premises of poetry for good and all, but he degraded it to the rank of an "imperfect species" (*species imperfecta*), since it was incapable of "perfect imitation"⁷⁴. Being "imperfect poetry", however, it had had a quality of generality as it could present objects in their universal aspect⁷⁵. As we know, the concept of "generality" was one of the most prominent in Sarbiewski's theoretical system of poetry. Thus, by taking up Minturno's line of thought, explicitly formulated later by Viperano, Sarbiewski produced in fact a vindication of lyrics, for from the point of view of its merit, the "generality" of lyrics could well make up for its deficiency with regard to fictional representation.

Among the most significant distinctive marks of lyrics there were supposed to be its peculiar means of imitation. Robortello, Minturno, Viperano, Sarbiewski and other theorists agreed in their emphasis on the parallelism of the linguistic, musical and also choreographical means employed in lyrical works⁷⁶. As they saw it, the melic character of the lyrical species was their uncontested structural quality.

The objectives of lyrics, as those of poetry in general⁷⁷, were epitomized in the tripartite formula: *docere, delectare, movere*. Sarbiewski stressed that lyrics could incite mild emotions (*lenis motus*); only the dithyramb was capable of inciting also grave affects (*gravis motus*)⁷⁸. Pontanus emphasized primarily the function of *delectare*, enriching the concept of *delectatio* by the motive of "spell" which can well be interpreted as an attempt to continue the Hellenistic tradition⁷⁹.

Concerning the emotional mood peculiar to lyrics, Renaissance theorists, following the Roman predecessors, defended the equal rank for "sublimity" and "grace". They referred to some species (e. g., the ode) and to some poets (as, e. g., Pindar) with the terms *nobilitas, sublimitas*, while to other species (like the love song) and to other poets (Horace, Simonides) they referred with such predicates as *sua-vitas, suavis, mellis*⁸⁰. As it seems, none of those aesthetic qualities attained a decisive superiority over the other; in the opposite, both of them were given an equal

⁷² *Ibidem*.

⁷³ See Szmydtowa, *op. cit.*, p. 423 f.

⁷⁴ Sarbiewski, *De perfecta poesi*, I, 4, 2 (pp. 19—20 in the quoted edition).

⁷⁵ *Op. cit.*, IV, 14, 2 (p. 154).

⁷⁶ Fr. Robortello, *Explicatio eorum quae ad elegiae antiquitatem et artificium spectant*, [in:] *Trattati di poetica e retorica*, p. 530 f.; Minturno, *op. cit.*, p. 27, 417 etc.; Viperano, *op. cit.*, I, 7; III, 10; Pontanus, *op. cit.*, cap. II, 38 (*De nominibus lyricorum versuum*).

⁷⁷ See B. Weinberg, *Nota critica generale*, [in:] *Trattati di poetica e retorica*, pp. 549-554.

⁷⁸ Sarbiewski, *De perfecta poesi*, I, 8 (p. 24).

⁷⁹ Pontanus, *op. cit.*, II, 37 (*De lyrica poesi*).

⁸⁰ Scaliger, *op. cit.*, I, 44; Pontanus, *op. cit.*, II, 37 etc.; Sarbiewski, *Characteres lyri-ci*, III, 5 (p. 105).

status, and further subtle shades were discerned within each, making thereby the differences between the specific structures of lyrics all the more sharply defined.

The equal rank of the different or even opposite aesthetic qualities was doubtless related with the principle of *varietas*, recognized as the primary postulate in this type of poetry. The principle of variety, supported by the authority of Horace, was elevated to the rank of a supreme norm, involving almost all the structural layers and aspects of a poem. The main capacity of lyrics was that of integrating its manifold objects of imitation. Scaliger wrote in this connection:

Lyricorum materiam plane demonstravit Horatius. Mihi ita videtur, quaecunque in brevi poema cadere possunt, ea lyricis numeris colligere ius esse laudes, amores, iurgia, insectationes, comessatoria, obiurgatoria, vota, ad indulgendum genio exhortationes. Contra: sobrietates, commendationes, gestorum summarias explicationes, nova consilia, deliberationes, negotiorum susceptiones, susceptorum repudiationes, invitationes, repulsiones, dehortationes, detestationes et alia siqua sunt⁸¹.

Usually the principle of *brevitas* (*poema breve*) was mentioned along with that of *varietas*. In considerations on lyrics the two terms, *varietas* and *brevitas*, appeared as a kind of an accepted phrase. We find this dual formula in Minturno, Viperano, Pontanus and others⁸².

The concept of *varietas* involved, besides the realm of objects, also the aspect of "means", and thus it was an aesthetic category affecting the principles of both the stylistic and metrical shape of a text.

Another general directive concerning the style of lyrics was the principle of employing, on equal terms, the "direct" speech (in Scaliger's terminology, *genus apertum*), consisting in the usage of common words in their proper meanings, and the "indirect" speech, described by Scaliger as *genus tectum circuitu verborum*, i. e. using the words in metaphorical senses. Discussing the latter mode of speech, Sarbiewski brought to the fore the metaphor, allegory and *katachresis* as the most proper means of expression. "The truly lyrical or sublime quality of a poem"⁸³ was determined by the skillful handling of those figures, and by an observance of the principle of politeness (*elegantia*).

A separate problem was connected with the principles of the apt selection of metrical forms. It must be stressed that, in agreement with the concept of *varietas* and taking Horace as the chief model, a variety of metrical and strophic devices within the particular lyrical species was admitted and even encouraged.

⁸¹ Scaliger, *op. cit.*, III, 123; alike e.g. Viperano, *op. cit.*, III, 9; Pontanus, *op. cit.*, II, 37; on the aesthetic principle of *varietas* and on its functioning during the Renaissance, see Skwarczyńska, *Kariera literacka form rodzajowych "silva"*, pp. 60 – 69.

⁸² Scaliger, *op. cit.*, III, 123.

⁸³ The problems of lyrical style are discussed in this vein, among others, by: Scaliger, *op. cit.*, III 123; Viperano, *op. cit.*, III, 10; Pontanus, *op. cit.*, II, 38; Sarbiewski, *Characteres lyrici*, III (fl. III, 5).

Monotony was felt as an evidence of artistic deficiency, particularly in collections of poems belonging to one species (e. g., of odes)⁸⁴.

In the system of poetic theory of the 16th and early 17th century, lyrics was not a "genre" nor a "species", but a peculiar category involving a multitude of species which, in spite of their obvious variety, were arbitrarily ascribed a set of qualities, intended by the theorists of the epoch to make up a uniform concept.

Translated by *Piotr Graff*

POJĘCIE „LIRYKI” WOBEC KATEGORII „RODZAJU” W DAWNEJ TEORII POEZJI

STRESZCZENIE

Pojęcie „liryki” było w starożytności niezależne od kategorii „rodzaju” poetyckiego. Koncepcja „trzech rodzajów” stworzona przez Platona, zreinterpretowana przez Arystotelesa, dotyczyła sfery językowej utworu. Rodzaje (w terminologii Arystotelesa: „sposoby naśladowania”) były rozumiane jako elementarne możliwości kształtowania λέξις. Jeśli podmiot wypowiedzi poetyckiej przemawiał sam, powstawało tzw. „proste opowiadanie” (np. w dytyrambie); jeśli „chował się” za postacią przedstawioną, pozwalając przemawiać im samym, formowała się wypowiedź „naśladowcza” (np. w komedii lub w tragedii), jeśli zaś obie te struktury pojawiały się przemienicznie, tworzyła się wypowiedź „mieszana” (np. w eposie).

Pojęcia: „poety lirycznego” (λυρικός), a następnie „liryki” (λυρική) otrzymały poświadczoną wypowiedziami teoretycznymi konotację dopiero w okresie hellenistycznym (na przełomie III i II w. p. n.e. lub może dopiero w I w. p.n.e.). Został wtedy ustalony tzw. kanon liryków, obejmujący listę dziewięciu poetów greckich uprawiających poezję meliczną. Alkman, Stesichoros, Alkaios, Sappho, Ibykos, Anakreont, Simonides, Pindar oraz Bakchylides zostali uznani za wzorcowych, godnych studiowania i naśladowania twórców. Pojęcie „liryki” wiązało się odtąd ściśle z poezją autorów kanonicznych. W tej też formie funkcjonowało ono w świadomości rzymskich teoretyków poezji i wymowy, którzy za „liryka” uważali ponadto Horacego.

Pojęcia „rodzaju” oraz „liryki” („poezji liryków”) mieściły się zatem na dwóch różnych płaszczyznach. Pierwsze odnosiło się do aspektu strukturalno-językowego poezji w ogóle; drugie do historycznie sprecyzowanej odmiany poezji, obejmującej pewną ilość gatunków, złączonych, jak dowodzili teoretycy hellenistyczni, wspólnymi właściwościami estetycznymi. Pojęć tych nie tylko nie próbowano z sobą identyfikować, ale też nie dopatrywano się między nimi żadnych stosunków.

W późnym antyku i we wczesnym średniowieczu stworzono natomiast sieć klasyfikacyjną, w której rodzaje, pojęte jako zbiory gatunków, ulegały podziałowi na gatunki. Liryka znajdowała się w tej klasyfikacji najczęściej po stronie *genus mixtum* (rodzaju „mieszanego”) obok eposu (tak np. u Diomedesa, IV w. p. n. e.). Już wtedy skryształizował się, ustalony ostatecznie w dojrzałym średniowieczu, z pominięciem wzorów stworzonych przez poezję prowansalską, teoretyczny model liryki; jego prototypem miały być *Pieśni* Horacego (np. sądy Honoriusza z Autun, XII w., Jana z Garlandii, XIII w.).

W XVI i na początku XVII w. ukształtowała się obszerna wiedza o liryce. Teoretycy ówczesni z jednej strony badali empirycznie gatunki liryczne, rekonstruowali ich genezę w literaturze greckiej i rzymskiej, charakteryzowali ich strukturę, starając się równocześnie sprecyzować i ujedno-

⁸⁴ Much attention was devoted to those problems by Minturno, *op. cit.*, p. 392 f.; Scaliger, *op. cit.*, book II entitled *Hyle*, and by others.

licie treść pojęcia liryki, która zyskiwała powoli rangę ogólnej kategorii poetyckiej. „Prawodawcami” liryki byli dwaj poeci: Pindar oraz Horacy. Z późniejszych zainteresowaniem darzono tylko Petrarke. Z drugiej strony poszukiwano miejsca liryki w ogólnym systemie poezji, poprzez określenie jej stosunku do kategorii rodzaju poetyckiego.

W genologii renesansowej ukształtowały się dwa różne poglądy na lirykę. Pierwszy, nawiązujący do tradycji klasyfikacji średniowiecznej, reprezentowany między innymi przez J. Pontanusa, uwydatniał niespójność rodzajową poezji lirycznej, wiążąc ją z *genus mixtum*. Drugi, szukający oparcia intelektualnego przede wszystkim u teoretyków antycznych, łączący swoiście koncepcje Platona i Arystotelesa, a reprezentowany przez takich autorów, jak Minturno, J. C. Scaliger lub A. Viperano — skłaniał się do kojarzenia liryki z rodzajem „opowiadającym”. M. K. Sarbiewski, który odegrał szczególnie dużą rolę w kształtowaniu wiedzy o liryce na początku XVII w., twierdził, iż ten typ poezji posługuje się sposobem wypowiedzi zbliżonym do wymowy (*rationatio*).

Trzeba jednak podkreślić, iż nie identyfikowano liryki z rodzajem. Zdawano sobie sprawę z niemożności utożsamienia zbioru gatunków z aspektem strukturalnym językowej warstwy utworu poetyckiego. Utożsamienie takie było możliwe tylko kosztem odejścia od platońskiej i arystotelesowskiej koncepcji genologicznej w kierunku pojmowania rodzaju jako „części” poezji.

Można więc powiedzieć, iż w świadomości ówczesnej istniała nadgatunkowa kategoria liryki, nie istniało natomiast i nie mogło istnieć przy zachowaniu platońsko-arystotelesowskiej tradycji intelektualnej — pojęcie „rodzaju lirycznego”.

Teresa Michałowska