



<https://theses.gla.ac.uk/>

Theses Digitisation:

<https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/research/enlighten/theses/digitisation/>

This is a digitised version of the original print thesis.

Copyright and moral rights for this work are retained by the author

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study,
without prior permission or charge

This work cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first
obtaining permission in writing from the author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any
format or medium without the formal permission of the author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author,
title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

Enlighten: Theses

<https://theses.gla.ac.uk/>
research-enlighten@glasgow.ac.uk

Laurence Sterne's Tristram Shandy examined in relation to

eighteenth-century dramatic theory and practice.

by Maria Danousy

A thesis submitted to the English Department

University of Glasgow

for the degree of Master of Letters

June 1989

ProQuest Number: 10971002

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10971002

Published by ProQuest LLC (2018). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

For my parents and Nikos

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to Glasgow University for the grant which enabled me to complete my degree. I also want to thank all the people who helped me with my research and encouraged me until the final stage.

CONTENTS

| | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|---------|
| INTRODUCTION | pp. | 1-8 |
| CHAPTER 1 STERNE'S INTEREST IN DRAMA AND THEATRE | pp. | 9-28 |
| CHAPTER 2 THE EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY BACKGROUND | pp. | 29-68 |
| CHAPTER 3 PULPIT ORATORY AND EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY STAGE THEORY | pp. | 69-135 |
| CHAPTER 4 A REVIEW OF EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY ACTING THEORIES AND PRACTICE | pp. | 136-251 |
| CHAPTER 5 A THEATRICAL READING OF <u>TRISTRAM SHANDY</u> | pp. | 252-307 |
| CONCLUSION | pp. | 308-311 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | pp. | 312-332 |

SUMMARY

The main goal of the present study is to show how contemporary drama and theatre had an influence on the structures of Laurence Sterne's novel Tristram Shandy. This does not necessarily imply that the novel is a dramatic text in itself. However, it is reminiscent of the theatre of the period under discussion in various ways.

To present the theatrical influence in its full complexity, firstly, I had to examine Sterne's life from the point of view of his interest and participation in theatrical activities (Chapter One). Secondly, I have dealt with the philosophical background and its projection in acting theories of the first half of the eighteenth century (Chapter Two). In the same chapter, I have also indicated how the fragmentary information in Tristram Shandy which relates to the acting theories -- if brought together -- points to a more systematic knowledge on the part of the writer.

Sterne's profession had to be taken into consideration with regard to the development of an idiosyncratic style. Therefore, in Chapter Three, I have shown that pulpit oratory and current stage theory shared a good deal, and a combination of both is bound to have had an impact on Sterne.

Chapter Four focuses on the acting styles of various groups of players active at the end of the seventeenth and in the first half of the eighteenth century. Instead of establishing a contrast of "old" versus "new" in this

chapter, I chose to point out how individual actors turned what in the beginning was thought to be novel into convention. Various examples of isolated gestures have been selected for being relevant to Tristram Shandy. Nevertheless, the plays I discuss were, then, the most popular and, in this sense, are representative of the kind of spectacle which Sterne would have watched.

In the final chapter, I substantiate the argument about an influence of acting theory and practice in Tristram Shandy by embodying the current controversies in the main characters of Tristram Shandy. Gesture and voice, as these are enlivened by Walter, Trim and Tody, frequently reverberate the antitheses dominating the stage at that time. Another aspect which comes under close scrutiny in the last chapter is the parallel between the relationship of narrator, characters and reader in Tristram Shandy and that of actor/director and audience on the eighteenth-century stage.

Accordingly, I have reached the conclusion that Sterne, accustomed to the immediacy of his relationship with his congregation and guided by the stage model of his day, tried to recreate in Tristram Shandy a dramatic atmosphere which would, however, have been felt by his contemporaries only.

ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|-------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <u>BML</u> | <u>British Museum Library</u> |
| <u>CE</u> | <u>College English</u> |
| <u>CQ</u> | <u>Critical Quarterly</u> |
| <u>ELH</u> | <u>Journal of English Literary History</u> |
| <u>MLQ</u> | <u>Modern Language Quarterly</u> |
| <u>MLR</u> | <u>Modern Language Review</u> |
| <u>MP</u> | <u>Modern Philosophy</u> |
| <u>PMLA</u> | <u>Publications of the Modern Language Association of America</u> |

All quotations from Tristram Shandy are from the Penguin edition, and references are incorporated in the main body of the thesis by number of volume, chapter and page.

INTRODUCTION

The primary goal of this study is a reassessment of influences on Tristram Shandy with a special emphasis on the contemporary theatre and pulpit oratory.

Since John Ferriar identified the miscellaneous sources on which Sterne had drawn, most critics embarked on the discovery of as many outside influences as possible. It is, of course, true that Sterne incorporated in Tristram Shandy a number of passages from Rabelais, Montaigne and various other sources after he had creatively transformed and adapted the "pilfered" texts to his own idiosyncratic style. However, the nature of Sterne's reading, as Max Byrd points out, was erratic, and its impact as an organizing principle of Tristram Shandy has been overestimated. In an article about the origin of the conscious-narrator technique in Tristram Shandy, Wayne Booth concurs with Byrd as far as the overrating of the tradition of the "learned wit" is concerned and draws attention to the availability of contemporary sources for the development of the author's personal style. (1)

It is precisely those contemporary sources that I would like to examine more closely. The most frequently cited authority by critics of Sterne is Locke's An Essay Concerning Human Understanding. Arthur Cash attributed the structure of Tristram Shandy to the Lockean "association of

ideas", but then underestimated the narratorial manipulation of the material, which can scarcely be described as associative. John Traugott has justifiably taken issue with the body of critics that have accounted for the structure of Tristram Shandy in Lockean terms. For what it is worth, I agree with Traugott in that the Lockean association is only applied to character illustration and not to the design of the book. (2)

Apart from that, Sterne's philosophical knowledge is not exclusively derived from Locke. Three decades ago, Jean-Claude Sallé called attention to the fact that Sterne's notion of "duration" by the "succession of ideas" did not depend on his reading of Locke but that of Joseph Addison, a primarily dramatic critic.(3) As it will emerge in the second chapter, Sterne was as well acquainted with Descartes as probably with Locke, which does not make of him an avid reader of Descartes's works. Most likely, Sterne elicited his information on Descartes from acting treatises or pulpit oratory manuals. At least this much is suggested by the fact that Sterne limited his references to Descartes only to the latter's theory of passions on which acting theories revolved in the eighteenth-century British theatre.

Sterne lived and composed in an age in which controversies both over the end of drama and acting styles had reached a peak. Stage criticism appeared not only in

journals and plays themselves but permeated all forms of literature as Loftis points out. (4) Sterne's library contained a rich selection of dramatic works as well as numerous sermon collections. As it will become clear later, Sterne must have realized that people went "to sermons with the same appetites and inclinations, as they to see, and hear plays", (5) and, in response to his audience's predilections, he took care to enliven his sermons with theatrical action.

Judging from the wealth of theatrical criticism and the variableness of sources, it seems logical to look for explicit or implicit dramatic criticism in the novel as well as in other forms of literature. For while stage disputes were gathering momentum in the eighteenth century, the novel was still at an experimental stage, and the lack of any references to contemporary novelists in Tristram Shandy has not passed unnoticed by some critics. (6) Even the term "learned wit" can be seen to have roots in the theatre. In Sterne's time of writing, "wit" was almost invariably involved in stage disputes. In fact, Loftis sees the dramatic reform movement as "part of a more inclusive controversy about the proper function of wit in literature". (7) Indicative of this fact is the inclusion of wit in the prologues of contemporary plays, and, as I shall argue, Sterne's use of the concept of wit in his preface is implicitly connected to current dramatic controversies.

Sterne did not need to delve into philosophy to familiarize himself with the theory of passions or the role of reason as a regulating factor. He read enough sermons and pulpit manuals to realize that passions were the point at issue. Pulpit oratory presupposed a rudimentary, at least, knowledge of action. However, gesture and voice were accounted for on a physiological basis set up by such philosophers as Descartes in France and the moral philosophers in Britain (Locke had occupied himself very little with the physiology of passions.) As it will appear in the third chapter, both pulpit and stage treatises were offering similar advice about action to young preachers and players while pointing up the interchangeability of method in these two disciplines.

All the above factors in combination with an avowed life-long interest in the theatre reinforce the view that Sterne's work must evince at least some signs of influence from areas that were related to his profession. Besides, the long theatrical tradition of York had implanted in him the essentials of acting and stimulated his interest in the theatre sufficiently.

Though I am far from suggesting that Tristram Shandy is dramatic in structure, it would, nevertheless, be unreasonable to ignore the space allotted to meticulous accounts of gesture and the sundry references or allusions

to the stage and to contemporary players' practice. In addition, it is an established point that a preoccupation with the body has always had a direct relationship with acting. (8)

There have been those, of course, who have looked upon the gestures in Tristram Shandy as a painterly mode of writing. To a certain extent, this is a valid argument. But when Sterne reaches the point of literally disintegrating the picture and stretching the character to the borders of the absurd, then it is sensible to search in different directions for an explanation. This is exactly where the contemporary stage provides a sound framework within which gestures can be placed, especially, in view of the fact that painting bore an organic relation to pulpit and stage rhetoric of the eighteenth century.

It is my intention to indicate how the stage references, which have so far either been ignored or mentioned in a random way, if brought together, reveal a more intimate acquaintance with the theatre than Sterne has been credited with. Furthermore, I shall show how important gestures are in Tristram Shandy for the depiction of the main characters and how the latter are associated with the dominant schools of acting through a complex net of allusions to specific gestures in contemporary play performances. According to the information provided in the first chapter, Sterne had attended those plays, and,

therefore, possessed a first-hand knowledge of the issues involved and the questions raised, on which he tried to comment in a humorous way.

The second important aspect in which Tristram Shandy can be said to be dramatic is the relationship between reader and narrator as well as that between reader and characters. These relationships are strongly reminiscent of the role of the audience in the eighteenth-century theatre and can also be seen as a development of a style which Sterne had initiated in his sermons. The writer himself pointed out the parallel between pulpit and stage in one of his letters after his visit to the church of St Roch to hear Père Clément preaching.

A last point I want to underline is that, though this work has no pretension to originality in every single aspect involved, it is an attempt to focus on the confluence of contemporary influences on Sterne. Accordingly, I do not expect the reader to ignore all the other sources of erudite knowledge attained by Sterne. I do, however, hope that s/he will set those sources aside temporarily to concentrate on the diverse range of contemporary ones immediately available to him either in written form or through his daily experience.

Notes to Introduction

1. Wayne Booth, "The Self-Conscious Narrator in Comic Fiction", PMLA, 67 (1952), 163-85 (pp. 176-77).
2. The mechanism of association functioning inside the minds of the characters constitutes their personal singularity, but has nothing to do with the imaginative design or the critical intentions of the narrator. We must distinguish between, on the one hand, the associative mechanism that sets the characters off along their favourite paths, and, on the other, the structural mechanics of the book's composition, which is a method deriving from the sort of associationism defined by later philosophers. It is an original method; beneath the appearances of detachment and spontaneity it is in fact premeditated and planned with the greatest care.

John Traugott, Tristram Shandy's World (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1954), pp. 69-70.
3. Jean-Claude Sallé, "A source of Sterne's Conception of Time", RES, 6 (1955), 180-82.
4. In addition to the moralistic criticism of the drama, there was as noted, a large body of aesthetic criticism -- of which Pope's Dunciad is a pre-eminent example. ...Pope gave special place to the theatres in the Dunciad, in all versions satirizing the theatrical managers and in the final version making Cibber, then poet laureate, his king. He seems to have taken suggestions for the fourth book of the Dunciad from several of Fielding's burlesques of the 1730's. And antedating even the first version of Pope's poem, there is a considerable dunciad literature of the theatre -- burlesque writings for

and about the theatre on the same general theme of vulgarization. Dryden's MacFlecknoe, which in both theme and satirical method anticipates the Dunciad, is in part a theatrical poem. Pope's own Peri Bathous (1728), closely related thematically to the Dunciad, includes as its final chapter a burlesque "Project for the Advancement of the Stage". Indeed, the alleged degeneracy of the stage was for years a popular subject for criticism and satire, giving rise to extended works as well as to brief satirical passages interpolated in essays, prefaces, dedications, prologues and epilogues.

John Loftis, Comedy and Society from Congreve to Fielding (Stanford, California, 1959), pp. 35-36.

5. Joseph Glanvill, An Essay Concerning Preaching (London, 1678), p. 87.
6. Indeed, in his self-absorption, in his effort to use the novel to establish or clarify his own identity, Sterne scarcely looks up to see what is being written around him -- his letters and books are striking for their lack of reference to contemporary literature; and he seems unaware even of the existence of his immediate predecessors Fielding and Richardson.

Max Byrd, Tristram Shandy (London, 1985), p. 20.

7. John Loftis, p. 28.
8. Joseph Roach, The Player's Passion (Newark, 1985)

CHAPTER ONE

STERNE'S INTEREST IN DRAMA AND THEATRE

In the present chapter, I shall focus on the dramatic and literary context of the period with special reference to the theatre at York. Biographical information will be included to the degree that it is relevant to the development of dramatic technique in Sterne's work, particularly in Tristram Shandy. Though it was not a period of the highest creative achievement, theatres in Sterne's days were busy and largely prosperous. However, it is true to say that drama -- once the most popular literary form -- was gradually losing ground to the slow but steady emergence of the novel.

In mid-century, York was the Metropolis of the North, providing a broad spectrum of plays which ranged from Shakespearian revivals to farces and burlesques. York, as other provincial theatres of the time, presented the plays which were performed in London soon after the capital saw them. The companies from Drury Lane and Covent Garden continued to go into the country when conditions in London were not very promising. Garrick himself played Hamlet at the York theatre in March 1750. (1) However, there is no evidence as to whether Sterne's first impression about his later actor-friend was formed then or subsequently when he

was introduced to him in London.

Among the most popular plays in the first half of the eighteenth century were those of Dryden, Southerne, Rowe, Congreve, Vanbrugh, Farquhar, Addison, Steele, Colley, Cibber and Fielding as well as Elizabethan revivals. According to Nicoll's figures, in the season 1748-49 at Drury Lane there was an increase of performances of Shakespearian comedies with a corresponding decline in the number of Restoration comedy performances. Sentimental comedies, however, secured a larger proportion of acting nights than previously. (2) With regard to York, we observe the same pattern with the added complication of a strong topical droll tradition. Sybil Rosenfeld, whose work on provincial theatres is remarkable, discusses the York company as one which produced indigenous drama. "York is unique in producing its own dramatists." (3) Besides the York races, which took place every summer, included among other festivities a number of play performances.

The fact that there were local dramatists in York is of real interest as regards Sterne since a) his original intention was to write for the theatre, and b) Sterne's first two volumes were rejected by Dodsley because they contained "too local satire". (4) Sterne's expressed wish to write for the theatre is found in his letter to Garrick of 27 January, 1760:

I sometimes think of a Cervantic Comedy upon these and the Materials of the 3rd and 4th Volumes which will be still more dramatick, -- tho I as often distrust its Successe, unless at the Universities. Half a word of Encouragement would be enough to make me conceive, and bring forth something for the Stage. (5)

Similar pleas to the actor are found within the text of Tristram Shandy:

O Garrick! what a rich scene of this would thy exquisite powers make! and how gladly would I write such another to avail myself of thy immortality, and secure my own behind it.

IV, 7 (p. 280)

But the "half word of encouragement" was either not given or the writer was realistic enough to be convinced that writing a play could cause irreversible complications in his profession as clergyman.

Absurd as it may sound for a writer who was vehemently criticized for the "smut" of his book, play-writing would have been a blatant violation of church etiquette. As it is well-known, and as Pedicord rightly emphasizes, the Collier controversy was by no means dead by the time Sterne was writing. "From 1698 to 1800 over fifty diatribes against playhouses were published more than twenty appearing after 1747." (6) In a well-documented discussion of the Garrick audiences, Pedicord distinguishes a special category of people who, though they could afford to attend the theatre, did not go because of religious or moral scruples. Sterne did attend the theatre, and in a very

dedicated way too, (7) but it seems most likely that he gave in to professional scruples as far as play-writing was concerned, knowing the predicament in which he would put himself. Judging from Pedicord's statement of the issue, Sterne was not alone:

Many clergymen attended performances, some of them cherishing lifelong ambitions as authors. With the majority, however, such ambitions must have been severely controlled. They always had to reckon with ecclesiastical authority. (8)

Though it might appear that Sterne would not be deterred by such considerations, the number of anticipatory addresses to those who may take offence in Tristram Shandy -- even if worded in a playful manner -- suggest that Sterne took heed of any likely bishoprial remonstrances:

But your horse throws dirt; see you've splashed a bishop -- I hope in God, 'twas only Enrulphus, said I. (9)

IV, 20 (p. 297)

While his clerical duties may have functioned as an obstacle to a playwright's career, Sterne's acquaintance with pulpit oratory and the cultivation of various techniques as a preacher contributed to the acquisition of the ability to dramatize situations. It also provided a theoretical foundation of "voice" and "action" in the pulpit, which, because of its organic relation to the rise of a stage theory in the first half of the eighteenth-century, accounted for an implicitly dramatic exploitation

of material by Sterne. In fact, Hugh Kelly, in his Epilogue to A Word to the Wise, pushes the relationship between drama and preaching so far as to suggest that sermons and plays had become interchangeable -- the former by the inclusion of wit and the latter by their adherence to the fulfilment of a didactic aim:

Modish Divines, at Court and in the City,
Are in their pulpits, hum'rous, gay and
witty --
They've now chang'd hands, the stage and
pulpit teaching,
Sermons are plays and plays are merely
preaching. (10)

Sterne developed the ability to dramatize situations in the earlier days when he had to convey moral lessons to his congregation and realized that an effectual way of doing this was by enacting the sermon (more details on the subject are included in the third chapter). The writer's early letters to his prospective wife constitute, in embryonic form, those dramatic abilities which were further elaborated and perfected in Tristram Shandy and A Sentimental Journey.

It is interesting to note that one of the methods Sterne employs to dramatize situations, apart from the involvement of his audience, is the use of familiar objects or "physical props", as McKillop chooses to call them. (11) I shall quote a passage from one of Sterne's letters to Elizabeth Lumley (1739-40), which shows precisely this ability to enact a drama out of an ordinary situation:

One solitary plate, one knife, one fork,

one glass! -- I gave a thousand pensive, penetrating looks at the chair thou hadst so often graced, in those quiet, and sentimental repasts -- then laid down my knife, and fork, and took out my handkerchief, and clapped it across my face, and wept like a child. -- I do so this very moment, my L. for as I take up my pen my poor pulse quickens, my pale face glows, and tears are trickling down upon the paper, as I trace the word L-. (12)

In drama, the necessity of familiar objects became obvious with the shift from the heroic nature of neoclassical tragedies to the domestic scene of the tragedies of the eighteenth century. Tristram Shandy matches this shift with its cosy atmosphere of the Shandy Hall.

The number of allusions to plays -- mainly, Shakespearian ones -- has already been brought out by Curtis, and it would be pointless to repeat them here except to reinforce the point about Sterne's proficient knowledge of drama. (13) However, an extract from the Journal to Eliza will further illustrate my view about Sterne's awareness of dramatizing situations:

I have this and a thousand little parties of pleasure -- and systems of living out of the common high road, of Life, hourly working in my fancy for you -- there wants only the Dramatis Personae for the performance -- the play is wrote -- the Scenes are painted -- and the Curtain ready to be drawn up -- the whole Piece (is) waits for thee, (-) my Eliza. (14)

While Sterne was aware of a mutual influence between stage and pulpit, his literary standards did not allow for the interference of didacticism in play-writing. In a

letter to Garrick from France, Sterne complains that tragedies at the Opera Comique far outnumbered comedies.

The main objection to tragedies is their didactic quality:

The French comedy, I seldom visit it -- they act scarce any thing but tragedies -- and the Clairon is great, and Mademoiselle Dumesnil, in some places, still greater than her -- yet I cannot bear preaching -- I fancy I got a surfeit of it in my younger days. -- There is a tragedy to be damn'd to-night -- peace be with it, and the gentle brain which made it. (15)

This is an interesting prejudice in view of Sterne's own profession, and it is of a piece with his predilection for Restoration comedy (see the "amours" plot in Tristram Shandy). One can argue that Sterne's satiety with preaching would not refer simply to his profession -- as the subject here is drama -- but to the number of sentimental plays he must have had the opportunity to see in York. Besides, the distinction "younger days" could not apply to preaching as Sterne had not totally given up preaching when he wrote the letter. (According to Cross, Sterne's last sermon was delivered in August 1766.) (16) Finally, if one went to hear a sermon, one would expect preaching and would be more sensitive to finding it out of place in drama.

Aversion to anything that savours too much preaching is restated in another letter to Garrick following the above. As Sterne purports, the tragic muse is distorted by one offshoot of moral philosophy: the tendency to preach

rather than dramatize:

I have been these two days reading a tragedy, given me by a lady of talents, to read and conjecture if it would do for you -- 'Tis from the plan of Diderot, and possibly half a translation of it -- The Natural Son, or, The Triumph of Virtue, in five acts -- It has too much sentiment in it, (at least for me) the speeches too long, and savour too much of preaching -- this may be a second reason, it is not to my taste. (17)

In the above passage, Sterne encapsulates the structural faults to which didactic aims led, that is, long edifying speeches which were embodied in the dialogue of either exemplary or reformed characters.

In the same letter Sterne criticizes the theme of love in tragedies which was, to a considerable extent, a French influence. Sentimental dramatists were held responsible for diminishing the heroic nature of tragedy by introducing domestic themes such as love:

'Tis all love, love, love, throughout, without much separation in the character; so I fear it would not do for your stage, and perhaps for the very reason which recommend (s) it to a French one. (18)

The deflation of a sentimental approach to the theme of love is taken up in Tristram Shandy where a distinction is drawn between love as "sentiment" and as "situation" :

In this case, continued my father which Plato, I am persuaded, never thought of -- Love, you see, is not so much a SENTIMENT as a SITUATION, into which a man enters, as my brother Toby would do, into a corps -- no matter whether he loves the service or no -- being once in it -- he acts as if he

did ; and takes every step to show himself
a man of prowess.

VIII, 34 (p.562)

It is also reflected in the pursuit of love by Toby as a sentimentalist and Trim as a manners comedy character. In this connection, Sterne's satire of sentimentalism can be placed in a dramatic context.

It is a strong possibility that Sterne's cultivation of a taste for drama and theatre was considerably heightened after his introduction to Garrick in January 1760. It would seem that there was a connection between the writer's immediate experience and the content of his book since the first reference to Garrick comes in III, 12 -- not long after he had met the actor, immediately after the publication of the first two volumes of Tristram Shandy, in January 1760.

During his first night at Drury Lane, Sterne saw Garrick in the Siege of Aquilea (19) and was astonished by the actor's performance as he confessed later in a letter.(20) In the space of time that Sterne spent in London (January to May 1760), Garrick gave him "an order for the liberty of his boxes, and of every part of his house for the whole season". (21) That must have made Sterne well acquainted with Garrick's theory and practice of "natural" acting, which the writer exploited in his method of characterization in Tristram Shandy, as I shall further argue in the last chapter.

His circle of actor-friends was enlarged the following year (1761), when Sterne returned to London. This time he had the opportunity to meet Francis Blake Delavar (22) -- and Samuel Foote whose mimicking style was notorious. According to Wilbur Cross, Sterne gained a good deal from his associations with people of the theatrical world.

In any case, Sterne's interest in drama is manifested not only in the attendance of theatrical performances but also in the reading and assessment of plays for potential performance at Drury Lane. This liberty, which he had either been given or taken himself, reveals Sterne not simply as an experienced theatre-goer but also as an efficient critic of drama and theatre.

On 31 January 1762, Sterne wrote to Garrick that he had seen Clairon in Iphigène. Clairon, at the time, was the "Garrick" of the French stage, and the two actors met a few years later, in 1765, during Garrick's Grand Tour. (23) In the letter mentioned above, Sterne sent Garrick a pamphlet upon tragical declamation knowing that it would be of interest to him as Garrick had condemned this manner of delivery in his acting and was striving for more natural rhythms (see Chapter Four):

I have bought you the pamphlet upon theatrical, or rather tragical declamation -- I have bought another in verse, worth reading, and you will receive them, with

what I can pick up this week, by a servant of Mr Hodges, who he is sending back to England. (24)

Besides the straightforward criticism in Sterne's correspondence, there is also implicit dramatic criticism in Tristram Shandy. In I, 21 Dryden and Addison are referred to as favouring the notion that the English Comedy surpasses any other due to the variety of the original material provided by difference in character:

Then again, -- that this copious storehouse of original materials, is the true and natural cause that our Comedies are so much better than those of France, or any others that either have, or can be wrote upon the continent; -- that discovery was not fully made till about the middle of King William's reign, -- when the great Dryden, in writing one of his long prefaces, (if I mistake not) most fortunately hit upon it. Indeed toward the latter end of Queen Anne, the great Addison began to patronize the notion, and more fully explained it to the world in one or two of his Spectators; -- but the discovery was not his.

I, 21 (pp.87-88)

The bringing together of the two critics -- though Addison is presented to follow Dryden in critical doctrine -- is not casual as both of them upheld a Hobbesian view of "fancy" and shared the theory of the juxtaposition of opposites. Sterne's assumed knowledge must have been derived from the numerous issues of Dryden's Prefaces and Spectators in his library.

Sterne did not fail to jibe at those who defended the stage on moralistic grounds:

Dennis the critic could not detest and
 abhor a pun, more cordially than my father.
 II,12 (p.129)

Except for the theoretical attacks on plays which were considered indecent, Sterne must have felt the repercussions of the stage controversy in a more direct way in York. Sybil Rosenfeld mentions a case of prohibiting the performance of plays which might be offensive to the audience:

In December 1758, Foote's The Author was stopped from performance in York as libellous. The York ladies were particular, and for long would not allow The Provok'd Wife to be presented on the score of its indecency. (25)

The above passage sheds some light on the role of the female audiences in the eighteenth century and their ability to influence the repertoire. (26) Further, it helps to establish the theatrical link of the narrator's poking at his female reader's alleged feeling of decency in Tristram Shandy:

Surely, Madam, a friendship between the two sexes may subsist, and be supported without -- Fy! Mr. Shandy: -- Without any thing, Madam, but that tender and delicious sentiment, which ever mixes in friendship, where there is a difference of sex. Let me entreat you to study the pure and sentimental parts of the best French Romances; -- it will really, Madam, astonish you to see with what a variety of chaste expressions this delicious sentiment, which I have the honour to speak of, is dressed out.

I, 18 (pp.76-77)

Apart from the secondary task Sterne set himself of

providing Garrick with information about the theatrical state of affairs in France, and a little later, in Italy, he put his abilities as actor and director to test in December 1762. On the occasion of the arrival of a company of English strollers in Toulouse, Sterne became involved in adapting, and acting in, A Journey to London, which, for his own purposes, he entitled A Journey to Toulouse. (27) On this occasion, Sterne employed himself as writer and actor/manager in real life.

Even in his latter days, Sterne did not relinquish his interest in the theatre. During Garrick's visit to France, Sterne frequently expostulated with his actor-friend asking him to speed up his return to England. (28) Apparently, Sterne was not satisfied with Powell who had been left to replace Garrick. At the time Sterne might have seen Powell the latter was playing Lear and Othello. Despite Sterne's opinion, which -- for all we know -- could have been prejudiced in favour of Garrick, Powell had admittedly displayed great talent and had stolen the performance from Garrick. Naturally, he had his failings among which was included an inclination to rant and bluster, but, generally speaking, he had gained the admiration of the audience. Perhaps, Sterne's standards were too high to be met by Powell's qualities. However, it seems from the following extract that Sterne's complaint was well-founded as it was directed against Powell's tendency to "whine and blubber":

Powell! -- Lord God! -- give me some one with less smook & more fire -- There are, who like the Pharisees, still think they shall be heard for much speaking -- come -- come away my dear Garrick, <-> & teach us another lesson. (29)

Sterne continued, even in those days, to inform his friends about current developments in the world of the theatre as his last letters to Lord Fauconberg indicate. In the following letter he relates the Duke of York's venture to play Horatio in The Fair Penitent in his own house -- a scheme which was disapproved by the King:

No news. I dined yesterday with Lord Marsh & a large Company of the duke of Yorks people & c-- and came away just as wise as I went -- the king at Cimon, the new Opera last night -- no body at Covent Garden but the Citizen's children & apprentices -- The Duke of York was to have had a play house of his own, & had studied his part -- in the fair penitent and made Garrick act it twice on purpose to profit by it -- but the King 'tis said, has desired the Duke to give up the part & the project with it -- (all this is for the Ladies) to whom, with all Comps to the party at Quadrille & Lady Catherine. (30)

Writing to the same friend a little later, Sterne was very generous in applauding Garrick's Cimon while he deplored Murphy's The School for Guardians:

... The School for Guardians -- (wrote by Murphy) could scarce get thro' the 1st night -- 'tis a most miserable affair -- Garrick's Cimon -- fills his house brim full every night. (31)

As can be deduced from the following versification of Sterne's opinion which appeared in the St. James's Chronicle

(22-24 January 1767, p.4), Sterne's views about current productions did not pass unheeded by other critics:

But now have at your Eyes and Ears;
 Earth, Heav'n and Hell, are all united,
 The Upper Gall'ry, so delighted!...
 ... The School for Guardians ...
 You'd swear, 'twas written by a Lord:
 So fine the Wit, so fine the Plot,
 You have 'em, and you have 'em not:
 The Plot and Wit make such a Pother;
 You cannot see the one for t'other:
 Like Ghosts they're here, and now they're
 there;
 'Tis M(urph)y now, and now Moliere.

Taking into account Sterne's convictions about the ingredients of good acting and considering the nature of his profession, we should have no scruples about taking for granted Madame Suard's testification as to the impression Sterne left on his listeners. Having met Sterne, Madame Suard wrote that his habitual gestures and words were so engraven in the memory and imagination of her husband that he could never hear Sterne's name mentioned without believing that he really saw him and was listening to him.

The composition of Tristram Shandy was not the best use to which Sterne could have put his abilities, but at least, he did all he could to re-create in his book the atmosphere of a "live" conversation.

Notes to Chapter One

1. York Courant, 27 March, 1750.
2. Allardyce Nicoll, A History of Early Eighteenth-Century Drama: 1700-1750 (Cambridge, 1925), pp.137-38.
3. Sybil Rosenfeld, Strolling Players and Drama in the Provinces: 1660-1765 (Cambridge, 1939), p.106.
4. One may wonder how far the immediate theatrical experience in York can have influenced Sterne in the choice of themes in Tristram Shandy. An example is the "noses" theme, which has always been attributed to Sterne's reading of "facetious" writers. No doubt, the erudite element is there, and John Ferriar made his contribution by scrutinizing Tristram Shandy to expose the "plagiaries". But that which may have stimulated Sterne's interest in those writers could have been his theatrical experience. Back to the theme of "noses", however, I shall quote Tate Wilkinson on the subject of the survival of minor episode in theatrical tradition:

The following lines from Mr. Foote's prologue of 1753 are remembered or forgotten.

"The many various objects that amuse
This busy curious time by way of news,
Are plays, elections, murders, lott'ries,
Jews;
All these compounded fly throughout the
nation
And set the whole in one great fermentation!
True British hearts the same high spirits

show,
 Be they to damn a farce or fight a foe.
 One day for liberty the Briton fires,
 The next he flames -- for Canning, or for
 Squires.
 In like extremes your laughing humour
 flows;
 Have you not roar'd from pit to upper rows,
 All all the jest was, -- what? a fiddler's
 nose!
 Pursue your mirth; each night the joke
 grows stronger,
 For as you fret the man, his nose looks
 longer."
 And strange to add, that Nosey, from the
 use of being loudly called for in 1753, is
 still retained by the galleries,
 particularly at present in the York
 circuit, where without compliment, the
 leader is a man of great professional
 merit, but has a nose as much too long as
 the manager's is too short.

On the same page Wilkinson quotes Samuel Foote's
 footnote to "fiddler's nose", which is as follows:

The person here intended is Mons.
 Cervetti, (engaged at Drury Lane many years
 before the trial of Elizabeth Canning) who
 has been a standing joke with the upper-
 gallery, for a long time past, on account
 of the length of his nose; but as I am
 informed that no features of his mind are
 out of proportion unless it be that his
 good qualities are extraordinary, I take
 this opportunity to mention, that it is
 cruel to render him uneasy in the business,
 in which he is eminent, and by which he
 must get a livelihood.

Memoirs of Tate Wilkinson, 4 vols (York, 1790), i,
 27-28.

5. Letters of Laurence Sterne, edited by Lewis Perry Curtis
 (Oxford, 1935), p.87 (27 January, 1760).
6. Harry William Pedicord, The Theatrical Public in the

Time of Garrick (New York, 1954), p. 40.

7. An indication of how dedicated to the theatre Sterne must have been may be derived from an anecdote of John Croft. Since Tristram Shandy had come out, Lydia -- Sterne's daughter -- had been plagued by her schoolmates with the name of Miss Tristram and Miss Shandy. Lydia, in revenge, wrote love letters to those who had pestered her under the signatures of the various players of the York company. The resolution of this mischief is irrelevant, but the episode itself presupposes a very good knowledge of the players of the York company which could have only been acquired by regular attendance.
8. Pedicord, p.40.
9. Sterne refers to William Warburton, Bishop of Gloucester, who was estranged from the writer because of the latter's refusal "to tone down the wit and licentiousness of his writings" (Penguin edition note, p. 638).
10. Drury Lane, 30 March, 1770.
11. Alan Dugald McKillop, The Early Masters of English Fiction (Lawrence and London, 1962), p.189.
12. Curtis, p.11 (? 1739-40).
13. Sherbo has provided some additional information about allusions to plays in Tristram Shandy.
Arthur Sherbo, Studies in the Eighteenth-Century English

- Novel (East Lansing, 1969), pp. 131-35.
14. Curtis, p. 364 (24 June, 1767).
 15. Curtis, p. 157 (19 March, 1762).
 16. Wilbur Cross, The Life and Times of Laurence Sterne (New Haven, 1929), pp. 412-13.
 17. Curtis, p. 162 (19 April, 1762).
 18. Ibid.
 19. John Genest, Some Account of the English Stage from the Restoration in 1660 to 1830, 10 vols (Bath, 1832), iv, 583.
 20. Curtis, p. 93 (6 March, 1760).
 21. Ibid, pp. 96-97 (8 March, 1760).
 22. Francis Blake Delavar had gained great applause in the part of Othello during an amateur performance at Drury Lane. This actor, like a few others, was Macklin's student. The latter had hired Drury Lane for a single night, especially, for this performance. I shall cite Kirkman on Delaval's Othello:

The figure of Othello was undoubtedly one of the finest ever produced on a stage; his deportment, in the whole, was majestic, without pomp; and his sense of the passions, the Author has thrown into his part, quick, and exquisite.

James Thomas Kirkman, Memoirs of the Life of Charles Macklin, 2 vols (London, 1799), i, 338.

23. Thomas Davies, Memoirs of the Life of Garrick, third edition, 2 vols (London, 1781), ii, 82-83.

24. Curtis, pp. 151-52 (31 January, 1762).
25. Rosenfeld, pp. 149-50.
26. With regard to the decisive role of female audiences,
Powell writes:

With the withdrawal of the Court interest, the fashionable world needed new leaders and they found them in the female element of Society. Ladies were not expected to be involved in the gravity of business, and, as opposed to that of men, their function was symbolic and decorative. As such they were fitting rulers for the lighter side of life, for drama had necessarily fallen victim to the basic puritan distinction between work and play.

Jocelyn Powell, Restoration Theatre Production (London, 1984), p. 155.

27. Curtis, p. 191 (17 December, 1762).
28. Ibid, p. 235 (16 March, 1765).
29. Ibid, p. 237 (6 April, 1765).
30. Ibid, p. 295 (9 January, 1767).
31. Ibid, p. 297 (16 January, 1767).

CHAPTER TWO

THE EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY BACKGROUND

As I have stated in my introduction, the drift of my thesis is the impact of drama and theatre on Sterne, in particular, as that regards Tristram Shandy. Considering the significance of passions for the formulation of stage theory, it is a matter of priority to indicate how Sterne's perception of passions and of their expression was affected by contemporary philosophy and, by implication, what were the avenues through which this influence made its impact on the writer.

As it will appear in the course of the discussion, acting theories in Britain owed a great deal to the Cartesian philosophy, especially, to The Passions of the Soul. Descartes's philosophy did not always exert its influence on British philosophers directly. Frequently, it was transferred in the disguise of manuals on pulpit oratory or in the form of acting treatises or even through theoretical works on painting such as Charles Le Brun's Méthode pour apprendre à dessiner les passions (French edition, 1702).

I shall begin by elaborating on Descartes's theory of passions and then proceed to examine how issues raised in Descartes are dealt with in the British philosophers

Hobbes, Locke, and Hume. Following that, I shall draw the reader's attention to the implications of contemporary philosophy for the foundation of acting theories and, secondarily only, of pulpit action. My ultimate goal is to show that the theory behind acting and pulpit action was one of Sterne's preoccupations and to indicate how this can be extracted from a network of references and allusions in Tristram Shandy.

Descartes's philosophy is based on a physiological theory that describes how the body moves and emotes. Many a parallel have been drawn between the machine and the human body in the Cartesian system; it should, however, be allowed that, in spite of its apparent simplicity, the Cartesian doctrine provides enough space for the volition of the soul to control the automaton.

The human body in Descartes resembles a hydraulic system. The heart is the pump that sends blood to the brain and the body after rarefying it. From the heart the great artery follows a direct route to the brain. As the passages are very narrow, only the finest and most active particles of the blood -- the animal spirits -- reach the brain while the rest of it is spread into the other regions of the body. The animal spirits create a wind that, firstly, prepares the nerves to function and, secondly, inflates the muscles and imparts movement to all parts of the body. Animal spirits

are carried to the muscles by little tubes which are formed by membranes surrounding the fibres of marrow starting from the brain. Therefore, if anything causes the slightest motion in a part of the body where a fibre terminates, it causes a movement in the part of the brain where lies the end of the fibre.

There are rudimentary responses, such as the withdrawal of one's hand from a flame, that preserve the body alive and are totally irrelevant to the functions of the soul. The latter are divided by Descartes into the actions of the soul and its passions. Those which he calls the actions are all the volitions either they are directed in the soul itself (belief in God) or in the body (walking). The passions, on the other hand, are the various perceptions or modes of knowledge in us. These perceptions can refer to objects outside us, to our body, or to our soul. Even though all three categories are in a broad sense passions, Descartes uses the term "passions" to signify only perceptions which refer to the soul itself and which are caused, maintained and strengthened by some movement of the spirits. These it is better to call "emotions" as they are -- of all kinds of thought the soul may have -- the ones that agitate and disturb it most strongly.

The seat of the soul is a gland in the middle of the brain which is joined, by means of the nerves, the animal spirits, and the blood, to all parts of the body. When the

objects of the senses produce various movements in the nerve-fibres, the latter are occasioned to open the pores of the brain, which in turn causes the animal spirits to enter the muscles in different ways. In this manner, the body moves. The small gland in the brain is suspended within the cavities containing these spirits so that it can be moved in as many different ways as there are perceptible differences in the objects. The gland can, however, be moved by the soul, too, driving, thus, the surrounding spirits towards the pores of the brain which direct them through the nerves to the muscles. The rest of the spirits go to nerves which expand or constrict the orifices of the heart so that the blood is rarefied in a different way from usual and spirits are sent to the brain which are adapted to maintaining the aroused passion by re-opening the pores of the brain which direct the spirits into the same nerves. For by entering these pores, the spirits produce in the gland a movement which makes the soul feel this passion.

Memory functions by the voluntary movement of the gland to both sides driving, thus, the animal spirits towards different regions of the body until they come upon the one that contains traces left by the object one wants to remember. Remembering consists in the opening of the pores of the brain into which the spirits previously entered owing to the presence of the same object. Likewise, one can

imagine something never seen before by making the gland move in the way required for driving the spirits towards the pores of the brain whose opening would enable the thing to be represented.

Passions can be only aroused indirectly through the representation of objects which are usually joined with the passions we have. Nor can they be suppressed, for that matter, by the action of our will as they are all accompanied by a disturbance in the heart and, consequently, also throughout the blood and the animal spirits. All that the will can do while the disturbance is at its full strength is to forestall the movements to which it disposes the body.

Passions are useful in that they strengthen and prolong thoughts in the soul which it is good for the soul to preserve or unuseful for doing the same with thoughts which are harmful for the soul to preserve. Therefore, it may initially seem that false judgements based on passions are difficult to change. Nevertheless, one can separate certain objects usually joined to certain passions and, through habit, join them to others which are different. This is feasible only by part of the soul which Descartes calls "will".

According to Descartes, there are only six primitive passions: wonder, love, hatred, desire, joy, sadness. The cause of wonder is located in the brain. Therefore, it has

no relation with the heart and blood on which depends the well-being of the body but with the brain in which are located the organs of the senses used in gaining knowledge. For each other passion of the soul Descartes describes the changes in the body organs, the blood flow, and the flow of the alimentary juices which determine the physical manifestations of the five senses. The latter are fixed reactions to external stimuli or inner imagination. In hatred, for instance, "the pulse is irregular, weaker and often quicker; we feel chills mingled with a sort of sharp, piercing heat in the chest; and the stomach causes to perform its function, being inclined to regurgitate and reject the food we have eaten, or at any rate to spoil it and turn it into bad humours". (1)

Desire is the passion which agitates the heart more violently than any other and supplies more spirits to the brain. The latter, passing to the muscles, make the body more mobile and lead it to action for the attainment of the objects of desire.

Lively motion represents a rippling expansion of hydraulic impulse from the center to the periphery; stillness and silence stem from the inward contraction of the spirits, a deprivation of the fluid needed to power the automaton. (2)

The external signs of the passions are changes in colour, the expression of the eyes and the face, trembling, listlessness, fainting, laughter, tears, groans and sighs.

For Descartes, there is no passion which some particular expression of the eyes does not reveal. Facial expressions are virtually of the same significance as eyes. The fact is that some of them differ so little that people make the same face when they weep as others do when they laugh. As an example of physical changes, I shall cite Descartes on how joy causes blushing and sadness pallor:

Thus joy renders the colour brighter and rosier because it opens the valves of the heart and so causes the blood to flow more quickly in all the veins. As the blood becomes warmer and thinner it fills out all the parts of the face somewhat, thus making it look more cheerful and happier.

Sadness, on the other hand, constricts the orifices of the heart, causing the blood to flow more slowly in the veins and to become colder and thicker. Needing to occupy less space, the blood then withdraws into the largest veins, which are the nearest to the heart, leaving the more remote veins, such as those in the face; and since these are particularly conspicuous, the face is caused to appear pale and sunken. This happens chiefly when the sadness is great, or when it comes on suddenly, as in terror, when surprise amplifies the action which grips the heart. (3)

In the third part of his discourse called The Passions of the Soul, Descartes deals with specific passions which are derivative of the primitive ones. I shall only provide a list of these below which will serve reference purposes later when I discuss passions in other philosophers or in stage theoreticians: esteem, contempt, generosity, humility, vanity, veneration, scorn, hope,

anxiety, confidence, despair, jealousy, irresolution, courage, boldness, emulation, timidity, fear, derision, mockery, envy, pity, self-satisfaction, repentance, favour, gratitude, ingratitude, indignation, anger, pride, shame, impudence, disgust, regret.

Cartesianism exerted a considerable influence on medical science in England where medical opinion was the most powerful source of the popular diffusion of such interpretations of the body. As the English physician George Cheyne put it in 1733:

Feeling is nothing but the impulse, motion or action of bodies, gently or violently impressing the extremities or sides of the nerves, of the skin or other parts of the body, which by their structure and mechanism, convey this motion to the sentient principle in the brain. (4)

According to Roach, such formulation of Cartesian opinion ultimately emerge in popularizations like the "physical terms" to which Garrick referred in his explanation about how the members of the body become agitated. (5)

Even though Cartesianism became widely known in Britain through stage treatises or rhetoric manuals, the British philosophy of the seventeenth century, especially the Hobbesian and Lockean systems, was materialistic and utilitarian rather than psychologically oriented. Hobbes -- whose Leviathan came out not much later than Descartes's Passions of the Soul, in 1651 -- was more interested in

knowledge acquisition than "the interior beginnings of voluntary motions", as he defined the passions.

It seems that external senses occupy a central position in Hobbes's system for receiving and storing the material. The external cause or object presses the organ proper to each sense. Through nerves and membranes of the body linked to the brain and the heart, the pressure which is exerted by the objects causes a counterpressure directed outward. In other words, sense is originally fancy caused by the motion of external objects upon our organs. After the object is removed, its image is still retained though more obscure than when it was present. This "decaying sense" is, in Hobbes's terms, imagination. However, if we want to denote the "decay" rather than the "decaying sense", then we call it "memory". It follows that imagination and memory are one and the same function which, for different considerations, have different names.

Although external senses constitute the basis of understanding in as far as the reception and storing of the material is concerned, it is only through the co-operative mediation of fancy and judgement that this material is reconstructed and takes its place in the secondary world of mental experience. Fancy or imagination is the power of the mind to combine images that have been previously stored by memory. In this perceptual activity fancy is aided by judgement in sorting out and constructing into unities the

material stored in memory. The combined activities of fancy and judgement are stimulated and directed by the principle of desire and are described as "wit" -- a general agility of the spirit.

The Hobbesian definition of wit implies a unity in the works of fancy which dispenses with any distinctions appearing later between reason and feeling. It also excludes the existence of an internal influence in the form of divine inspiration, which was unacceptable to moral philosophers in the eighteenth century. Hobbes believed that all pleasures of imagination derive from the senses, and there can be no images without sight. These images can be retained, altered, and compounded into all varieties of picture by a special faculty of the mind. The primacy of sight among the senses is not new. It is originally, an Aristotelian doctrine which was carried through by Quintilian. Aristotle had declared that the soul never thinks without a mental picture and that when pictures are strongly present in the imagination, the soul is as moved as if the actual objects of desire were present to the senses.

(6)

According to Hobbes, imagination is the internal beginning of all voluntary motion. Before man perceives any physical change or motion as walking, speaking, striking or any other visible action, there are such motions. These

internal motions are the relics of the same motion remaining after sense, and they are defined as passions. The notion of passions in Hobbes does not greatly differ from that of animal spirits in Descartes (The latter attributes these internal motions to the opening up of the pores in which relevant experience has been stored before).

Those internal motions Hobbes calls "desire" or "aversion" depending on their direction toward or from what causes it. Desire and aversion are the same as, or synonymous with, love and hatred. That which causes desire is good while that which causes aversion is evil. We feel pleasure or displeasure, respectively. The pleasures of the mind constitute joy whereas the displeasures of the mind come under grief. Appetite, desire, love, aversion, hate, joy and grief are the simple passions which have their names diversified depending on a) "the opinion men have of the likelihood of attaining what they desire", b) the object of our love or hatred, c) "the consideration of many of them together", and d) "the alteration or succession itself". (7) As a result of the above considerations, Hobbes provides a long list of secondary -- should we say -- passions many of which coincide with Descartes's "specific" passions such as hope, despair, fear, courage, anger, confidence, diffidence, indignation, benevolence, covetousness, ambition, magnanimity. Contrary to Descartes, Hobbes does not elaborate on the physiological processes which give form to

the passions nor does he describe the physical manifestations of each one of them.

If both Descartes and Hobbes had seen passion as an internal motivating force, Locke thought of a passion as a psychological state, and he stressed the static nature of perception and experience. Passion, for Locke, signifies "effect", not "action":

The efficacy whereby the new substance or idea is produced is called, in the subject exerting that power, action; but in the subject wherein any simple idea is changed or produced it is called passion; which efficacy, however various, and the effects almost infinite, yet we can, I think, conceive it, in intellectual agents, to be nothing else but modes of thinking and willing; in corporeal agents, nothing else but modifications of motion. (8)

Passions are qualified depending on whether they cause, in the body or in the mind, pleasure or pain, and, consequently, whether they are connected with good or evil. Locke makes no differentiation between primary and secondary passions; he only distinguishes among passions according to their operation within us. Thus, he provides the following list: love, hatred, desire, joy, sorrow, hope, fear, despair, anger, envy, shame.

Moral philosophers -- in particular, Shaftesbury -- overturned the Lockean balance achieved by the dominant reason to the side of "passions" or "affections". Passions became the pivotal concept of human behaviour in

Shaftesbury's system. In fact, Shaftesbury adopted the Cartesian doctrine that there is "a simple mechanism, an engine, or piece of clockwork" that directs man's actions. Passions are classified as a) natural ones that lead to the good of the public, b) self-affections that protect self-interest, and c) those that lead neither to the good of the public nor the individual and are, therefore, unnatural. The immoderate degree of one or more passions cannot but be detrimental to others, and this is the occasion of partiality or injustice. If, therefore, an absolute dependence on passions or affections can be the cause of injustice or unhappiness, reason is to be brought in to moderate the influence of passions (the equivalent of reason in Descartes is volition):

As it (a capricious affection) has no foundation or establishment in reason, so it must be easily removable, and subject to alteration without reason. Now the variableness of such sort of passion, which depends solely on capriciousness and humour, and undergoes the frequent successions of alternate hatred and love, aversion and inclination, must of necessity create continual disturbance and disgust, give an allay to what is immediately enjoyed in the way of friendship and society, and in the end extinguish, in a manner, the very inclination towards friendship and human commerce. (9)

Hume went one step beyond Shaftesbury to identify passions and reason. In A Treatise of Human Nature, he defines both passions and reason as affections of the same kind differing only in force of operation:

What we commonly understand by "passion" is a violent and sensible emotion of mind, when any good or evil is presented, or any object, which by the original formation of our faculties, is fitted to excite an appetite. By "reason" we mean affections of the very same kind with the former; but such as operate more calmly, and cause no disorder in the temper; which tranquillity leads us into a mistake concerning them, and causes us to regard them as conclusions only of our intellectual faculties. (10)

Since reason can never produce any action or give rise to volition, it is incapable of preventing volition or controlling any passion or emotion. Besides, a passion must be accompanied by a false judgement to be unreasonable; and even then it is not the passion which is unreasonable, but the judgement. Frequently, calm passions can be confused with reason as the latter operates with calmness and tranquillity. Of course, from this view of Hume ensues an absolute reliance on passions, which may seem to dispose of the Cartesian dualism but, by no means, accounts for human behaviour. (Descartes and Locke had argued for a subordination of passions to reason implying, thus, that passions are of an unwieldy nature and, if let loose, can lead us astray.)

Naturally, Hume had to make amends for the omnipotent role of passions in his system, and he did so by establishing the fundamental goodness of human nature and solidifying it into the principle of sympathy. Sympathy, or, in other words, the assumption about the fundamental

goodness of human nature, is crucial for accounting for moral behaviour in the eighteenth century. According to Hume, through sympathy one can put oneself into someone else's position and try to enliven the feeling of pleasure or pain experienced by the other person. The concern one takes in one can, by means of the sympathetic mechanism described here, be extended so as to make one have some regard for the well-being of the others:

Upon the whole, there remains nothing, which give us an esteem (esteem and contempt are species of love and hatred) for power and riches, and a contempt for meanness and poverty except the principle of sympathy, by which we enter into the sentiments of the rich and the poor, and partake of their pleasures and uneasiness. Riches give satisfaction to their possessor; and this satisfaction is convey'd to the beholder by the imagination, which produces an idea resembling the original in force and vivacity. This agreeable idea or impression is connected with love, which is an agreeable passion. It proceeds from a thinking conscious being, which is the very object of love. From this relation of impressions, and identity of ideas, the passion arises, according to my hypothesis.
(11)

When we sympathize with the passions of others, these movements appear in our minds as mere ideas. By relating the objects causing the ideas to ourselves, the ideas are converted into impressions -- ideas and impressions differing only in degree of force and vivacity. In this transition, nothing is lost thanks to the relations

of resemblance and contiguity which assist us in feeling the sympathy in its full perfection. A presupposition for the passion to be carried further in this case is that the object of our passion is connected with us by a double relation. A virtuous brother has a relation of ideas to myself: the passion, of which he is the object, by being agreeable, has a relation of impressions to pride.

As the ideas of our passions strike us with a greater vivacity than the ideas of the passions of other objects, we find it difficult to pass from ourselves to another object. It follows then that passions pass from the contiguous to the remote and from the great to the small more easily than vice versa while imagination follows the opposite route. This explains why we pass more easily from love and hatred to pride or humility than vice versa.

Where any two passions place the mind in similar dispositions, the one passes easily to the other. On the contrary, a difference in disposition makes the transition more difficult. This difference may also be the result of a variableness in degree. We experience more difficulty in passing from violent to weak hatred than from moderate love to moderate hatred. Therefore, one needs a considerable interval for the transition between the two. Ideas must bear some kind of relation to each other either by comparison or by the passions they produce. Unless they are united by some relation, the transition of ideas and of the

passions attending them becomes uneasy.

In Hume's system, there are two categories of passions: direct and indirect. Direct passions are the impressions which arise from good and evil most naturally and with the least preparation. These are: desire and aversion, despair, grief and joy, hope and fear, security. Indirect passions are such as proceed from the same principles but by the conjunction of other qualities. Under the latter, Hume lists: pride, humility, ambition, vanity, love, hatred, envy, pity, malice, generosity, and their dependants.

Desire and aversion are the same as love and hatred -- the latter having not only a cause and an object but an end as well which they try to attain:

The conjunction of this desire and aversion with love and hatred may be accounted for by two different hypotheses. The first is, that love and hatred have not only a cause, which excites them, viz. pleasure and pain; and an object, to which they are directed, viz. a person or thinking being; but likewise an end, which they endeavour to attain, viz. the happiness or misery of the person beloved or hated; all which views, mixing together, make only one passion. According to this system, love is nothing but the desire of happiness to another person, and hatred that of misery. The desire and aversion constitute the very nature of love and hatred. They are not only inseparable but the same. (12)

When an affection is infused by sympathy, it is firstly known by its external signs in countenance and

conversation. But the idea is quickly converted into an impression with such vivacity that it becomes the passion itself (The implications of this principle for acting theories are obvious). Impressions may be related to each other not only when their sensations resemble each other but also when their impulses and directions are similar. Pride and humility, for instance, have no direction, and, therefore, do not move us into action. This happens only with ideas that are attended with a certain appetite or desire such as love and hatred.

Passions depend upon principles that operate in certain degrees. Accordingly, a certain degree of poverty produces contempt; but a degree beyond causes compassion and good will. Variations in our judgement proceed from variations in our perception. However, as variation does not lie in the immediate impression of the object, it must lie in some other impression that accompanies it. There are two principles accounting for that: firstly, every part of an object has a separate emotion attending it; secondly, if an object is found by experience to be always accompanied by another, we always think of the second when the first appears (see also the Lockian association of ideas). This is the reason that only comparison between objects of the same species arouses, for example, envy.

Hume was convinced that passions are slow and restive contrary to imagination which is quick and agile. On

the definition of imagination depends in some ways the operation of passions. By imagination Hume means the capacity to create or evaluate by resorting to the stored experience, which ultimately constitutes one's knowledge. Therefore, even when a considerable length of time has elapsed after the mind has been affected with a passion, there is still a reminiscence of that passion in the mind. The mind is, thus, likened to a string instrument that still vibrates after the initial stroke:

Now if we consider the human mind, we shall find, that with regard to the passions, it is not of the nature of a wind-instrument of music, which in running over all the notes immediately loses the sound after the breath ceases; but rather resembles a string instrument, where after each stroke the vibrations still retain some sound, which gradually and insensibly decays. (13)

We observe that the hydraulic operation of the body has been now substituted for a more complicated one bearing an acoustical analogy. This notion is carried further in Harvey. The latter argued for an inherent capacity in the body to respond to external or internal stimuli in the form of some kind of fluid substance stored in the nerves. Nerves are seen as strings, solid bodies that vibrate. When the vibrations subside, they leave impressions of themselves, a tendency to fainter vibrations. These impressions represent the origin of simple ideas. They dispose the nervous system to similar vibrations. Passions are sequences of vibrations

structured by memory and association though reordered and intensified by imagination.

There is enough evidence to suggest that the Cartesian theory of passions found its application in the pulpit and stage rhetoric of the eighteenth century. The Cartesian influence was not always directly transferred to the English pulpit or acting. Apart from the Traité de l'Orateur, ou de la Prononciation et du Geste by Michel Le Faucheur, which was translated from French and edited twice within a period of twenty years or so, Le Brun, the French painter and theoretician, was the other channel through which the Cartesian conception of body was conveyed to the British. The parallel of painting became very convenient to the actor as the Cartesian system favoured the freezing of a player's postures for the return to the previous state, thus, creating a series of calculated tableaux. Interestingly, as Rogerson points out, Betterton was the first actor to detect the relationship between the acting-out of passions and French painting. (14)

It was mainly Aaron Hill who adapted the Cartesian interactive dualism to the English state of theatrical affairs. He probed such issues as whether the actor's emotion begins from the inside, mentally, and works its effect on the body or the performance of the bodily actions produces the feeling itself. Hill shared with Descartes the

mechanistic view that the player can experience the passions at the will's command. Here is, in an immediately recognizable form, Descartes's idea that the body operates efficiently under the supervision of its ghost. Hill's originality, however, lies in the way he applied this interactive dualism to the actor's means of expression, particularly, in the emphasis on the actor's inner affective and imaginative processes.

Hill discarded the use of external methods for evoking the passions; instead, he declared that a strong imagination can fix the idea of the passion in the mind and, thus, dispatch the animal spirits through the nerves to shape the facial muscles into the proper expression and throw the body into the right posture. In other words, Hill believed that the actor's willed image or idea of the passion exerts an actual physical pressure, which moves the spirits and muscles to conform. This facility Hill called the "plastic imagination". (15)

Hill insisted that "to act a passion well, the actor never must attempt its imitation, 'till the fancy has conceived so strong an image, or idea, of it, as to move the same impressive springs within his mind, which form that passion, when 'tis undesigned and natural". (16)

The exact procedure to be observed is summarized in the following extract:

1st, The imagination must conceive a strong idea of the passion.

2dly, But that idea cannot strongly be conceived, without impressing its own form upon the muscles of the face.

3dly, Nor can the look be muscularly stamp'd, without communicating, instantly, the same impression, to the muscles of the body.

4thly, The muscles of the body, (brac'd, or slack, as the idea was an active or a passive one) must, in their natural, and not to be avoided consequence, by impelling or retarding the flow of the animal spirits, transmit their own conceiv'd sensation, to the sound of the voice, and to the disposition of the gesture. (17)

Hill recommended a strictly linear pattern in the physical manifestation of the passion, insisting on the completion of the posture and facial expression before a sound could be produced:

But, still -- This caution, let the thinking Actor forever take care to remember -- That he is not to begin to utter, even so much as a single word, till he has first reflected on and felt the idea; and then adapted his look, and his nerves to express it. But as soon as this pathetic sensation has strongly and fully imprinted his fancy, let him, then -- and never a moment before -- attempt to give the Speech due utterance. -- So shall he always hit the right and touching sensibility of tone, and move his auditors, impressingly: whereas, should he, with an unfeeling volubility of cadence, hurry on from one overleap'd distinction to another, without due adaption of his look and muscles, to the meaning proper to the passion, he will never speak to hearts; nor move himself, nor any of his audience; beyond the simple and unanimating, verbal sense; without the spirit of the writer. (18)

Hill urged the actors to study the passions in order

that they should acquire mental images and reinforce their "ideal pathos". He recommended the use of prints and paintings to increase the actor's store of ideas -- not to copy but to suggest by association or, as Descartes put it, to influence the bodily emotions "indirectly through the representation of things which are usually united to the passions which we desire to have". (19)

At about the same time, similar advice was given to pulpit orators by John Henley, the most systematic exponent of elocution among the ecclesiastics:

In proper speaking and gesture, the nature of the thing spoken, strongly imprinted on the mind, and present feeling of the orator, is the only guidance. (20)

Initially, Hill defined six "capital dramatics", which were roughly equivalent to Descartes's primary passions: joy, sorrow, fear, scorn, anger, amazement. He also acknowledged the fact that numerous "auxiliary" passions such as jealousy, revenge, love and pity could be compounded from two or more of the "capitals". (21) Later on, Hill added up to the list of primary passions pity, hatred, love, and jealousy. In the "soft passions", such as love, the spirits allegedly flow through the nerves languidly. In a rage, they gush about turbulently whereas in the passive passions, such as fear and grief, the animal spirits reverse their outward flow and gather in the central organs causing pallor, languour, dejection, muscular

collapse and even paralysis of the extremities. (22) Hill had more or less paraphrased Descartes, and the following passage, describing the sudden evacuation of spirits from the limbs, exemplifies his approach:

But, in Astonishment, the recoil of the animal spirits, hurried back in two (sic) precipitate a motion, drive the blood upon the heart with such oppressive redundance, as, retarding circulation, almost stagnates the vital progression: and arresting the breath, eyes, gesture, and every power and faculty of the body, occasions an interruption of their several rules, that would bring an actual cessation -- but, that the reason, struggling slowly to relieve the apprehension, gives a kind of hesitative articulation to the utterance, and gradual motion and recovery to the Look, the Limbs, and the Countenance. (23)

I find Aaron Hill's suggestion that actors imagine external objects normally associated with the passion they want to express more in the line of seventeenth-century associationism as this was expounded in Hobbes and Locke. On the contrary, the principle of sympathy as used for the acting out of passions is an eighteenth-century development firstly resorted to by moral philosophers to support their system which relied on passions as motivators of action. The fragileness of the moral philosophers' system, which needed the support of reason to direct and control passions, is reflected in the acting theories of the eighteenth century.

On the one hand, stage critics would express their approval of a well-acted part by assuming that the actor had

totally identified with the character through sympathetic imagination. But on the other hand, the actor's practice of studying his part meticulously -- oftentimes with the help of history-paintings (24) -- disproved those assertions as the preparation of a part involved a great deal of observation and imitation. It is noteworthy that pulpit rhetoric had the same dependence upon philosophy and specified the same prerequisites for proper action. John Henley instructed his tutees that "the masters of musick and painting, are the true masters of speaking and action: the principles of both are to be taken from philosophy, that is, a just, clear, distinct sense of the nature of things in general; and in particular, from the mathematics". (25)

If passions got out of hand, control over the body was lost. The power of the mind over the body was not new to the eighteenth century; it had been a well-known doctrine since the ancient times. An actor had to experience the passions he enacted but he was only held in esteem if he was capable of keeping his bodily powers in check. Gildon seconded this view when he said that "tho the passions are very beautiful in their proper gestures, yet they ought never to be so extravagantly immoderate, as to transport the speaker out of himself ... (into) madness". (26) To provide against this kind of madness, Gildon urged actors to improvise in front of a mirror:

For want of such a glass there is but a

more difficult thing to be apply'd to, and that is some friend, who is a perfect master in all the beauties of gesture and motion, and can correct your errors, as you perform before him, and point out those graces, which wou'd render your action completely charming. (27)

By the time John Hill formulated his theory on acting -- largely, a development of Pierre Remond de Sainte-Albine's Le Comédien -- the body had ceased to be seen as a hydraulic system with spurts of fluid being sent off into different directions. Instead, the parallel of a string instrument had been established. The ability of the organs to register an external impression and to move in response to the intensity of that impression was called "sensibility". If an actor's body has an innate capacity for responsiveness, and if his soul is a function of his physical organization, then the way the actor embodies emotion is different from the models imposed by the mechanistic physiology of Descartes.

Apart from sensibility, Sainte-Albine maintained that an actor should also possess some other attributes such as understanding, fire, and figure. John Hill retained all of Sainte-Albine's categories. In terms familiar to the physiologists of the period, he accounted for the capacity of an actor for a specific role by the variegated responsiveness of the nerves:

In those characters where rage prevails, Mr. Garrick, who is as naturally violent as Mrs. Cibber is melancholy, finds it

very difficult to make the transition from anger to sorrow, as may be seen in several parts of Jaffeir: and in the same manner, Mr. Barry, whose natural tendency is to elegant distress, finds it as hard to pass from that to anger in some parts of the same character. (28)

In John Hill's theory of acting, philosophy, or, in other words, understanding, functions as the safety valve for feeling:

It has been supposed by some, that this sensibility depended upon the understanding; and that the degree of the one was always proportioned to that of the other; but nothing can be a greater error. We find people of both sexes who have very little of this sensibility. Nay, perhaps, the greatest understandings of all are most exempt from it. It is in reality, no other than giving way to the passions; and philosophy would teach us to get the better of it; or, at least, to disguise the sensation. The soft passions are concerned in it in the greatest degree; and we know the weakest minds are often the most affected by these. But what we wish him to comprehend, the most perfectly imaginable, what is intended by the author; and from this conception we wish him to derive that sensibility, thro' which it is to be conveyed to us. (29)

In spite of the significant role calculation is implied to hold in John Hill's definition, copying predecessors comes under his attack. He makes a clear distinction between imitation and understanding, which is useful to keep in mind while examining eighteenth-century stage theories:

It will be said, that imitation will supply the place of understanding. Too many players are of this opinion; but it is

setting their profession very low, it is reducing that to a mechanical part which was intended to exert all the force of genius; but as it is contemptible, it is also imperfect. (30)

So far I have highlighted the aspects of philosophy that helped develop pulpit and stage rhetoric in the eighteenth century. Besides, a closer link has been established between the two disciplines through the various references to philosophy as a substantial guide to an orator/actor's action in acting treatises and pulpit oratory manuals. I have purposely not elaborated on Locke's theory as the latter's contribution to a theory of passions was minimal. In the next few pages, I intend to bring out all the relevant background in Tristram Shandy suggesting that Sterne was not only acquainted with acting techniques but also aware of the philosophical basis on which acting theories were built.

Characteristically, Tristram Shandy opens with a remark about the animal spirits that could have well been taken out of Descartes though it seems more likely that it was borrowed from some treatise or other which used Descartes's system as the basis of an acting theory. Of course, many critics have read the idea of heredity between Sterne's lines, but, in my view, the key concept is contained in the last few sentences of the relevant passage. Those implicate the associationism on which Descartes

elaborated, namely, the link between an object and special pores in the brain which have retained the relevant information:

... away they (the animal spirits) go clattering like hey-go-mad; and by treading the same steps over and over again, they presently make a road of it, as plain and as smooth as a garden-walk, which, when they are once used to, the Devil himself sometimes shall not be able to drive them off it.

I, 1 (p.35)

The physiological procedures of an image causing physical reactions, which Sterne describes, are very similar to the Cartesian ones though the phrasing points to Aaron Hill (One should bear in mind the Cartesian influence on Aaron Hill):

... this identical bowling-green instantly presented itself, and became curiously painted, all at once, upon the retina of my uncle Toby's fancy; -- which was the physical cause of making him change colour, or at least of heightening his blush to that immoderate degree I spoke of.

II, 5 (p.118)

One of the main consequences of the above theoretical assumption in Descartes, and, by extension, in Aaron Hill, is the primacy of sight as against the other senses. The communication of sight with imagination as dealt with in Tristram Shandy bears a striking similarity to that found in acting treatises. The context in which Sterne discusses this relationship -- that is, Corporal Trim's action while delivering a speech -- points to its connection

with acting rather than to a purely philosophical attitude:

I said, "we were not stocks and stones" -- 'tis very well. I should have added, nor are we angels, I wish we were, -- but men cloathed with bodies, and governed by our imaginations; -- and what a junketting piece of work of it there is, betwixt these and our seven senses, especially some of them, for my own part, I own it, I am ashamed to confess. Let it suffice to affirm, that of all the senses, the eye (for I absolutely deny the touch, though most of your Barbati, I know, are for it) has the quickest commerce with the soul, -- gives a smarter stroke, and leaves something more inexpressible upon the fancy, than words can either convey -- or sometimes get rid of.

V, 7 (p.356)

It is quite obvious that Sterne had in mind the importance of sight for the stage when, on another occasion, he describes Widow Wadman's look through an allusion to the spurting fire of Garrick's:

-- In vain! for by all the powers which animate the organ -- widow Wadman's left eye shines this moment as lucid as her right -- there is neither mote, or sand, or dust, or chaff, or speck, or particle of opake matter floating in it -- There is nothing, my dear paternal uncle! but one lambent delicious fire, furtively shooting out from every part of it, in all directions, into thine.

VIII, 24 (p.551)

The seat of the soul was a pivotal subject both in philosophy and acting theory of the eighteenth century. Sterne appears to have been equally concerned about this matter and to have indirectly positioned himself on the Cartesian side. Although the narrator of Tristram Shandy

examines and eliminates, in an off-hand manner, the Cartesian doctrine about the seat of the soul and its functions as well as the views of Borri, the Milanese physician, what he describes as the least objectionable account, attributed to Dutch anatomists, does not significantly deviate from the Cartesian point of view as this was interpreted in eighteenth-century treatises on acting. According to the latter, in particular Aaron Hill's work, the soul is the spot on which all nerves connected to the organs of senses terminate, thus, transmitting all relevant impressions and mobilizing the mechanisms which cause the physical reactions to each stimulus.

Now, from the best accounts he had been able to get of this matter, he was satisfied it could not be where Des Cartes had fixed it, upon the top of the pineal gland of the brain; which, as he philosophized, formed a cushion for her about the size of a marrow pea; though, to speak the truth, as so many nerves did terminate all in that one place, -- 'twas no bad conjecture;

... What, therefore, seemed the least liable to objections of any, was, that the chief sensorium, or headquarters of the soul, and to which place all intelligences were referred, and from whence all her mandates were issued, -- was in, or near, the cerebellum, -- or rather somewhere about the medulla oblongata, wherein it was generally agreed by Dutch anatomists, that all the minute nerves from all the organs of the seven senses concentered, like streets and winding alleys, into a square.

II, 19 (pp. 162,163)

The theory of passions was central for the stage,

and it seems that Sterne attributed the same importance to it in Tristram Shandy (more will be said in the last chapter). Sterne accepted, if in a facetious manner, the Cartesian concept of the imagination being able to push blood and animal spirits into one direction and excite a certain passion:

... but that the size and jollity of every individual nose, and by which one nose ranks above another, and bears a higher price, is owing to the cartilaginous and muscular parts of it, into whose ducts and sinuses the blood and animal spirits being impelled, and driven by the warmth and force of the imagination.

III, 38 (p.238)

The route via which the animal spirits and more subtle juices are carried from the heart to the head to excite a passion is for Sterne, as for Descartes, the nerves:

No body, but he who has felt it, can conceive what a plaguing thing it is to have a man's mind torn asunder by two projects of equal strength, both obstinately pulling in a contrary direction at the same time: For to say nothing of havoc, which by a certain consequence is unavoidably made by it all over the finer system of the nerves, which you know convey the animal spirits and more subtle juices from the heart to the head, and so on.

IV, 31 (p. 331)

The ability to retain control over one's passions is a prerequisite for players in the eighteenth century, and it originally stems from Descartes. Sterne acknowledges this necessity:

True Shandeism, think what you will against it, opens the heart and lungs, and like all

those affections which partake of its nature, it forces the blood and other vital fluids of the body to run freely through its channels, and makes the wheel of life run long and cheerfully round.

Was I left, like Sancho Pança, to choose my kingdom, it should not be maritime -- or a kingdom of blacks to make a penny of it -- no, it should be a kingdom of hearty laughing subjects: And as the bilious and more saturnine passions, by creating disorders in the blood and humours, have as bad an influence, I see, upon the body politic as body natural -- and as nothing but a habit of virtue can fully govern those passions, and subject them to reason -- I should add to my prayer -- that God would give my subjects grace to be as wise as they were merry; and then should I be the happiest monarch, and they the happiest people under heaven --

IV, 32 (p. 333)

The lack of the ability to harness one's passions is evident in Toby's reactions. A succinct account of the eighteenth-century principle of joining reason and feeling in a perfect union to save oneself from the inordinacies of a one-sided givenness to emotion is provided on the occasion of Uncle Toby's fretful behaviour:

When a man gives himself to the government of a ruling passion, -- or, in other words, when his hobby-horse grows headstrong, -- farewell cool reason and fair discretion.

II, 5 (p.113)

The harmful effects of submitting oneself -- willingly or not -- to the influence of a certain passion had been stressed by eighteenth-century physicians with regard to players, and are repeated in Tristram Shandy in a similar vein:

Alas! 'twill exasperate thy symptoms, --
 check thy perspirations, -- evaporate thy
 spirits, -- waste thy animal strength, --
 dry up thy radical moisture, -- bring thee
 into a costive habit of body, impair thy
 health, -- and hasten all the infirmities
 of thy old age. -- O my uncle! my uncle
 Toby!

II, 3 (p. 111)

The antidote for such pernicious practice is the cold phlegm which regulates sense and humours and which is mentioned as totally lacking in Yorick.

In several cases, Sterne uses the Cartesian idea of blood and spirits flowing from and to the heart as this was adapted by Aaron Hill to apply to the stage. He also reinforces the popular opinion that violent emotions result when the blood and animal spirits are driven from the heart to the head:

He was very sensible that all political writers upon the subject had unanimously agreed and lamented, from the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign down to his own time, that the current of men and money towards the metropolis, upon one frivolous errand or another, -- set in so strong, -- as to become dangerous to our civil rights, -- though, by the bye, -- a current was not the image he took most delight in, -- a distemper was here his favourite metaphor, and he would run it down into a perfect allegory, by maintaining it was identically the same in the body national as in the body natural, where the blood and spirits were driven up into the head faster than they could find their ways down; -- a stoppage of circulation must ensue, which was death in both cases.

I, 18 (p.73)

Many a time in Tristram Shandy, gestures are broken down to their physiological components in a non-casual way

involving the Cartesian philosophy as adjusted to the stage by Aaron Hill. The following passage, which describes Walter's violent reactions to Toby's preoccupation with military affairs, can compare to Aaron Hill's account of physical changes while experiencing the passion of rage (see p. 51 of this chapter) :

Any man, Madam, reasoning upwards, and observing the prodigious suffusion of blood in my father's countenance, -- by means of which, (as all the blood in his body seemed to rush into his face, as I told you) he must have redcened, pictorically and scientintically speaking, six whole tints and a half, if not a full octave above his natural colours: -- any man, Madam, but my uncle Toby, who had observed this, together with the violent knitting of my father's brows, and the extravagant contortion of his body during the whole affair, -- would have concluded my father in a rage.

III, 5 (p. 175)

The above passage is not the only example of the influence of stage theory on Sterne. There are various instances to the same effect. Laughter entails the activation of certain muscles according to Descartes, and Sterne along with Aaron Hill seems to endorse the same position in Tristram Shandy :

... 'tis wrote, an' please your worships, against the spleen; in order, by a more frequent and a more convulsive elevation and depression of the diaphragm, and the succussions of the intercostal and abdominal muscles in laughter, to drive the gall and other bitter juices from the gall-bladder, liver, and sweetbread of his majesty's subjects, with all the inimicitious passions which belong to them, down into their duodenums.

IV, 22 (p. 299)

In the preceding pages, I have attempted to pinpoint the links between the long philosophical dissertations and the meticulous accounts of gesture in Tristram Shandy in order to draw the reader's attention to the stage influence on Sterne, which has been inadequately examined so far. The extension of these theoretical considerations will be seen in the final chapter after I have delved into contemporary theatrical practice. Nevertheless, it seemed necessary to establish the philosophical background of Tristram Shandy that relates to the stage so that the references or allusions to contemporary play performances or to individual acting techniques should be placed on a theoretical basis.

Notes to Chapter Two

1. René Descartes, The Passions of the Soul, in The Philosophical Writings of Descartes, translated by John Cottingham, Robert Stoothoff and Dugald Murdoch, 2 vols (Cambridge, 1985), i, 363.
2. Joseph Roach, The Player's Passion (Newark, 1985), pp. 64-65.
3. Descartes, p. 368.
4. George Cheyne, The English Malady ; or, a Treatise of Nervous Diseases of all kinds (London and Dublin, 1733), p.49.
5. Roach, p. 65.
6. The Galenic-Renaissance physiology of the passions seconded the Aristotelian view that the "image" in the soul serves as the prime activator of bodily response. Following the theory of eloquence behind Quintilian's "visiones", rhetoricians and physicians alike believed that the animal spirits can amplify an exciting impulse through the body, stirring the humours up, whether the object is actually present to the senses, remembered, or imagined. In each case, they believed, joy will heat the spirits and radiate them to the peripheries while fear will collapse them back upon the heart -- in the presence of a lover or merely in the contemplation of her, in the grasp of a bear or merely in his neck of the woods.

Roach, pp. 40-41.
7. Thomas Hobbes, Leviathan, edited by C.B. Macpherson, originally published in 1651 (Harmondsworth, 1968),

- p.122.
8. John Locke, An Essay Concerning Human Understanding edited by A.D. Woodzley, originally published in 1690 (London and Glasgow, 1964), p. 184 .
 9. Anthony, Earl of Shaftesbury, Characteristics of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times, edited by John M. Robertson originally published in 1711 (New York, 1964), p. 300.
 10. David Hume, A Treatise of Human Nature, edited by Páll S. Ardal, originally published in 1739, 2 vols (London and Glasgow, 1962), ii, 175.
 11. Ibid., ii, 111.
 12. Ibid., ii, 115.
 13. Ibid., ii, 178.
 14. Most commentators on the acting-out of passions said little of the relation between their theories and the normalized expression of the French academic painter, but Betterton (or his compilers) perceived the likeness of their aims.

Brewster Rogerson, "The Art of Painting the Passions", Journal of the History of Ideas, 14 (1953), 68-94 (p.78).
 15. Aaron Hill and William Popple, The Prompter: A Theatrical Paper (1734-36), edited by William W. Appleton and Kalman A. Burnim (New York, 1968), p. 85.
 16. Aaron Hill, The Works, 4 vols (London, 1753), iv, 355.
 17. Ibid., iv, 356.
 18. Ibid., iv, 366-67.

19. Descartes, i, 345.
20. John Henley, The Appeal of the Oratory to the First Ages of Christianity (London, 1727), p. 17.
21. The Prompter, p. 84.
22. Ibid., p. 141.
23. Aaron Hill, The Works, iv, 384.
24. Both the author of the Traitté and Charles Gildon urged upon the actor the study of history-painting as a supplementary method of familiarizing himself with his part. An extract from Gildon shows how this could be effected:

If therefore a player was acquainted with the character of his hero, so far as to have an account of his features and looks; or of any one living of the same character, he would not only vary his face so much by that means, as to appear quite another face; by raising, or falling, contracting, or extending the brows; giving a brisk or sullen, sprightly or heavy turn to his eyes; sharpening or swelling his nostrils, and the various positions of his mouth, which by practice would grow familiar, and wonderfully improve the art of acting, and raise the noble Diversion to greater esteem. The studying history-painting would be very useful on this occasion, because the knowledge of the figure and lineaments of the represented (and in history-pieces almost all who are represented are to be found) will teach the actor to vary and change his figure, which would make him not always the same, as I have said, in all parts, but his very countenance so chang'd, that they would not only have other thoughts themselves but raise them in the audience.

Charles Gildon, The Life of Mr Thomas Betterton (London,

- 1710), pp. 62-63.
25. Henley, p. 17.
 26. Gildon, p.86.
 27. Ibid., p. 55.
 28. John Hill, The Actor; or, A Treatise on the Art of Playing (London, 1745), p. 65.
 29. Ibid., pp. 51-52.
 30. Ibid., p. 21.

CHAPTER THREE

PULPIT ORATORY AND EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY STAGE THEORY

The purpose of the present chapter is to bring into focus the various influences Sterne received in the compositions of his sermons. Questions of style will be dealt with in the first section while in the second one I shall examine pulpit oratory and its relationship with the stage at the end of the seventeenth and in the first half of the eighteenth century. My intention is to establish the thesis that Sterne's sermons, unlike those of other contemporary preachers, shared a good deal with the theatre of the period. This will lead me on to show in the last chapter how important the contribution of the combined influence of pulpit and stage was in writing Tristram Shandy.

Before 1660 sermons were written in figurative language, quoted freely from the classics and tended to pictorialize their material so as to make a strong impression on the minds of the audience. As a reaction to this and in agreement with the rational spirit of the period after 1660, a new style of sermon-writing developed. The florid language and histrionic manner of speaking, typical of the first half of the seventeenth century, were now discarded as being associated with Catholic fanaticism.

Sermons began to be organized in logical units and excluded any appeal to the visualising abilities of the audience.

The majority of the clergy in the last few decades of the seventeenth century strictly conformed to the normative views espoused and advanced for general acceptance mainly by Sprat and the other ecclesiastical controversialists of that period. In his exposition of the problems arising from figurative language, Sprat makes out two main reasons for being opposed to it: firstly, it engages the passions and, secondly, it inhibits the acquisition of knowledge. (1) (Religion could be learnt; not revealed.) The remedy which Sprat recommends is "... to reject all the amplifications, digressions, and swellings of style; to return back to the primitive purity and shortness, when Men deliver'd so many things, almost in an equal number of words ... bringing all things as near the mathematical plainness as they can; and preferring the language of artizans, countrymen, and merchants, before that of wits or scholars." (2)

Simon Patrick blamed the use of metaphor in sermons for people's ignorance and the violation of religious rules. A year later, John Eachard was as scathing about metaphorical language as Patrick before. Interestingly, he resorts to the Roman orators Tully and Coesar to show how inappropriate metaphors are in sermons. The extract that follows is representative not only of the criticism directed

at the elaborate style but also of the kind of metaphor commonly used before the advent of the scientific style: (3)

Metaphors, though very apt and allowable, are intelligible but to some sorts of men, of this or that kind of life, of this or that profession: for example: perhaps one gentleman's metaphorical knack of preaching comes of the sea: and then we shall hear of nothing but star-board and lar-board, of stems, sterns, and forecastles, and such like salt-water language: so that one had need take a voyage to Smyrna or Aleppo, and very warily attend to all the saylers terms, before I shall in the least understand my teacher. Now, although such a sermon may possibly do some good in a coast-town, yet upward into the country in an inland-parish, it will do no more than Syriack or Arabick. Another he falls a fighting with his text, and makes a pitch'd battel of it, dividing it into the right-wing and left-wing, then he reads it, flanks it, intrenches it, storms it, then he musters all again, to see what word was lost, or lam'd in the skirmish; and so falling on again with fresh valour, he fights backward and forward, charges through and through, routs, kills, takes, and then, Gentlemen, "as you were". (4)

Some line must be drawn between sermons written under the influence of the scientific approach and those written at the turn of the eighteenth century and during the first half of it. A considerable degree of permeation of the latter by the former must be, however, allowed. An encapsulation of the scientific style is included in Gilbert Burnet's Discourse of the Pastoral Care. (5) Burnet's instructions concerning style are prescriptive to the point of recommending such short sentences as to contain no more

than one thought:

The shorter sermons are, they are generally both better heard, and better rememb(e)red. The custom of an hour's length, forces many preachers to trifle away much of the time, and to spin out their matter, so as to hold out. So great a length does also flat the hearers, and tempt them to sleep; especially when, as is usual, the first part of the sermon is languid and heavy: in half an hour a man may lay open his matter in its full extent, and cut off those superfluties which come in only to lengthen the discourse: and he may hope to keep up the attention of his people all the while. As to the stile, sermons ought to be very plain; the figures must be easy, not mean, but noble, and brought in upon design to make the matter better understood. The words in a sermon must be simple, and in common use; not savouring of the schools, nor above the understanding of the people. All long periods, such as carry two or three different thoughts in them, must be avoided; for few hearers can follow or apprehend these: niceties of stile are lost before a common auditory.
(6)

Sermons were divided into three parts in accordance with the classical rules: the explanatory part, the composition, and the applicatory part. In the applicatory part only is the preacher allowed to use "eloquence", which, in Burnet's definition, has nothing to do with action or voice, it means the illustration of one's precepts:

But in the applicatory part, if he (the preacher) has a true taste of eloquence, and is a master at it, he is to employ it all in giving sometimes such tender touches, as may soften; and deeper gashes, such as may awaken his hearers. A vain eloquence here, is very ill plac'd, for if that can be born any where, it is in illustrating the matter: but all must be

grave where one would persuade: the most natural but the most sensible expressions come in best here. Such an eloquence as makes the hearers look grave, and as it were out of countenance, is the properest. That which makes them look lively, and as it were smile upon one another, may be pretty, but it only tickles the imagination, and pleases the ear; whereas that which goes to the heart, and wounds it, makes the hearer rather look down, and turns his thoughts inward upon himself. (7)

The most prominent feature of the scientific style is a process of abstraction, a tendency to reduce everything to abstract concepts and work with them throughout a sermon, the most notable exemplar being Benjamin Hoadley. This method dispenses with any kind of illustrative explanation which would require the use of metaphor. In one of his sermons, Hoadley sets off to show why "self" and "public spirit" are inextricably connected so that the welfare of the one presupposes the well-being of the other. The following passage from this sermon is typical of the process I described above:

So that, if you only consider yourselves as "members" of "Human Society", you have the strongest motive, which honour, and reason, and equity, can suggest; that is, the motive taken from the bonds, and engagements, you have brought yourselves under; to perform, on your part, what in reason you may expect from others in the same circumstances; and what is agreeable and answerable to the privileges and protection you think yourselves entitles to, from the "Body Politick". (8)

Part and parcel of this abstract method was the use of logical arguments equivalent to mathematical equations in

order to prove a point:

So that the difference between true religion and superstition, seems to be this; that the former is the argument of the judgement and understanding, ... and the latter is the result of uncontrolled passion. ... We may therefore, as we pass, observe that superstition, in some respects, is that to religion, which, in common life, the flattery of a false tongue is, to the sincerity of conversation and friendship. Flattery takes the place, and often the very air and mien, of sincere profession. It puts itself instead of friendship; and hopes to be taken for it. It is made up of pleasing sounds, and expressions and the appearance is of something good. (9)

It is of particular interest to notice how everything in Tillotson's sermons is rationalized and brought into the realm of the practical. It strikes me that in all these sermons there is a utilitarian taint which is not the case at all in late eighteenth-century sermons. The following argument, for instance, would have seemed out of place in a sermon about "a holy and virtuous life":

A religious and virtuous course of life doth naturally tend to the prolonging of our days, and hath very frequently the blessing of health and long life attending upon it. The practice of a great many virtues is a great preservative of life and health, as the due government of our appetites and passions by temperance and chastity and meekness, which prevent the chief causes from within of bodily diseases and distempers. (10)

Even when an appeal to the heart is most appropriate, Tillotson resorts to this utilitarian kind of argument

relying on the absolute trust of reason rather than feeling:

It is an argument of a great, and noble, and generous mind, to extend our thoughts and cares to the concernments of others, and to employ our interest, and power, and endeavours for their benefit and advantage; whereas a low, and mean and narrow spirit is contracted and shrivelled up within itself, and cares only for its own things, without any regard to the good and happiness of others. It is the most noble work in the world; because that inclination of mind, which prompts us to do good, is the very temper and disposition of happiness. (11)

Even pleasure exists in the mind only and not in the senses for Tillotson:

We shall reap the pleasure and satisfaction of it in our own minds; and there is no sensual pleasure that is comparable to the delight of doing good. (12)

Frequently, there is a contrast between quotations from the scriptures and the main text of the sermon due to the lack of descriptive detail or metaphor in the latter and their abundant use in the former:

But there is no where the least intimation given, either by our Saviour or his Apostles, that obedience to the precepts of the Gospel (which are in substance the moral law cleared and perfected) is not necessary to our acceptance with God, and the obtaining of eternal life; but on the contrary, 'tis our Saviour's express direction to the young man, who ask'd, "what good things he should do, that he might obtain eternal life? If thou wilt (says he) enter into life, keep the commandments": and that he might understand what commandments he meant, he instanceth in the precepts of the moral law. And indeed, the whole tenor of our Saviour's sermons, and the precepts and writings of

the Apostles, are full and express to this purpose. "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven: but he that doth the will of my Father which is in heaven, whosoever heareth these sayings of mine" (that is, these precepts which I have delivered) "and doth them not, I will liken him to a foolish man, who built his house upon the sand; and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house, and it fell, and great was the fall of it. If ye know these things, happy are ye, if ye do them. (13)

As far as structure is concerned, "scientifically" conceived sermons are divided into logical units the headings of which are given in the beginning in a way of laying out the skeleton of the sermon: Wesley's sermon under the title "Justification by Faith" is divided into the following parts:

I. What is the general ground of this whole doctrine of justification; II. What justification is; III. Who they are that are justified; and IV. On what terms they are justified. (14)

This kind of exposition is preceded as in others and, in particular, Tillotson, by definitions of the terms contained in the saying on which he elaborates. Wesley's definition of "evil-speaking", for instance, is reminiscent of Tillotson's (15) in that it is matter-of-fact and purely informational:

For evil-speaking is neither more nor less than speaking evil of an absent person; relating something evil, which was really done or said by one that is not present when it is related. Suppose, having seen a man drunk, or heard him curse or swear, I

tell this when he is absent; it is evil-speaking. In our language this is also, by an extremely proper name, termed "backbiting". Nor is there any material difference between this and what we usually style "tale-bearing". If the tale be delivered in a soft and quiet manner (perhaps with expressions of good-will to the person and of hope that things may not be quite so bad), then we call it "whispering". (16)

Wesley's general treatment of the subject of "evil-speaking" is similar to Tillotson's. They both define the term first and offer the same suggestions about avoiding "back-biting".

In spite of the general observance of the rules of simplicity and order in the sermons of the last few decades of the seventeenth century, the stylistic vestiges of the immediately preceding period had not totally eclipsed. Simon Patrick is very interesting in this aspect since, as I have already pointed out, he made conscious efforts to transform his early style of writing into a simpler one. This survival of the old style can be verified in several sermons. Metaphor, the figure of speech which was most vehemently banned from the sermons of Tillotson and Wesley, still forms part of Patrick's style. In the following passage, Patrick's metaphors, even though they could have been borrowed from the Bible, are integrated and homogenized in Patrick's own style:

Even so we, ... carrying about with us always our inbred passions and domestic affections, are every where tossed by them, and live in the like tumult; finding no quiet nor rest to our selves, till these be

cast out and discharged. To this we must apply our care; and when we have once purged our selves of them, let the affairs of the world be never so tempestuous, and work like the sea in a great storm; we shall not be so sick and ill at ease, as we used to be even in a more calm and peaceable condition. (17)

The above passage would have probably qualified for Patrick's own criticism in his Friendly Debate. In addition to the use of metaphor and contrary to the method of abstraction of the other preachers, Patrick renders his concepts concrete by illustration and pictorialization or by the invention of props:

What thing is it that you can call necessary, which you do not call necessary, which you do not at this time possess? You do not need a thousand pound; that's but a fancy. Nor do you need a great many sorts of meats at your table; that's another extravagance. There is no absolute need of so much as of a pewter-dish, much less of more costly charges, and silver cups; that is but the like dream. Awake yourselves: shake your souls a little, and stir up your thoughts: you will find a man may live, and be a man, and all that he should be, without any of these. (18)

William Dunlop's sermons can be said to belong to the decisive transition period of the first two decades of the eighteenth century, and, therefore, indicative of the changes taking place. His elaborate metaphors help create some pictorial effects not very common in other preachers:

Yet take a prospect of that awful hour, when the glory of infinite purity, that shall clothe thy judge, will then so brightly reflect the eternal shame and disgrace of sin, that every eye of all that

general assembly of beings shall behold them; when all these base lusts, these vile and hateful vermin that have inhabited thy breast, will come crawling forth, and be set in all their wretchedness and naked pollutions in the brightness of the divine countenance: with what confusion and agony wilt thou then look at this abominable monster, that now is so foolishly entertained by thee? In a word, sin will then appear exceeding sinful, and, how fair soever its charms and pleasures now seem to bewitch men, yet they are hated by the perfectedest love, and disapproved and contemned by unerring wisdom that never fails in judgement. (19)

The "scene" metaphor making its appearance in Dunlop's sermons was scarcely ever met before, and I suggest that the stage parallel, which was then growing stronger, can account for this:

- a) And now, what a horrid scene opens to our view? (20)
- b) Now if we consider what was necessary to repair the divine honour stained by sin, and to prevent disorder in the world, which seemed to have happened by the salvation of sinners, what a glorious incomprehensible scene of grace is opened to us? (21)

Eighteenth-century sermons vary according to the degree of absence of the characteristics of the preceding period. Not all of those were dropped simultaneously. For instance, although John Butler, preaching at the same time as Sterne, had done away with the clear-cut specifications of the parts of his discourse, his style is reminiscent of Tillotson or Sprat in that it is primarily argumentative rather than illustrative and castigates passions with the

same zest that it recommends reason. Newton follows the clear exposition of the main parts of his discourse, but falls back on the pictorial element, and uses, in common with Sterne, the technique of recreating a scene mentally in order to affect his audience:

If therefore, there be any consolation in Christ, if any comfort of love, if any fellowship of the spirit, if any bowels of mercies, fulfil ye the joy of this glad solemnity, by showing a compassionate and merciful regard to these afflicted mourners. Let your generous pity descend upon them as the dew of heaven, even as the drops that water the parched earth. (22)

It is interesting to note that as soon as sermons began to be built on character and scene, the parallel of painting was brought in. This novelty was closely related to the changes in the mode of sermon delivery as painting helped preachers to reconstruct scenes, postures, and gestures when their own resources failed them. In fact, painting sometimes served as a cover-up parallel for a comparison with the stage. (23)

The differences in style within the same period become easier to recognize when we compare sermons of different preachers on the same subject. John Green's method, in his sermon on the duties of the preacher, (24) is demonstrably based on the scientific approach of the preceding period whereas Ashton's treatment of the same subject (25) bears out the elements of the elaborate style of the eighteenth century. Green's sermon is divided into

three sections the topics of which are given at the beginning (p. 5). Green resorts to the utilitarian doctrine of the welfare of the whole as a motive for good performance, (p. 4) while Ashton refers to the "ruling passion" and "zeal" (p. 10). Contrary to Ashton's recommended eloquence, Green's reference to the "figurative representations" of the Scriptures in a cautious -- not to say, indirectly dismissing -- way:

The duties of our ministerial function are set forth in Scripture under a number of different analogies; in some it is described with high titles and characters of dignity; in others it has a reference to the more ordinary occupations of human life; but all those figurative representations of it are such as require some work to be performed, and make labour and industry necessary for the performance of it. If we are sometimes called "stewards of Christ's" spiritual "household"; the nature of this trust sufficiently shews, "it is required for stewards that a man be found faithful;" and he will hardly deserve that praise, who is not both honest and industrious in the management of this delegated power, who does not exercise a constant and careful inspection over every part of his domestic province. If we are stiled "shepherds", entrusted to "watch and to feed" the flock of our Master; however this employment, by a change of times and customs, may have varied from its original design, or the term been debased by an accommodation to modern ideas, yet in the simplicity of antient days, and when this allusive language was well understood, it was always a trust of some consequence, often of great difficulty and danger. (26)

Sterne diverged from all these preachers he read,

admired or even plagiarized. He may have borrowed from them, but he transformed their ideas in his own personal manner of expression. The appeal to the reasoning capacities of the audience, the clarity of meaning, and the simplicity of style devoid of any figures of speech, which were the distinctive features of preaching before and in Sterne's time, were displaced in Sterne's sermons. As Hammond observes, Sterne's sermons were "entirely freed from the capital letters and Roman numerals, anticipating paragraphs and lengthy recapitulations, footnotes and documentary proofs, which so frequently encumbered the weightier, more argumentative and certainly more profound disquisitions of the period". (27)

All in all, Sterne's approach was sentimental and evinced some influence from the drama of his day. (28) His sermons share with sentimental drama the prolonged and repeated scenes of anguish: (29) Job's sufferings, the plight of the widow of Zarephath, the dreadful state of the fallen traveller in the parable of the Good Samaritan, the troubles of Jacob, the sorrow of the mothers of the innocents slaughtered by Herod, the pains suffered by the victims of the inquisition, the miseries of old age, death and hell. I shall cite a passage from the description of the massacre of the innocent children, which was initiated by the cruel Herod, to illustrate my point:

Every Bethlehemitish mother involved in

this calamity, beholding it with hopeless sorrow -- gave vent to it -- each one bewailing her children, and lamenting the hardness of their lot, with the anguish of a heart as incapable of consolation, as they were of redress. Monster! -- could no consideration of all this sorrow, stay thy hand? -- Could no reflection upon so much bitter lamentation, throughout the coasts of Bethlehem, interpose and please in behalf of so many wretched objects, as this tragedy would make? -- Was there no way open to ambition but that thou must trample upon the affections of nature? Could no pity for the innocence of childhood? -- no sympathy for the yearnings of parental love, incline thee to some other measure, for thy security -- but thou must pitilessly rush in -- take the victim by violence -- tear it from the embraces of the mother -- offer it up before her eyes -- leave her disconsolate forever -- brokenhearted with a loss so affecting in itself -- so circumstanced with horror, that no time, how friendly so ever to the mournful -- should ever be able to wear out the impression? (30)

The above passage is filled with the kind of language that is rife in sentimental plays ("sorrow", "bewailing", "lamenting", "hardness", "anguish", "bitter lamentation", "wretched", "sympathy", "pitilessly", "disconsolate", "mournful") and competes with contemporary drama in the flow of water from tears.

Hammond never acknowledges the kind of transformation other preachers' texts undergo by Sterne's pen. The following two passages from Richard Bentley and Sterne are offered as an example of plagiarism in the appendix of Hammond's book. And yet, a sentimental turn of phrase and some expostulations in Sterne's sermon make all the

difference between the original and the "plagiarized" passage:

This stretch, that strangulation, is the utmost nature can bear, the least addition will overpower it; This posture keeps the weary soul hanging upon the lip, ready to leave the carcass, and yet not suffered to take its wing.

Observe the last movement of that horrid engine, -- What convulsions it has thrown him into. Consider the nature of the posture in which he now lies stretch'd. -- What exquisite torture he endures by it. -- 'Tis all nature can bear. -- Good God! see how it keeps his weary soul hanging upon his trembling lips willing to take its leave, -- but not suffered to depart. Behold the unhappy wretch led back to his cell, -- dragg'd out of it again to meet the flames. (31)

Sterne uses the parallel of the engine to describe the movement of the body. This kind of parallel was often found in manuals of rhetoric and acting as I have already mentioned in Chapter Two. Besides, the detailed description of posture and movement or, generally speaking, the exact physiological manifestation of a passion in the above text is a distinctive element of his style not only in the sermons but also in Tristram Shandy and is clearly related to contemporary theories of acting and rhetoric.

Contrary to Tillotson's plain style, Sterne resorted to metaphor in order to render his meaning forceful whereas Wesley and those who copied Tillotson insisted on the purist one-to-one equivalence between signified and signifying.

Sterne's definition of "evil-speaking", for instance, can hardly compare to that of Tillotson or Wesley. The latter's definition is simply informative and, in this sense, reminiscent of Tillotson's:

For evil-speaking is neither more nor less than speaking evil of an absent person; relating something evil, which was really done or said by one that is not present when it is related. Suppose, having seen a man drunk, or heard him curse or swear, I tell this when he is absent; it is evil-speaking. In our language this is also, by an extremely proper name, termed "backbiting". Nor is there any material difference between this and what we usually style "tale-bearing". If the tale be delivered in a soft and quiet manner (perhaps with expressions of good will to the person, and of hope that things may not be quite so bad), then we call it "whispering". (32)

In a cursive search for metaphors used for "evil-speaking" in Sterne, I have set up the following list: "itch" (iii, 147), "contagious malady" (iii, 147), "malignant case of the mind" (iii, 149), "deadly poison" (iii, 149), "arrow shot in the dark" (iii, 150), "pestilence" (iii, 150).

To the enumeration of the causes of "evil-speaking" in Tillotson or Wesley, Sterne opposes a stream of causes which, in one period, concentrates the content of six succeeding periods in Tillotson's sermon. A comparative reading of the two passages will help illustrate this point:

(33)

First, One of the deepest and most common causes of evil-speaking is ill-nature and cruelty of disposition. ...Secondly,

another cause of the commonness of this vice is, that many are so bad themselves in one kind or other. ... Thirdly, another source of this vice is malice and revenge. ... Fourthly, another cause of evil-speaking is envy. ... Fifthly, another cause of evil-speaking is impertinence and curiosity. ... Lastly, men do this many times out of wantonness and for diversion. (34)

This delusive itch for slander, too common in all ranks of people, whether to gratify a little ungenerous resentment; -- whether oftener out of a principle of levelling from a narrowness and poverty of soul, ever impatient of merit and superiority in others; whether a mean ambition or the insatiate lust of being wily, (a talent in which ill-nature and malice are no ingredients,) -- or lastly, whether from a natural cruelty of disposition, abstracted from all views and considerations of self: to which one, or whether to all jointly we are indebted for this contagious malady; thus much is certain, from whatever seeds it springs, its growth and progress of it are as destructive to, as they are unbecoming a civilized people. (35)

There are, in my view, some further implications to be drawn about the way the above two passages would have been spoken. While in the former one can manage with a flat non-undulating voice because of the shortness of the periods and the way one succeeds another under a numerical heading, in the latter there must have been some variation of tone which could have been achieved according to the instructions of the Traitté about starting with a low voice and gradually increasing the volume to carry one through the "spiritus". (36)

Another difference in style appears in Sterne's

definitions and those of Tillotson. In Tillotson's sermon on conscience, the definition is in the usual form of a short one-clause period:

Conscience is nothing else but the judgement of a man's own mind concerning the morality of his actions. (37)

In Sterne, however, the definition appears as a parenthetical sentence in a rather long period, included between dashes:

Now, -- as conscience is nothing else but the knowledge which the mind has within herself of this; and the judgement, either of approbation or censure, which it unavoidably makes upon the successive actions of our lives; 'tis plain you will say, from the very terms of the proposition, -- whenever this inward testimony goes against a man, and he stands self-accused, -- that he must necessarily be a guilty man. (38)

The parenthetical inclusion of the definition in Sterne implies a change of emphasis, and would have been pronounced in a lower voice than the rest of the period to signify that change. When I say "change of emphasis", I have in mind Tillotson's series of definitions and propositions which form a basic component of this style and which would be pronounced with no considerable variation of one from another. This, in Sterne's sermon, would have been absurd because of the complexity of his periods which basically contributed to the creation of a "conversational style".

In exploring the possible inferences in the function

of one's consciousness, Tillotson generalizes them in abstract terms:

So that it highly concerns men to consider what opinions they embrace in order to practice, and not to suffer themselves to be hurried away by an unreasonable prejudice and a heady passion, without a due and calm examination of things; not to be overborne by pride, or humour, or partiality, or interest, or by a furious and extravagant zeal: Because proportionably to the voluntariness of our error will be the guilt of our practice pursuant to that error. (39)

For Sterne, on the other hand, each possible cause of the wrong function of the conscience is personified and, thus, vividly presented to the audience. While Tillotson proceeds by abstraction, Sterne populates his sermons with personifications of affections setting up a sort of dumbshow (the same technique is later transferred to Tristram Shandy): (40)

At first sight this may seem to be a true state of the case; and I make no doubt but the knowledge of right and wrong is so truly impressed upon the mind of man, -- that did no such thing ever happen, as that the conscience of a man, by long habits of sin, might (as the scripture assures it may) insensibly become hard; -- and, like some tender parts of his body, by much stress and continual hard usage, lose, by degrees, that nice sense and perception with which God and nature endowed it: -- Did this never; -- or was it certain that self-love could never hang the least bias upon the judgement; -- or that the little interests below could rise up and perplex the faculties of our upper regions, and encompass them about with clouds and thick darkness: -- could no such thing as favour and affection enter this sacred COURT: --

Dit WIT disdain to take a bribe in it; -- or was ashamed to shew its face as an advocate for an unwarrantable enjoyment: -- Or, lastly, were we assured that INTEREST stood always unconcerned whilst the cause was hearing, -- and that passion never got into the judgement-seat, and pronounced sentence in the stead of reason, which is supposed always to preside and determine upon the case. (41)

Most of Sterne's contemporary preachers follow a fixed pattern, a rational approach consisting in the exposition of the arguments for or against a proposition. By contrast, Sterne humanizes his text; the appeal is to the heart rather than to the mind. To substantiate this, I shall elaborate on the parable of the Good Samaritan in Hoadly and Sterne. Hoadly first gives his audience a brief account of the parable and goes on to lay out the main parts of his discourse under four different headings. As a result of the argumentative nature of his sermon, his periods could have only been delivered in a repetitive pattern with no variations of any kind. Observe, for example, the first heading taken from the above-mentioned sermon:

From this history, and the occasion of it, we may observe, that a whole nation of men, men who have, and think they have, the greatest opportunities of religious knowledge; nay, men who are peculiarly devoted to the study of religion, and the offices belonging to God's worship, may sometimes, be grossly ignorant of some of the plainest and important duties of religion; and accordingly, their practice may be most unreasonable and inexcusable. (42)

Dealing with the same parable, Sterne is far from attempting

to show a number of points. On the contrary, he chooses to develop the story, and, true as it may be that the use of narrative is a traditional practice in pulpit oratory -- though not so much among Anglicans -- there is, in Sterne's preaching, a unique kind of dramatic presentation in which he makes a drama out of watching a drama. (43) Sterne populates his parable with real characters and has his characters deliver long soliloquies or involves them in dialogue. The delivery of a soliloquy in a sermon would have required the imitation of stage manners. It would have been spoken in a different tone of voice so that Sterne could have signified to his audience that it was the character speaking and not the preacher:

I shall beg leave for a moment, to state an account of what was likely to pass in his (mind), and in what manner so distressful a case would necessarily work upon such a disposition. As he approached the place where the unfortunate man lay, the instant he beheld him, no doubt some such train of reflections as this would rise in his mind. "Good God! what a spectacle of misery do I behold -- a man stripped of his raiment -- wounded -- lying languishing before me upon the ground just ready to expire, -- without the comfort of a friend to support him in his last agonies, or the prospect of a hand to close his eyes when his pains are over. But perhaps my concern should lessen when I reflect on the relations in which we stand to each other -- that he is a Jew and I am a Samaritan. -- But are we not still both men? partakers of the same evils? -- let me change conditions with him for a moment and consider, had his lot befallen me as I journeyed in the way, what measure I should have expected at his hands. (44)

Sterne has no difficulty in setting up a stage in front of his audience and casting himself in the roles of the characters with whom he populates his sermons. In "Pharisee and Publican in the temple", he presents the two characters addressing God in two different corners in first person:

God! I thank thee that thou hast formed me of different materials from the rest of my species, whom thou hast created frail and vain by nature, but by choice and disposition utterly corrupt and wicked! Me, thou hast fashioned in a different mould, and hast infused so large a portion of thy spirit into me, lo! I am raised above the temptations and desires to which flesh and blood are subject! -- I thank thee that thou hast made me thus: -- not a frail vessel of clay, like that of other men, -- or even this publican, but that I stand here a chosen and sanctified vessel unto thee! (45)

Within the little dramas that Sterne unfolds before his audience, he employs the technique (which becomes part of his method in Tristram Shandy) of shifting scenes:

To conceive this, look into the history of the Romish church and her tyrants, or rather executioners, who seem to have taken pleasure in the pangs and convulsions of their fellow-creatures! -- Examine the inquisition, hear the melancholy notes sounded in every cell! -- Consider the anguish of mock trials, and the exquisite tortures consequent thereupon, mercilessly inflicted upon the unfortunate, where the racked and weary soul has so often wished to take its leave, -- but cruelly not suffered to depart! -- Consider how many of these helpless wretches have been hauled from thence in all periods of this tyrannic usurpation, to undergo the massacres and

flames to which a false and a bloody religion has condemned them! ... If we shift the scene, and look upwards, towards those whose situation in life seems to place them above the sorrows of this kind, yet where are they exempt from others? (46)

Sterne's audience is not an ordinary one. They are drawn, through direct appeals, into action in a similar way that eighteenth-century drama "invited the spectator to come up again on the stage". Sterne's auditors are made to participate in the "conversation", to ask and answer questions, to raise objections and to make direct addresses to the speaker calling him "preacher":

Do you think, my good preacher, that he who is infinitely happy, can envy us our enjoyments? or that a Being so infinitely kind, would grudge a mournful traveller the short rest and refreshments necessary to support his spirits through the stages of a weary pilgrimage? ... Consider, I beseech you, what provision and accommodation the Author of our being has prepared for us, that we might not go on our way sorrowing.
(47)

The preacher responds, in his turn, to the arguments and propositions of the audience as he would answer the questions of a collocutor:

I will not contend, at present, against this rhetoric; I would chuse rather for a moment to go on with the allegory, and say we are travellers. (48)

In some cases, Sterne asks his audience to provide their own lines instead of supplying them himself. In the opening of the sermon of the Levite and his Concubine, the various voices are introduced by such phrases as "you will say" and

"you may add". In other cases, the audience is invited to look at a death-bed scene. The reflections of the hypothetical witnesses are voiced in first person:

O my soul! with what dreams hast thou been bewitched? how hast thou been deluded by the objects thou hast so eagerly grasped at? (49)

Sterne's practice of addressing his audience in the sermons is later transferred to Tristram Shandy with similar stagey effects. He is unique as far as the number of addresses to his audience is concerned. In making these addresses, Sterne activates the auditor's -- and in Tristram Shandy, the reader's -- imagination. Therefore, the function of imagination is dramatic in that it reconstructs all the scenes to which the receiver is asked to be witness. Preston's comment on this visual appeal to the audience is illuminating:

"Imagine!" -- this is an exhortation heard often in Sterne's sermons. "Imagine how a sudden stroke of such impetuous joy must operate..." says Sterne after relating how Elijah brought the widow's child back to life. "Let us imagine;" "set forth your imagination, I beseech you"; "'tis no unnatural soliloquy to imagine", he says of the words he gives to the men who fell among thieves. And later in the same sermon he writes "'tis almost necessary to imagine" what could have prompted the good Samaritan's actions. Similarly, in the novel, especially in the opening chapters where he particularly needs to catch the reader's attention, the narrator keeps intimating that the story will be real only as long as the reader is capable of imagining it. "Imagine to yourself a

little, squat, uncourtly figure of a Doctor Slop", (II, 9); "You will imagine, Madam,...?" (I, 21); "My father, as any body may naturally imagine,..." (I, 16).
(50)

Because of the appeal of Sterne's sermons to the imagination of his audience, some critics have credited him with what they call a "painterly mode". This is an undeniable source for Sterne the significance of which I do not intend to devalue. The painterly element is also part of Dunlop's and Ashton's method though in neither of them is there anything to compare to the gestures in Sterne's sermons. Even in Ashton's "scenes of life" (51) and in spite of the appeal to the audience's imagination the details of gesture, so familiar in Sterne, are missing. On the contrary, Ashton follows a process of abstracting rather than concretizing. This is at least the conclusion one may reach by comparing a number of passages from the two preachers of which the following serve as an example (a is from Ashton, and b and c from Sterne):

- a) Let us conceive a man (and I will hope such a thing does exist not only in conception) whose mind is entirely disposed to the practice and promotion of every virtue. Who has (by an habitual sense of God and love of goodness) raised himself above every deceit, which the weakness of humanity, the flattery of the world, or the cunning of the temper are apt to impose upon unwary mortals: whose call of nature it is, whose ruling passion to do the will of Him who sent him: whose zeal for the glory of his Redeemer, and the good of his flock, impels him to make

the present and eternal welfare of men, his daily labour and his nightly care: whose ardent desire to advance the happiness of his fellow-creatures, (though it may not carry him with the transported lawgiver of the Jews, to beg that his own name may be blotted out of the Book of God, unless his people's also were entered in it. (52)

- b) I see the holy man upon his knees, -- with hands compressed to his bosom, and with uplifted eyes, thanking heaven, that the object which had so long shared his affections, was fled. (53)
- c) I see the picture of his departure -- the camels and asses laden with his substance, detached on one side of the piece, and already on their way: -- the prodigal son standing on the fore-ground with a forced sedateness, struggling against the fluttering movement of joy, upon his deliverance from restraint: -- the elder brother holding his hand, as if unwilling to let it go: -- the father -- sad moment! with a firm look, covering a prophetic sentiment, "that all would not go well with his child," - - approaching to embrace him, and bid him adieu. (54)

Even as late as 1760, when Sterne had already established his own style, the tendency to divide the sermons in neat units had not eclipsed; nor had the use of abstract terms in fact. It appears that the reason for that was, apart from a conscious observance of the "scientific" method, that sermons served at times as vehicles of social critique and, therefore, demanded some degree of organization to meet the standards of the audience which, not infrequently, happened to be the House of Lords or the Queen.

However, Sterne, above all, recognized the necessity to arouse his audience and stimulate their imagination by dramatizing his sermons. The use of character, the portrayal of dramatic action and situation and the creation of a dramatic atmosphere in which the members of an audience could feel themselves participating in the action greatly contributed to the fulfilment of Sterne's intention.

In the first section of this chapter I examined the problems of style in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century sermons and how these relate to Sterne. I have also attempted to indicate, where appropriate, how style can determine the mode of delivery. Accordingly, on this part I shall concentrate on "pronunciatio", or action and voice. To do this, I shall firstly establish a link with the seventeenth century. Naturally, a good deal will be left unsaid about the original influence on oratory which would normally refer us to ancient rhetoric. However, it will appear from the discussion that the classics -- in particular, Quintilian and Cicero -- had always been influential in the formulation of speech theory, much more so in the seventeenth century. Either as a positive influence or as a negative reaction to a servile observance of the ancients, classical doctrines were somehow involved in criticism.

It is understandable that we have more evidence concerning the style of the sermons than about the way they were delivered. The verbal portrayal of gesture and voice falls outside one's best capacities. Besides, there are scarcely any paintings that could have immortalized action even in a "frozen" form. This is probably due to the fact that a histrionic manner of delivering sermons automatically associated the artist with Catholic fanaticism. Nevertheless, some assumptions can be made about the manner of delivery from the style.

The link between style and action can be established from the combined attack of the most enthusiastic ecclesiastical supporters of simplicity against both. A melodious voice or a gesture were as undesired in the pulpit as a figure of speech in a sermon. The first substantiated attack on pulpit eloquence came from Simon Patrick, Bishop of Chichester and later of Ely, who "had himself undergone a considerable stylistic change before he began to combat the style of the dissenters". (55) His Friendly Debate is in the form of a dialogue between a conformist and a non-conformist. The following passage, which is spoken by the conformist -- the mouthpiece of Patrick's views -- is a succinct statement of the prevalent theory among the clergymen in the last decades of the seventeenth century:

I have been taught, that there are two ways to come at the affections: one by the

senses and imagination; and so we see people mightily affected with a puppet-play, with a beggar's tone, with a lamentable look, or any thing of like nature. The other is, by the reason and judgement; when the evidence of any truth convincing the mind, engages the affections to its side, and makes them move according to its direction. Now, I believe your affections are moved in the first way very often; by melting tones, pretty similitudes, riming sentences, kind and loving smiles, and sometimes dismally sad looks; besides several actions or gestures which are very taking. And the truth is, you are like to be moved very seldom in our churches by these means. For the better sort of hearers are now out of love with these things: nor do they think there is any power either in a puling and whining, or in roaring and tearing voice. But if you can be moved by such strength of reason, as can conquer the judgement, and so pass to demand submission from the affection; you may find power enough (I think) in our pulpits. (56)

The impropriety of eloquence is reinforced in the course of the debate when the conformist accuses the nonconformist of being affected by "a melting tone, a sweet voice". (57)

Accompanying speech with gesture was very improper in Patrick's terms; in fact it rated as low as -- if not lower than -- figurative language:

... things done in imitation of others, when we are not in that condition, and have not that occasion, and that spirit also which they had, are very fulsome; no better than the motions of a monkey when he imitates a man. To do those things also commonly which those great men did now and then, is monstrously unbeseeming. Besides, his (David's) psalms are pieces of divine poetry, in which passions are wont to be expressed much otherwise than they ought to do in plain and familiar speech. And yet

you not onely venture to use their figures of speech, but you go beyond them. Like a man that having light upon a good figure in rhetorick, will never have done with it, but is always touching upon it. Then which nothing can be more absurd, especially if he heap a great many of these figures together, as your manner is, asking God over and over again, (as I said) why he doth not this or that, and when he will do it. Besides, that which in a great agony (as I said) is very decent to be spoken, doth not befit a man's mouth at another time; but they that go about to imitate it, do a thing unnatural. (58)

Patrick's attack was followed by a number of similar discourses militating against action in the pulpit and, interestingly, associating elaborate style and use of gesture with the stage. John Eachard clearly disapproved of preachers who, to enliven their speeches, added to the lifeless text of their sermons voice and action:

Amongst the first things that seem to be useless, may be reckon'd the high tossing and swaggering preaching; either mountingly eloquent, or profoundly learned. For there be a sort of Divines, who if they but happen of an unlucky hard word all the week, they think themselves not careful of their flock, if they lay it not up till Sunday, and bestow it amongst them in their next preachment. Or, if they light upon some difficult and obscure notion, which their curiosity inclines them to be better acquainted with, how useless soever; nothing so frequent as for them, for a month or two months together to tear and tumble this doctrine, and the poor people once a week shall come and gaze upon them by the hour, until they preach themselves, as they think, into a right understanding. Those that are inclinable to make these useless speeches to the people, they do it, for the most part, upon one of these considerations: either out of simple

phantastic glory, and a great studiousness of being wonder'd at, as if getting into the pulpit were a kind of staging, where nothing was to be considered, but how much the sermon takes, and how much star'd at. (59)

Glanvill is more interesting than the others in that he shifted ground later to make some allowances for rhetoric. From a downright condemnation of rhetoric and a distrust of imagination in his Philosophia Pia (1671), which encapsulated all previous attempts to reconcile religion and science, Glanvill began to weaken his stand seven years later in An Essay Concerning Preaching (1678). An important concession Glanvill makes in the latter is the inclusion of wit in sermons in order to avoid dullness. However, the crucial point in this essay is the justification of gesture and voice as it implicitly identifies the congregation with a theatre audience:

They (the hearers) come to sermons with the same appetites and inclinations, as they go to sea, and hear plays. (60)

The role of the audience as a regulator of style and of the mode of delivery was not new as such. What is fascinating about Glanvill is that the same arguments that had advocated simplicity of style before were now used for the opposite purpose. Some compromise had to be made concerning the involvement of passions in the conveyance of a moral lesson:

It will be hard for you to make them heed doctrines, though they are never so worthy, or important: their affections are raised by figures, and earnestness and passionate

representations; by the circumstances of the voice, and gesture, and motion; so that however little you may think these, they must be heeded and suited to the capacity, and genius of your hearers. (61)

Glanvill's previous position against all action has now undergone some modifications allowing for "proportioned action":

As to the circumstance of action, there are two extreams about it. Some are mimical, phantastical, and violent in their motions; this is rude and irreverent: others in opposition stand like images, and preach without any motion at all; this is stupid and unnatural. When a man speaks about things of consequence, is concern'd himself, and would have others be so, he cannot (without great violence) but use some proportioned action. God hath made us so that we must express our inward resentments by outward agitations; and the motion is allowed, and much set by, by all the masters of eloquence; it is necessary to the grace of speaking, hath a considerable share in the influence on the hearers, who are moved by the eye as well as by the ear. So that motionless speaking is senseless, and unnatural. It was never taken upon any grounds of reason, but from the restraint of notes, or an humor of opposition of the other extream; and is as bad a one it self. Some motion is requisite, the care must be to govern it so that it may be grave and decent; not a violent agitation, and distortion of the whole body; but a su(i)table and moderate motion, as the matter shall require; and such as is free and natural, without constraint, or affectation. (62)

In spite of all concessions, Glanvill cautions the preacher against exaggerated gesture which he likens to foolery. (63) The same warning against exaggeration is made about voice. The interesting fact about the following

passage is that Glanvill acknowledges the monotony of sermon delivery in the period between 1660 and 1690, which went hand in hand with the "scientific" style of composing sermons. Although Glanvill recommends a variation in voice depending on the content, he makes no mention of passions and their share in the matter of varying one's voice:

The voice should be lively and earnest; but without any set, or affected tone. It should vary as the matter doth, and may have its risings, and falls, if you take care to shun the extrems of excessive loudness in some periods, and as unfit lowness in others: you should avoid a droning dullness of speech on the one hand, which shews unconcernment, and want of zeal; and a boisterous noise on the other, which argues rudeness, and want of modesty, and manners. (64)

Jones, like various other modern critics, suggests that the influence on Glanvill as well as Ferguson is to be sought in France where the reformation of pulpit eloquence began earlier and the scientific movement was not as strong as in England. The channel through which French theories reached England was according to Jones, Rapin's Réflexions sur l' Usage de l' Eloquence de ce Temps (1672), which was translated into English the same year. (65) The distinction between proper and far-fetched figures of speech is first made in this French work. In addition to that, and supposing that the two preachers had French, (66) another source of influence could have been Faucheur's Traité, first published in 1657 and intended for the use of divines

and lawyers.

Sermons were not very likely to discuss the propriety of action in the pulpit, and yet there is some evidence dated toward the end of the seventeenth century that it was a serious consideration for some preachers. These sermons imply that at least some preachers were in fact using gesture and varying their voice depending on the passions they wanted to convey to their audiences.

As early as 1693, William Fleetwood exploited the opportunity of discussing the clergy's duties to advance his views about eloquence. The terms he uses are interesting in themselves as they compare to those used later in treatises on pulpit oratory as well as stage theory and criticism. In the following passage the "cadence" and the "round and flowing periods" suggest that the "tone" (monotony of pronunciation) had been dropped by some preachers at least and replaced by a kind of singing voice which compares to that on the stage at the beginning of the eighteenth century (The actor's voice was not free of all artificiality then). Fleetwood's description seems to be based on contemporary experience:

They (the hearers) did not only like the song it seems, but the way of singing it, the Grace and Air with which he set it off; they did not only approve the matter of the Prophet's sermon, but the manner of its delivery too; the comely mien with which he spoke, his graceful way of elocution, (67) and the harmonious cadence of his voice.

He had all the external accomplishments, as well as internal that a man could want and wish for, and the people took great notice of it, and had him in esteem accordingly. But notwithstanding all these advantageous ornaments in the preacher, and all this forwardness to hear, and favourable disposition in the people towards him, yet it happened to his sermons, as it does to lovely songs, they pleased the ear and struck the fancy for the present, but made no deep and sensible impression on the mind and understanding. (68)

The reason for people's inefficiencies was, for Fleetwood, the eloquence of sermons:

They (the hearers) came to hear the word of the Lord because it sounded sweetly from his mouth: because his voice was tuneable; his gestures and deportment manly, comely and excelling; his periods round and flowing, and his elocution sweet and powerful. (69)

Another important detail in the same sermon is the association of sermons with "performances":

They have prejudged his performances already, and all he says, seems but as idle talking. (70)

My suggestion that Fleetwood must have been describing from real life in the preceding passages is based not only on the contemporary diction for oratory of which he makes use but also on further accounts of preachers' practice in the pulpit. The following extract is from a preface to William Dunlop's sermons who died in 1720; (71) therefore, his sermons fall within the period before and after the turn of the eighteenth century when eloquence in the pulpit was still unacceptable in most quarters. The

passions are no longer the culprits for evil as they used to be in most seventeenth-century sermons -- but the springs of proper action:

He (Dunlop) was one of these orators that triumph over their audience; I may say he flamed in the pulpit from beginning to end, he fixed the attention of his hearers, struck their minds, captivated their hearts, and led their passions which way he pleased; nor was this the effect of meer artificial rhetorick and oratory, but flowed rather from the real sentiments and affections of his own soul transfused into his hearers: for, as he had a warm imagination, lively fancy, and mighty voluble expression, so he had a deep impression of all the great subjects of religion upon his heart; and when he spoke of them, he did it always with such clearness and elevation, with such force and vehemence, and power of persuasion, enlivened with a suitable action, as was not in the power of his hearers to resist. One, methinks, may easily perceive this in reading any of the following sermons, in which the spirit of the author still breathes with such a mixture of warmth and sublimity both of thought and expression, as carries the mind away with pleasure through all the various turns of his discourse, and makes the reader not only to understand but feel his subject. (72)

The subject of pleasure as against conscious thinking had been touched upon in the first translation of Le Faucheur's Traité more than two decades before. Under the circumstances, it is possible that Dunlop as well as several other preachers who made use of action to impress a moral lesson on their audiences had borrowed the theoretical justification of this practice from the Traité. In the

second chapter of this treatise, Le Faucheur argues that there is no indecency about delivering a sermon through proper action, and he produces the apostles as an example for imitation:

Why, say they, he that studies in his sermon agreeable to the congregation, must needs take more pains to please than to profit, and amuse himself how to tickle their ears instead of thinking seriously how to instruct their minds and edify their consciences. 'Tis true indeed, this is to please their senses: but then that pleasure, as it tends to the glory of God and the conversion of their souls; as it delights their attention to the good things they are told and helps their memories to retain what they hear; it is without doubt very innocent, and very holy and reverent as well as profitable and pleasing. (73)

Although there are many instances of pulpit orators recommending stage action as a model, the identification of plays and sermons -- when it comes from dramatic critics -- is a rarer case even if the point at issue is theme rather than action:

While Lear and the Companions of his Wretchedness are almost without Hopes, unerring Nature is pursuing her Course; the vices of Goneril, Regan, and Edmund, are working their own Ruin, and the Uprising of those whom their Cruelty had reduced to the lowest State of Misery. Here is a Lesson that administers Comfort to the poor and distressed. ...

I have read many Sermons, but remember no one that contains so fine a Lesson of morality as this Play. Here is Loyalty to a Prince, Duty to a Parent, Perseverance in a chaste Love, and almost every exalted Virtue of the Soul, recommended in the loveliest Colours; and the opposite Vices are placed in the strongest Light in which

Horror and Detestation can place them. (74)

The Traitté constitutes a valuable source of information about the significance of action in the pulpit and, more importantly, about the rapprochement of pulpit and stage in terms of gesture and voice at the beginning of the eighteenth century. One can talk about a mutual influence between pulpit and stage theory of action or about a gradual permeation of the one by the other. The reason for dealing with the Traitté first is that it was the beginning of a series of similar treatises on pulpit oratory until about the middle of the eighteenth century.

The translation of the Traitté in English must have initially appeared at the turn of the eighteenth century if we can judge from the introduction to the second edition, which refers to the first as "having been buried upwards of twenty years in the most profound silence and oblivion". (1727, p. xi) Besides, the first edition refers to Dr. Wake as "Reverend" (A6V - A7V), a mention which could only be made at a point when his career did not qualify him for a special title, that is, some time between 1689 and 1702, when he was canon of Christ Church (Dictionary of National Biography). As the second edition came out in 1727, the first one must have been as near 1707 as possible according to the approximate estimation of the two decades' distance between the two. These two pieces of information, if combined, point to 1702 as the most probable date of

publication of the first edition. Its full title was: An Essay Upon the Action of an Orator, as to his Pronunciation and Gesture. Useful both for Divines and Lawyers, and Necessary for all Young Gentlemen that study how to speak well in Public.

As the title of the first edition suggests, the stage was left out on the list of applications of the theory of action. Further than a passive resistance to the stage as a model of action, the Essay was very explicit against the ill use of the theory of the passions on the stage:

However, they that have a phanatical qualm against the art of action and make a scruple on it, urge yet, that we ought to leave this knack to stage-players; who propose no other end to themselves of acting comedy and tragedy but to please people and indulge a fond inclination. But I think, on the contrary, that it ought not to be left so, nor to be given up to play-houses; where the actors make a very ill use on it, in prostituting it to their own ends of interest and appetite. (75)

By the time the second edition of the translation of the Traitté came out, the hostility against the stage had receded, and this was reflected in the altered title: The Art of Speaking, or, an Essay on the Action of an Orator; as to his Pronunciation and Gesture. Useful in the Senate or Theatre, the Court, the Camp, as well as the Bar and Pulpit.

Le Faucheur brought about the break of modern oratory from the classical one by shifting the emphasis from invention, disposition, and elocution to "pronunciatio", that

is, voice and gesture. Without underestimating the former three, Le Faucheur rationalized the overruling significance of the latter on the grounds that our passions are affected by "what strikes in at our senses" (76) and that, as long as the congregation profits from such a representation, pleasure is justifiable:

Why, say they, he that studies in his sermon how to render his pronunciation and gesture agreeable to the congregation, must needs take more pains to please than to profit, and amuse himself how to tickle their ears instead of thinking seriously how to instruct their minds and edifie their consciences. 'Tis true indeed, this is to please their senses: but then that pleasure, as it tends to the glory of God and the conversion of their souls; as it delights their attention to the good things they are told and helps their memories to retain what they hear; it is without doubt very innocent, and very holy and reverent as well as profitable and pleasing. (77)

If didacticism had crept on the stage through sentimental drama, (78) the element of pleasure had intruded in the pulpit area through the application of the theory of passions to pulpit oratory. Not only did the passions become the seminal idea round which revolved gesture and voice in the pulpit, but the stage was recommended as a model of action to those who wished to improve their performance:

Besides, not to omit anything that may contribute to the advancement of so necessary a work, as the several inflexions of the voyce are in point of speaking, I must add this; That the only way to acquire

the faculty of varying the voyce upon all kind of subjects as well as passions, is to be often reading of comedies, tragedies, and dialogues aloud, or some other discourses of authors, whose stile comes nearest up to the dramatick: For nothing can be more serviceable to the improvement of action and elocution. (79)

Gesture, which was previously condemned by ecclesiastical men, is now recommended as a prerequisite for the pulpit on account of its "universal" nature. It is even placed above voice as the latter can only be understood by native speakers:

Besides gesture has this advantage above pronunciation; that by speech we are only understood by people of our own country and lingua; but by gesture, we render our thoughts and our passions intelligible to all nations, indifferently, under the sun. 'Tis as it were the common language of all mankind, which strikes the understanding in at our eyes as much as speaking does in at our ears. (80)

The same priority of gesture over voice is observed, justifiably so, in treatises about stage action:

One prime cause of all this theatrical burlesque in the players, upon high life and its passions, is a custom that prevails with the managers to form their judgement on an actor without regard to any other of his qualities than merely the tone or extent of his voice, never dreaming (in the midst of a crowd of examples) that the finest natural voice may be useless and insignificant to its possessor unless accompanied by a power to discover passions and express them. (81)

Apart from the general theoretical considerations arising in the Traité, the practical hints about proper

action in the pulpit are strikingly similar to those in stage treatises, and, in particular, Charles Gildon's The Life of Mr. Thomas Betterton, the nearest -- chronologically -- to the first edition of the Traitté. The influence of the Traitté on Gildon is indirectly acknowledged in his preface:

I should not have troubled the reader with a Preface to this little Treatise, but to prevent an objection, which may be made, and that is that I have been a plagiarist, and delivered rules for my own, which are taken out of other authors. I first allow, that I have borrowed many of them from the French, but then the French drew most of them from Quintilian and other authors. Yet the Frenchman has improved the ancients in this particular, by supplying what was lost by the alteration of custom with observations more peculiar to the present age. (82)

A basic rule both in the pulpit and on the stage which has its origin in the principle of sympathy (see Chapter Two) is that the auditor should have full view of the orator/actor's eyes while delivering or acting, respectively. The following two passages from the Traitté and Gildon show the congruence between pulpit and stage with regard to that principle:

As for your eyes, you must always be casting them upon some or other of your auditors and rolling them gently about from this side to that, with an air of regard sometimes upon one person and sometimes upon another; and not fix 'em like darts that are once shot, still upon one place of your auditory, as many people do to their great disadvantage: for it is so very disagreeable and dull, that it affects the

persons before whom we speak, much less then when we look them decently in the face, as we use to do in familiar and common conversation. (83)

I would not be misunderstood, when I say you must wholly place your eyes on the person or persons you are engaged with on the stage; I mean, that at the same time both parties keep such a position in regard of the audience, that these beauties escape not their observation, though never so directly to each other, yet the beholder, by the advantage of their position, has a full view of the expression of the soul in the eyes of the figures. (84)

Another stipulation common to the pulpit and stage was the smooth movement of the body, which later brought about a lot of controversies owing to Garrick's and other actors' "violent" gestures. Again the author of the Traitté and Gildon are in full concurrence:

As for the whole body, it ought neither to change place nor posture every moment. This fickle agitation would be as indecent as the gesture of Curion, whom Junius compared to a man at sea in a cock-boat, for tossing his body about continually, sometimes to the right and sometimes to the left, with the greatest inconstancy imaginable: But then, on the other hand, it must neither stand like a stock, nor be as immoveable as a may-pole for over and above that this is not natural; God Almighty having made the body of such a moveable meen and of such members as dispose it for motion, that it ought to move sometimes, either as the soul directs or as the body it self requires; It is also disagreeable and ungenteel for want of variety; which becomes it so well upon every occasion or change of discourse, and sets every thing off to admiration. (85)

The place and posture of the body ought not to be chang'd every moment, since so fickle

an agitation is trifling and light: Nor, on the other hand, should it always keep the same position, fixt like a pillar or marble statue. For this, in the first place, is unnatural, and must therefore be disagreeable since God has so form'd the body with members disposing it to motion, that it must move either as the impulse of the mind directs, or as the necessary occasions of the body require. This heavy stability, or thoughtless fixtness by losing that variety, which is so becoming of and agreeable in the change and diversity of speech and discourse, and gives admiration to everything it adorns, loses likewise that genteelness, and grace which engages the attention by pleasing the eye. (86)

Another fundamental rule, common to pulpit and stage and almost inviolable in both areas, is the use of the right hand: (87)

You must make all your gestures with the right hand; and if you ever use the left, let it only be to accompany the other, and never lift it up so high as the right. But to use an action with the left hand alone, is a thing you must avoid for its indecency. The only exception to this rule will be in places, where you speak of the right and the left by name; as if you chance to discourse of the seperation, which the sovereign judge of the world will make between the good and the bad in the last day of Judgement, placing the just on his right hand and the wicked on his left: there 'tis not only allowable, but necessary to adjust your gestures according to that distinction; making one of them with the right hand alone, and the other with the left alone. (88)

If an action comes to be used by only one hand, that must be the right, it being indecent to make a gesture with the left alone; except you should say any such thing as "Rather than be guilty of so foul a deed, I'd cut this right hand off, & c." For here the action must be expressed by

the left hand, because the right is the member to suffer. (89)

Other equally important points are raised in both works such as the shrugging of the shoulders, which should be avoided by all means, (90) or the precedence of gesture over speech. (91) It seems, however, that in spite of the existing theories, preachers did not take heed of the instructions contained in the treatises. At least this is what one may suppose from Gildon's urge to the parsons:

And I am persuaded, that our parsons would move their hearers far more, if they added but graceful action to loud speaking. (92)

Even though the above passage would suggest a one-way influence of the stage on the pulpit, this would not be true. Gildon himself admitted to having borrowed many examples from oratory as he believed that an actor "may learn his just lessons" (93) from oratory as well as drama.

Another essay that establishes the link between pulpit and stage is Some rules for Speaking and Action, first published in 1715. This is a very short manual in the form of a letter to a friend, which is more or less a summary of the principles laid down in the Traitté. However, there is only a vague acknowledgement of that in the preface:

This in obedience to your commands, Sir, I have run over what books I could in this short time, which lay down rules for speaking and action in public. (94)

To the third edition of Some Rules for Speaking and Action

(1716) were added Quintilian's "The Portraiture of a Compleat Orator", some extracts "Out of Bishop Sprat's Charge to his Clergy" and "Out of Bishop's Pastoral Care".

The main body of the Sprat text deals with the delivery of prayers and contains some final remarks on sermon delivery. Sprat is far from recommending anything more than giving "every word and sentence its due poise" (p. 12). He takes care to advise his clergy "where to lay a greater or smaller weight, according to its natural or spiritual force; where to be quicker or more vehement, where slower and more sedate; how to observe equally all pauses and distances; how to avoid monotonies on the one hand, and immoderate elevations and depressions on the other; yet, where to use the same tones, where to rise or fall in the right place" (p. 12). Far from becoming the exponent of varied action common to the pulpit and the stage, Sprat warns the clergy against "over-action and mimical gesticulations" (p. 14). Instead, he recommends "a stedly, compos'd, severe, decent, lively, and apposite managing your voices and gestures in the pulpit" (p.14).

Burnet seems to have gone one step further than Sprat in the approximation of pulpit and stage by accepting the latter as a model for achieving the best effects in the former:

We plainly see by the stage what a force there is in pronunciation. The best

compositions are murdered, if ill spoken, and the worst are acceptable when well said. In tragedies rightly pronounced and acted, tho' we know that all is fable and fiction, the tender parts do so melt the company, that tears cannot be stop'd, even by those who laugh at themselves for it. (p. 16)

Burnet may have had some influence from the Traitté or, more likely, from Rapin whom he recommends as a source of eloquence. This influence, however, did not carry him as far as to accept its precepts uncritically; on the contrary, he expressed his disapproval very strongly:

In delivering of sermons, a great composure of gesture and behaviour is requisite, to give them weight and authority. Extrems are bad here, as in every thing else. Some affect a light and flippant behaviour, frantick and enthusiastical motions; and others think that wry faces, and a tone in the voice, will set off the matter. Grave and compos'd looks; and a natural, but distinct pronunciation, will always have the best effect. (p.15)

Though, the above passage in no way recommends a "musical" voice in sermon delivery, the writer of Some Rules for Speaking and Action falsely attributes to Burnet a paragraph in which he, allegedly, advocates "a modulation of music of the voice". This miscotation must be due to the influence on the pulpit of new developments in contemporary stage theory as it is not previously found in the Traitté. The paragraph to which I refer is the following:

Discourses brought forth with a lively spirit and heat, press'd with affection and vehemence, enforc'd with proper motives of the eye and countenance, and accompany'd

with a due modulation of music of the voice, (for there is a music in speaking as well as in singing) will have all the effects which can be expected. The great Tillotson had all these qualities in such perfection, that I never once saw a wandering eye where he preach'd. Time and exercise will bring any one to this easiness of speaking, this freedom of expression, and give him a tone of authority, an air of assurance, a majesty of pronunciation, and as much flame and life as are necessary to keep up the attention of his audience. (pp. 14-15)

The date of the second edition of Some Rules for Speaking and Action (1716) coincided with the year in which John Henley was ordained deacon by Dr Wake. Henley, from the beginning of his career, displayed a keen interest in the subject of elocution, and was, decidedly, the recipient of the influence of Le Faucheur's Traité. Before undertaking the task of establishing an institution for the initiation of people in elocution, Henley developed his theory in one of the most important sermons on this score. (95) This specific sermon is remarkable for the similarity of the principles it exposes to those held by Aaron Hill. Henley stipulates, for example, that as long as the proper idea would strike the mind its physical correlative would follow automatically:

In proper speaking and gesture, the nature of the thing spoken, strongly imprinted on the mind, and present feeling of the orator, is the only guidance; and as things are, in their own nature, various, they necessarily require a variation of the voice, and of the deportment, that is conformable to each of them: and the

precise fitness of one certain sound and movement of the whole person, even to a line of the countenance, to one certain thing, most properly and perfectly express'd, and the consequent unfitness of any other, to it, are as demonstrable, as any proposition in the mathematics. (96)

As for instructions about voice, these resemble the rules laid down by Le Faucheur in the Traité. In an attempt to prevent the monotonous closing of sentences in an identical low tone, Henley recommends the following expedient:

In particular, the pathetic close of a discourse ought to be spoken with the greatest force, not, as the method is, by lowering the voice, to the end of it. For as a pathetic discourse must be suppos'd to grow it self stronger, towards the conclusion of it, and to end with a kind of triumph; and as the last impression ought to be very forcible, therefore that fall in such a close is absurd, and the contrary, the just way of speaking it. (97)

For the proper management of gesture and voice, Henley suggests that one should be cognisant of music and painting -- the former because of its involvement in modulating the voice and the latter as an ancillary means of falling into the right postures or wearing the appropriate facial expressions.

After about ten year's practice, John Henley opened up his famous Oratory (3 July 1726) with a view to instructing people in religion, sciences, and languages. Like Aaron Hill, he became preoccupied, in his oratory transactions, with the description of the physical

manifestations of the passions in medically precise terms. Dealing, for instance, with "the action of the eye", he accounts for the movements of the eyes on the basis of the mobilization of different muscles depending on the passions by which one is affected each time. (98) The same approach is followed with the other parts of the body, in particular, the hands the significance of whose position Charles Le Brun had long before indicated.

It seems that, in spite of all theory on pulpit action, the majority of preachers continued to deliver sermons in the usual way instead of enriching them with appropriate gestures and inflections of voice. Richard Steele, a par excellence dramatic critic, pointed up the weaknesses he saw in the plain unimpassioned style of much eighteenth-century preaching. Among the countries to which he alludes in the following extract, there must certainly be France since in the latter the dramatic delivery of sermons was supposed to be more advanced than in England:

Our orators are observed to make use of less gesture or action than those of other countries. Our preachers stand stock still in the pulpit, and will not so much as move a finger to set off the best sermons in the world. ... Our words flow from us in a smooth, continued stream, without those strainings of the voice, motion of the body, and majesty of the hand, which are so much celebrated in the orators of Greece and Rome. We can talk of life and death in cold blood, and keep our temper in a discourse which turns upon everything that is dear to us. (99)

The example of France in The Spectator notwithstanding, Lewis Riccoboni declares in his preface to A General History of the Stage (1754) that French preachers were wrong in practising the "theatrical declamation" with which they were acquainted from French tragedies. (100) This remark agrees with Sterne's complaint in his letter to Garrick that the French tragedy is not proper for the English stage and that it brims with "preaching" with which, of course, Sterne was satiated in his earlier life.

By the middle of the eighteenth century we find that eloquence was used as a means of attracting people to religion rather than being abused for its impropriety in the pulpit. In 1749, John Ashton admonished his audience that the compositions of a man who "betrays the cause of virtue, the salvation of souls, the service of his saviour and God" are "lifeless and unmeaning: as void of the spirit of religion as the imagination they come from ... and pronounced with an indifference which lulls you to sleep, or with an affectation which awakens another sensation in you". (101) Contrary to that mode of delivery which would divert rather than draw the attention of an audience, Ashton advises the "diligent preacher" to vary his voice and gesture according to the content of his sermons:

His (the diligent preacher's) speech, and his manner of speaking, (not fixed in a certain unaffected sameness, of unseasonable vehemence, or of as ill-plac'd

composure) but diversified into such different degrees of ease or emotion, as the nature of the subjects shall dictate, and his inward convictions require. (102)

If until about the time Ashton was preaching the stage had been resorted to by preachers as a parallel, An Essay on the Action Proper for the Pulpit implies that clergymen had begun to visit the playhouse and copy from the players. At least we can gather that from the following passage:

The theatre too affords an example of the same thing. Everybody knows the amazing and universal influence of this talent, in the case of Garrick, who by possessing it in an eminent degree, is able to alarm and soothe, to inflame and melt by turns a mixed and numerous audience; to torture or transport them at pleasure: he seems in short upon the stage to have a kind of despotic empire over the human passions, not over those alone of the more refined hearers, but those too of the more vulgar, both small and great. We may observe by the way, what low and silly things some ingenious players can raise and dignify, merely by their manner of speaking them. I appeal likewise to what we see in the pulpit ... (103)

The author of the Essay places great emphasis on "musical" voice even if it has a wrong modulation. As I shall show in the following chapter, the musicality of voice on the stage was a requisite -- but only before the appearance of Macklin and Garrick. It seems, therefore, that the pulpit was rather slow in bringing about changes or keeping up with new developments in action theory. On the other hand, modifying action would have meant a

conversational rather than "scientific" style as I have pointed out in the first section of this chapter, and that was still impracticable for a great number of preachers. To rectify the fault of declamatory monotony, preachers were now advised to make use of pauses. The latter had already become a thorny issue in dramatic criticism as there were many conflicting views about the number and nature of pauses on the stage (see following chapter). The demand for a kind of sermon delivery which would be closer to real life was high. The necessary steps to be made in that direction are best summarized in the following passage from An Essay on the Action Proper for the Pulpit:

He (the speaker) will proceed in that with greater ease and success, if he makes frequent pauses. These will indeed afford equal relief to himself and to his audience. Then they will take off the air of declamation which a continued address is so apt to carry. They will bring it nearer to life, and add an importance and solemnity to the whole. When on any more momentous topic in particular, they are or appear to be occasioned by the difficulty of expressing some great idea, that labours in the preacher's bosom, and struggles as it were for vent, they have commonly in that case a marvellous impression. Such a silence is more eloquent than any words.
(104)

I shall now focus on the information available about Sterne's practice. Unfortunately, the evidence is scarce and, most of the time, vague. As I have indicated in the first section, Sterne's style -- if not necessitated --

required a conversational manner of delivery to suit the dramatic content of his sermons. (105) Further than that, one can imagine that Sterne would have spoken in a striking manner and would also have assumed various postures to create the dramatic atmosphere in which the members of his audience could have felt themselves participating in the action portrayed. Joseph Hunter informs us that Sterne "never preached at Sutton but half the (congregation) were in tears" and "when he preached, the audience was quite delighted with him". According to the same source, "the Minster was crowded whenever it was known that he was to preach". (106)

Naturally, one can only speculate about the postures in which Sterne would have fallen while preaching. However, we have, in one of his sermons, the verbal justification of varying voice and gesture depending on the passions Sterne wanted to represent:

Nature has assigned a different look, tone of voice, and gesture, peculiar to every passion and affection we are subject to; and, therefore, to argue against this strict correspondence which is held between our souls and bodies, -- is disputing against the frame and mechanism of human nature. (107)

To form a rough idea about Sterne's performance while delivering his sermons, one need only mention the case of the woman who, each time the mass was finished, used to ask Sterne where he intended to preach the next time so that

she would not miss a single sermon of his. (108)

Doubtless, Sterne did not conceive of sermons as written messages which were to be read out to the congregation. Quite the opposite, he thought of them as "live" performances in which preacher and congregation interacted in the way he had watched players and spectators interact in the theatre. The pulpit was the stage for Sterne, and the characters of his sermons were the actors whose parts he had to act out in front of his audience. To improve his technique, Sterne had gone out of his way during his visit in France to observe Père Clément enlivening his delivery with dramatic action which Sterne was endeavouring to embody in his own sermons. The following extract from a letter to his wife shows what were the elements Sterne most admired in Père Clément's preaching:

I have been three mornings together to hear a celebrated pulpit orator near me, one Père Clément, who delights me much; the parish pays him 600 livres for a dozen sermons this Lent; he is K. Stanislas's preacher -- most excellent indeed! his matter solid, and to the purpose; his manner, more than theatrical, and greater, both in his action and delivery, than Madame Clairon, who, you must know, is the Garrick of the stage here; he has infinite variety and keeps up the attention by it wonderfully; his pulpit, oblong, with three seats in it, into which he occasionally casts himself; goes on, then rises, by a gradation of four steps, each of which he profits by, as his discourse inclines him: in short, 'tis a stage, and the variety of his tones would make you imagine there were no less than five or six actors on it together. (109)

Sterne must have thought of both sermons and Tristram Shandy as equally susceptible to the dramatizing transformations of his pen. As a confirmation of this attitude, I can mention the integration of the sermon on conscience in Tristram Shandy through the dramatization of the responses of the audience, which, on the occasion, includes the principal characters of the book. Trim, who reads the sermon, identifies himself with what he says and with the emotions it is charged with. He is astonished, he grows angry, his eyes fill with tears, and he lets fiction take over from reality. Generally speaking, Trim reads the sermon like an actor performing a part, carried away by the rhetoric of his piece, and using voice and gesture to give it maximum effectiveness. This is what makes Walter call the sermon "dramatic".

I have referred to the dramatizing elements of this sermon within Tristram Shandy, firstly, to foreshadow some similar processes in Tristram Shandy and, secondly, to suggest that both sermons and Tristram Shandy held, for Sterne, the same potential for dramatization regardless of where he drew his techniques -- the pulpit or the stage.

Notes to Chapter Three

1. Thomas Sprat, The History of the Royal Society (London, 1734), pp. 111-12.
2. Ibid., p. 113.
3. John Walwood, "A sermon preached upon I Pet. iv, ver. xviii", in Some Select Sermons (London, 1750), p.30.
4. John Eachard, The Grounds and Occasions of the Contempt of the Clergy and Religion Enquired into (London, 1670), pp. 47-48.
5. Gilbert Burnet, Lord Bishop of Sarum, A Discourse of the Pastoral Care (London, 1692).
6. Ibid., p. 111.
7. Ibid., pp. 111-12.
8. Benjamin Hoadly, The Works, 3 vols (London, 1773), iii, 641-42.
9. Ibid., iii 702.
10. John Tillotson, The Works, 3 vols (London, 1752), iii, 53.
11. Ibid., ii, 594.
12. Ibid., ii, 599.
13. Ibid., ii, 548.
14. John Wesley, Sermons on Several Occasions (London, 1944), p. 50.
15. Tillotson, i, 396.

16. Wesley, p. 566.
17. Simon Patrick, Sermons upon Contentment and Resignation (London, 1719), pp. 85-86.
18. Ibid, pp. 75-76.
19. William Dunlop, Sermons, 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1722), ii, 53.
20. Ibid, ii, 57.
21. Ibid, ii, 145.
22. Benjamin Newton, "A sermon preached at the Cathedral of Gloucester on 10 September 1760: "O worship the Lord, in the beauty of holiness!" ", p. 12.
23. When Agoretas describes the delivery of sermons as dramatic, Theodorus contrives the expedient of history-paintings as an alternative to the stage parallel:

I would observe, that a preacher of true taste will chuse for ordinary, I do not say always, to make his discourses turn upon some one leading truth, or another; which shall run through each from beginning to end, and serve to collect the several parts together, and to which they shall all point as to their common center, throwing one joint blaze of light upon it, and being chiefly or solely subservient to that end, so that, if I may be permitted here to borrow a comparison from one of the fine arts, the most of his sermons will resemble in this respect a genuine piece of history-painting, where the subordinate figures, though variously diversified from one another, have yet some general predominant air of feature, which runs through them all, and leads the eye at first sight to the principal figure, for the sake of which they were designed, and which they all

conspire to set off in the most distinguished and affecting manner.

James Fordyce, The Eloquence of Pulpit; An ordination sermon to which is added a charge (London, 1755), pp. 179-80.

24. John Ashton, "A sermon preached at the triennial visitation of the Right Reverend Samuel Lord Bishop of Chester in the Parish Church of Cartmel, Lancaster, on 2 June, 1749".
25. John Green, "A sermon preached in Ely-Chapel at the Consecration of the Right Reverend Father in God Edmund Lord Bishop of Chester on 22 March 1752".
26. Ibid., pp. 12-13.
27. Lansing Van Der Heyden Hammond, Laurence Sterne's Sermons of Mr. Yorick (New Haven, 1948), p. 102.
28. Irvin argues that Sterne's "presentation of both good and evil in the sermons is entirely consistent with the Latitudinarianism and sentimentality of eighteenth-century drama".
Maurice Ray Irvin, "Histrionics and Homiletics: The Sermons of Laurence Sterne" (unpublished Ph.D dissertation, Case Western Reserve University, 1972), p. 51.
29. Arthur Sherbo has suggested that the description of distress in sentimental drama is distinctive because of prolongation and repetition and by the use of certain

words and expressions.

Arthur Sherbo, Studies in the Eighteenth-Century English Novel (East Lansing, 1969).

30. Sterne's Sermons, in The Works of Laurence Sterne, 4 vols (London, 1803), iii, 116-17.
 31. Hammond, p. 105.
 32. Wesley, p. 566.
 33. Hammond juxtaposes the two extracts in his appendix of sermons plagiarized by Sterne. Nevertheless, in Sterne's sermon, we are only confronted with a plagiarized concept. The style is transformed into the familiar conversational tone of Sterne.
 34. Tillotson, i, 399.
 35. Sterne's Sermons, iii, 147-48.
 36. ...there's another sort of periods, that the rhetoricians call Spiritus; which have not the same order, scope and composition of those sentences that are properly called periods, but only couch and contain a great number of articles, simply propounded all in the same manner. ...In such periods as those, you are upon no force at all to strein your lungs; for you may take your breath as often as you shall have occasion, and make an equal pause at every article they contain; there being no manner of reason why you should not make a stop upon one as well as another."
- An Essay Upon the Action of an Orator (London, 1680), pp. 155, 158.
37. Tillotson, i, 355.
 38. Sterne's Sermons, iii, 351.

39. Tillotson, i, 356.

40. Sterne has another set of characters, put on in Tristram more often than in the sermons, acting a sort of dumbshow. These are the personifications, usually of affections, gemütlich characters, most of them. ... In "The Abuses of Conscience", Conscience is no less than a scampish Ambidexter, the Vice of an old Morality, his spirit, like that of chop-fallen Yorick, new-found in eighteenth-century York Minster. We are never very far from Tristram Shandy's errant scoundrel Gravity; or Desire, with vest held up to the knee, snatching at Fancy; or Death who stops to hear Tristram's joke and leaves, forgetting his commission.

John Traugott, Tristram Shandy's World (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1954), pp. 105-06.

41. Sterne's Sermons, iii, 351-52.

42. Hoadly, iii, 808.

43. One is reminded by Sterne's technique of The Rehearsal. In Buckingham's work, Smith and Johnson are spectators at a rehearsal of Bayes' play. But the real drama includes the reaction of these gentlemen as they, before and after the trial performance gets under way, ply Bayes with questions, professing incomprehension at various parts of his piece, raising doubts as to its efficacy and correctness, and relieving their own feelings of boredom in ironic praise and sarcastic comment. In Sterne's sermons seldom does the narrative exist for itself; it becomes a vehicle for a drama of varied author and audience response.

Irvin, p. 7.

44. Sterne's Sermons, iii, 38.

45. Ibid, iii 83-84.

46. Ibid, iii, 138-39.

47. Ibid, iii, 16-17.
48. Ibid, iii, 17.
49. Ibid, iii, 320.
50. John Preston, The Created Self (London, 1970) p. 152.
51. Ashton, p. 12.
52. Ibid., pp. 10-11.
53. Sterne's Sermons, iii, 230.
54. Ibid., iii, 258-59.
55. Richard Foster Jones, The Seventeenth Century (Stanford, California, 1951), p. 117 .
56. Simon Patrick, A Friendly Debate between a Conformist and a Non-Conformist, third edition (London, 1669) pp. 15-16.
57. Ibid., p. 122.
58. Ibid, pp. 85-86.
59. Eachard, pp. 38-39.
60. Joseph Glanvill, An Essay Concerning Preaching (London, 1678), p. 87.
61. Ibid., pp. 55-56.
62. Ibid., pp. 79-81.
63. Ibid., pp. 56-57.
64. Ibid., pp. 78-79.
65. Rapin's Critical Works were included in Sterne's library.
66. Nevertheless, it is possible that they had read the

Traitté in its Latin translation by Melchior Schmidt, available to the European world of learning in 1690.

67. "Elocution" is the eighteenth-century term for what was previously called "pronunciatio", that is, action and voice. Before Fleetwood, John Wilkins had used the same word in this sense in Ecclesiastes; or, A Discourse concerning the Gift of Preaching, which was originally published in 1646 and edited six times by 1700.
68. William Fleetwood, "A Sermon preached before the Queen at White-Hall, on 12 February 1693" (London, 1693), pp. 6-7.
69. Ibid., p. 7.
70. Ibid., p. 9.
71. Dunlop's sermons were in Sterne's library (the 1722 edition).
72. Dunlop, i, xv-xvi.
73. An Essay Upon the Action of an Orator, pp. 18-19.
74. The British Journal, 12 December, 1730.
75. An Essay Upon the Action of an Orator, p. 23.
76. Ibid., p. 2.
77. Ibid., pp. 18-19.
78. The interchangeability of drama and preaching is evident in Aaron Hill's prologue to The Fatal Extravagance. Hill goes as far as to suggest that the stage is as effective as the pulpit in promoting

virtuous conduct:

Experience teaches us, that many frequent the stage, who would hardly be prevailed upon, to receive counsel from the pulpit. The clergy, therefore, should consider, as auxiliaries and fellow-labourers, those poets who preach virtue from the press or the theatre. And since we seek not a share of their revenues, for the pains we take in their service, they ought, at least, in civility to allow us their countenance and acknowledgement.

79. An Essay Upon the Action of an Orator, pp. 117-18.
80. Ibid., p. 171.
81. Aaron Hill and William Popple, The Prompter: A Theatrical Paper (1734-36), edited by William W. Appleton and Kalman A. Burnim (New York, 1966), p. 82.
82. Charles Gildon, The Life of Mr. Thomas Betterton (London, 1710). pp. ix-x.
83. An Essay Upon the Action of an Orator, pp. 183-84.
84. Gildon, p. 67.
85. An Essay Upon the Action of an Orator, pp. 178-79.
86. Gildon, pp. 57-58.
87. Ancient medicine postulated that the vital spirits, exiting through the left ventricle, permeate and humidify the left side of the body, thus, rendering the left arm more difficult to control.
88. An Essay Upon the Action of an Orator, pp. 196-97.
89. Gildon, p. 74.
90. An Essay Upon the Action of an Orator, pp. 193-94

- Gildon, p. 73.
91. An Essay Upon the Action of an Orator, p. 175. Gildon, pp. 25-26.
 92. Gildon, p. 31.
 93. Ibid., p. 137.
 94. Some Rules for Speaking and Action (London, 1715), p.20.
 95. John Henley, "A Sermon preached in the Church of St. George the Martyr, London, on 15 November, 1724", in The Appeal of the Oratory to the First Ages of Christianity (London, 1727), 21 pp.
 96. Ibid., p. 17.
 97. Ibid., p. 17.
 98. British Library, Additional Mss, 19,925.
 99. The Spectator, no. 407.
 100. Lewis Riccoboni, translator, A General History of the Stage, second edition (London, 1754) pp. 28-29.
 101. Ashton, p. 21.
 102. Ibid., p. 15.
 103. An Essay Upon the Action Proper for the Pulpit (London, 1753) pp. 16-17.
 104. Ibid., p. 37.
 105. Wilbur Cross acknowledges the dramatic quality of Sterne's sermons and the importance of style for the manner of delivery:

...under Sterne's hand the method resulted in most striking portraits. For setting forth the character of these and other men

in Scripture, Sterne frequently impersonated them, spoke as he fancied they must have spoken, giving their points of view, their reason for their conduct, in conversation or in monologue. In this dramatic manner the man of Jericho, for example, soliloquises for a half page and more after he had been passed by, "friendless and unpitied", by priest and Levite; and the Samaritan paused over the unfortunate traveller for a still longer meditation before deciding to "soften his misfortunes by dropping a tear of pity over them". Everywhere Sterne thus lets his imagination play upon the few details furnished him by Scripture, building up scenes and characters just as Shakespeare knew how to do from an incident or two out of Holinshed.

Wilbur Cross, The Life and Times of Laurence Sterne (New Haven, 1929), pp. 231-32.

106. James M. Kuist, "New Light on Sterne: An Old Man's Recollections of the Young Vicar", PMLA, 80 (1965), 549-50.
107. Sterne's Sermons, iv, 124.
108. John Adams, Elegant Anecdotes and Bon Mots (London, 1794), pp. 264-65.
109. Curtis, pp. 154-55 (17 March, 1762).

CHAPTER FOUR

A REVIEW OF EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY ACTING THEORIES AND PRACTICE

In the second chapter, I pointed forward to a discussion of eighteenth-century acting theory and practice in order ultimately to relate it to Tristram Shandy. However as there is no understanding the conventions of eighteenth-century stage without a prior knowledge of the external factors pertaining to the theatre, I shall begin with the actor/audience relationship -- in particular, as this was demarcated by the structure of the playhouse -- and the link between painting and acting.

The authoritarian voice of the playwright was gradually being silenced in the eighteenth century by the actor's ascending power. (1) The revival of Elizabethan and Restoration plays and the attainment of the player's freedom in interpreting parts that had been intended for acting out a few generations before as well as the philosophical theories encouraging a more spontaneous expression in terms of action and speech were of great significance. Aaron Hill, in his preface to Zara, claims to have received a neglected old play thanks to the "natural" acting of the players (London, 1752, third edition).

There was an immediate interaction between actor and spectator that could not exist between playwright and

audience because of the writer's distance from the theatrical reality. Actors could detect and satisfy the needs of the audience more quickly and efficiently than playwrights might do. According to Richard Southern, the feeling of direct personal contact between the actor and the audience was very strong between 1700 and 1750 and did not start weakening until the late eighteenth century. Therefore, the English theatre in that period was based on an intimate and complex relationship between actors and audience. Garrick, with his new style, greatly contributed to the emancipation of the actor and to the formation of a tendency to experiment with new techniques.

Another important condition for the establishment of the actor as an influential figure in the theatrical world was the mediocrity of dramatic production in the first three quarters of the eighteenth century. According to Pedicord's statistics, the staple of the repertoire consisted mostly in stock plays, revivals, alterations or adaptations. The growth of audience interest in opera and pantomime constituted a threat to the legitimate drama. Tragedy was substantially less popular and subordinated not only to comedy but, increasingly, to opera and pantomime. Success, therefore, came to rest with the actor's skilful interpretation and the manipulative exploitation of the demands of the public. The culmination of that centralization in task distribution in the theatrical world

was the emergence of the phenomenon of one person holding the roles of playwright, actor and manager -- with Garrick and Foote as the most obvious examples.

However, the conflict between author and actor and the mutually intrusive character of the performer/audience relationship still formed vital part of the eighteenth-century juncture of theatrical affairs. In Charles Macklin's play Covent Garden Theatre; or Pasquin Turn'd Drawcansir (Covent Garden, 3 April 1752), there are a great number of people brought upon the stage to judge the play while at the same time several actors are planted in the audience to help carry on the performance:

Sir Conjecture: And there's one of the actresses some where or other in the front Boxes; -- She's a New Woman very handsome, they say, one Miss Tweezeldom. I wish we could find her out. (2)

The self-appointed spectator-as-critic greatly assisted in what was a typical eighteenth-century development: the plays-about-plays or plays-within-plays. Plays about writing plays, plays satirizing other plays, plays expounding opposite dramatic theories were all abundant and could not but have had a considerable influence on other literary genres of the period, even more so on the newly-fledged novel.

The relationship between spectator and actor was determined by a number of factors of which the structure of

the playhouse was not the least important. If we assemble the scarce information in our possession about the structure of the mid-eighteenth-century theatre, we realize that the privileged spectators of the side-boxes could shake hands with the players or have access to the platform and the back-scenes. This habit proved almost impossible to eradicate in spite of Garrick's efforts as a manager. In 1747 at the foot of the bills made its appearance a bold statement to the effect that since "the Admission of Persons behind the Scenes has occasioned a general Complaint on Account of the frequent Interruptions in the Performance, 'tis hop'd Gentlemen won't be offended, that no Money will be taken there in the future".

The acting space of the eighteenth-century stage was divided into two main areas by the green curtain. The area in front of the curtain was the "platform" while the area behind the curtain was the "scene". The platform of the eighteenth-century playhouse can be identified with the stage. It had a double function: it was designated for forward movement on the part of the actors, but it was also designated for a forward movement on the part of the spectators in the opposite direction -- the two groups meeting in one location. That which separated the players and the spectators seated in the pit was the long trough containing a batten of footlight lamps and two ornamental spiked railings at each front edge of the stage.

At each side the stage-doors were flanked by stage-boxes. Members of the audience used to mount the stage when the stage-boxes and the side-boxes were occupied. The green curtain, which was flat and raised on a roller, rose to reveal the scene. The latter usually consisted in a pair of shutters, which ran along grooves, and three pairs of side-wings by means of which the stage pictures of the time were created. In the English playhouse, the wings were shoved on and pulled back by the scene-shifters while the flats at the rear were traditionally constructed as two "shutters" that ran along grooves. Whenever the necessity arose, a pair of forward shutters shut off part of the scenic area to enable furniture to be set in position while the actors carried on their business.

By the 1760s flats on rollers were common substitutes for the frames shoved in from the sides of the stage. Painted scenes on rollers, while already in use at the beginning of the Garrick period, became more common in the 1760s. Many of them were back-cloths. In addition to those, there were drops used in a front position which came in use immediately after 1750. Front drops began to be exploited for introductory and concluding action as well as for concealing the scene when a deep set was being prepared. Between 1750 and 1770 the front drop developed into the act-drop which did not differ at all from any of the other

"cloths" on rollers, but it was distinguished from them by being painted with a distinctly different purpose.

Compared to the Italian, the English stage was backward in scenery. Before Davenant's introduction of scenery on the English stage, the common theatrical convention, due to the scarcity of technical devices, was word-painting. The advent of pantomime and the Italian opera imported along with them new scenery and costume. Aaron Hill and Charles Macklin insisted on accomplishing the picture of "natural" acting with naturalistic decoration. Hill supplied new scenes and dresses for his tragedy The Fatal Vision (1716) and, later, for Henry V (1723) while Macklin attempted a realistic presentation of character in The Merchant of Venice (1741) by providing new costumes.

Before Garrick's visit to France between 1761 and 1763, lighting effects were achieved with hoops or rings of candles over the platform. The rings of candles could be drawn up when a darkening of the scene was required or, if the opening scene was dark, the candles were not lit. Lighting in the scene was provided by another three or four rings and also by vertical battens which could be placed behind the wings. In spite of all this, the scenic area must always have been dim because the candles could not have illuminated it sufficiently. Garrick removed the chandeliers with their glaring light and increased the number of candles set in concealed positions. Besides, he improved the lamps

in the footlights and supplied them with reflectors while equipping the scene-ladders behind the wings with similar reflectors. The result was "a full view of the stage" as announced in The Public Advertiser (30 October 1766).

The incorporation in the English playhouse of Italian single-focus perspective sets in the early seventeenth century partly contributed to the establishment of a painterly mode of representation. (3) The link between acting and painting was further reinforced in the eighteenth century by the application of the theory of passions to both arts. Betterton's instructions to the stage-players to study such history-painters as Le Brun and Coypel are valuable in view of the fact that there was scarcely any information about the relationship between acting theory and the French academic painters.

In our days, Paulson has pointed out the unprecedented attention paid to the portrayal of passion by means of gesture both in painting and drama:

What Du Fresnoy, Le Brun, and the academicians (and Dryden in England) emphasized in a history painting was the unity of passions even at the expense of the unity of action. The passions could be expressed either by showing through movement, colour, and light the passion felt by a character (or embodied in a scene), or by representing the passions of various characters within the picture. (4)

The interesting aspect of the relationship between

the two arts was the interchangeability of method. The instruction to the actor to study painting in order to familiarize himself with gesture and its expression is reversed in treatises on painting which ask painters to be good actors:

The Painter's People must be good Actors; they must have learn'd to use a Humane Body well; they must Sit, Walk, Lye, Salute, do every thing with Grace. There must be no Awkward, Sheepish, or Affected Behaviour, no Strutting, or Silly Pretence to Greatness; no Bombast in Action : Nor must there be any Ridiculous Contortions of the Body, Nor even such Appearances, or Fore-shortnings as are displeasing to the Eye, though the same Attitude in another View might be perfectly Good. (5)

Speaking for the actors, Aaron Hill declared:

It wou'd be impossible, after an actor had conceived an idea correspondent to the picture, in the words in this, not to impress every lineament of the Passion upon his Look, and every Attitude of it upon his Gesture; and then, the Tone of his voice, concurring, cannot fail to sound the slow, conflicting struggle of Astonishment. (6)

A painting is conceived, like a play, as having a plot, a design, and main and secondary action in the same way that a play has a plot and an under-plot. Lairese, for example, advised young painters to consider all those factors:

Having considered well of the subject, and where the action happened, first make a plan or ground ; next, determine where to place the principal figures or objects, whether in the middle or on the right or left side; afterwards dispose the

circumstantial figures concerned in the matter, whether one, two, or more; what else occurs must fall in course... (7)

The most evidently shared convention is the description of character. As on the stage, so in painting characters are illustrated according to their significance. On the stage, minor characters appear in relatively inconspicuous places compared to the central position of the main ones. Likewise, in painting secondary figures are pushed into the background while the eminent ones are placed in the foreground. Dryden illustrates this point as follows:

I had almost forgotten one considerable resemblance. Du Fresnoy tells us "That the figures of the groups must not be all on a side; that is, with their face and bodies all turned the same way; but must contrast each other by their several positions." Thus in a play, some characters must be raised, to oppose others, and to set them off the better; according to the old maxim, "contraria juxta se posita magis elucescunt." Thus in The Scornful Lady, the usurer is set to confront the prodigal: thus, in my Tyrannic Love, the atheist Maximin is opposed to the character of St. Catherine. (8)

As Paulson points out in Emblem and Expression "the perspective box" can serve as a convention to relate spatial and temporal dimensions:

Space can be a metaphor for time, the earliest event being placed in the foreground, later events on a series of planes in the background or to the sides. The different planes are areas within a coherent stage-like structure, indicating the progression of an action in meaning as well as time. (9)

A painting has a set of characters which should not exceed a certain number as a play should follow the law of economy and not be crowded with too many characters. To this principle consented both Richardson and Dryden, each of them using a parallel from the other's art :

No supernumerary Figures, or Ornaments ought to be brought into a Picture. A Painter's Language is his Pencil, he should neither say too little nor too much, but go directly to his Point, and tell his Story with all possible Simplicity. As in a Play, there must not be too many Actors, in a Picture there must not be too many Figures. (10)

When there are more figures in a picture than are necessary, or at least ornamental, our author calls them "figures to be let"; because the picture has no use of them. So I have seen in some modern plays above twenty actors, when the action has not required half the number. (11)

In painting, as on the stage, the basic means of defining a character are gesture and expression as well as clothing (of course, in acting there is the added advantage of giving voice to one's passions). Theoretical works on both arts justify the argument that the similarities in descriptive language are founded on a mutual influence between the two. Dryden -- stressing the parallel between acting and painting -- quotes Du Fresnoy on the subject of placing a central character in a conspicuous place:

The principal figure of the subject must appear in the midst of the picture, under the principal light, to distinguish it from the rest, which are only its attendants. Thus, in a tragedy, or an epic poem, the

hero of the piece must be advanced foremost to the view of the reader, or spectator: he must outshine the rest of all the characters; he must appear the prince of them, like the sun in the Copernican system, encompassed with the less noble planets: because the hero is the centre of the main action; all the lines from the circumference tend to him alone: he is the chief object of pity in the drama, and of admiration in the epic poem. (12)

Gesture is the principal constituent in building up characters both in painting and acting. As far as the propriety of gesture and countenance is concerned, various eighteenth-century painters, among whom were Lairesse and Richardson, illustrated the differences depending on the passion they wanted to express in physical terms borrowed from contemporary scientific treatises (actors did the same). Le Brun, paid great attention to the face thus paying tribute to the classical view that "the whole man is seen in head" and that "if man be truly said to be the Epitome of the whole Man". Hogarth's representation of "horror" in Richard III -- and even before that, in the figure of Rakewell -- corresponds to Le Brun's description of the various passions. Garrick's Richard III has been identified as a faithful enactment on the stage of Le Brun's "horror" which, of course, has given rise to the question as to the extent to which actors studied paintings to improve their performance. (13) Alastair Smart is of the opinion that this was indeed the case. Stage theoreticians leave no doubt as to the acceptability of this practice if we can go by their

recommendations to actors to follow such an approach.

Another similarity between painting and acting was their prescriptive attitude toward scenes of violence: Richardson drew attention to violence in painting, pointing out that Michaelangelo committed this mistake several times:

Polydore, in a Drawing I have seen of him has made an ill choice with respect to Decorum; he has shewn Cato with his Bowels gushing out, which is not only offensive in it self, but 'tis a situation in which Cato should not be seen, 'tis Indecent; such things should be left to Imagination, and not display'd on the Stage. But Michelangelo, in his Last Judgement, has sinn'd against this Rule most egregiously.
(14)

Addison, speaking for drama, advanced the idea of improbability as an argument for avoiding battles on the stage. However, it is obvious from the rhetoric of the following quotation that the moral impropriety loomed prominent in his mind:

I have sometimes seen a couple of armies drawn up together upon the stage, when the poet has been disposed to do honour to his generals. It is impossible for the reader's imagination to multiply twenty men into such prodigious multitudes, or to fancy that two or three hundred thousand soldiers are fighting in a room of forty or fifty yards in compass. Incidents of such nature should be told, not represented. ... I should likewise be glad if we imitated the French in banishing from our stage the noise of drums, trumpets and huzzas; which is sometimes so very great, that when there is a battle in the Haymarket Theatre, one may hear it as far as Charing Cross. (15)

The form that came nearest to a stage performance

was Hogarth's "conversation piece". Hogarth was the first to acknowledge that his art was based on observations of stage presentation:

I therefore wished to compose pictures on canvas, similar to representations on the stage; and farther hope that they will be tried by the same test, and criticized by the same criterion. ... I have endeavoured to treat my subjects as a dramatic writer; my picture is my stage, and men and women my players, who, by means of certain actions and gestures, are to exhibit a dumb show. (16)

One of the characteristics of Hogarth's art in his "dumb show" is to captivate characters in the midst of action, and, by freezing the scene, to eternalize the transience of feeling and gesture. This can only apply to the stage and no other literary form; for drama, by its nature, is meant to arrest action by focusing on the scene as well as by pursuing a linear method of ordering its material as in the novel.

Hogarth, in his direct theories on acting, reinforced the view held by stage theoreticians that passions are raised through spontaneous gesture the nature of which is entirely left to the actor to determine:

Action consider'd with regard to assisting the author's meaning, by enforcing the sentiments or raising the passions, must be left entirely to the judgement of the performer, we only pretend to shew how the limbs may be made to have an equal readiness to move in all such directions as may be required. (17)

Not only did Hogarth disapprove of the hackneyed style of acting according to a set of imposed rules but he also stipulated and theoretically justified the right of the actor to interpret the play in terms of action as he chooses. His theory about how to achieve comic effects through the use of lines was that the fewer the strokes are, the more ridiculous the actor appears since the movement of one muscle involves the synchronous activation of several others related to it. Therefore, restriction to certain combinations of movement can grow "stale to the audience, become at least subject to mimicry and ridicule, which would hardly be the case, if an actor were possessed of such general principles as include a knowledge of the effects of all the movements that the body is capable of". (18)

Of several attempts to compare painting and acting in the eighteenth century, we distinguish Aaron Hill's article in The London Daily Advertiser, in which he set off a number of actors against famous painters according to their excellency in different aspects of acting expressed in terms borrowed from painting. Accordingly, Barry's counterpart is Julio Romano; Garrick's is Titian; Bellamy's is Tintaret while Mrs Cibber's is Corregio; Mrs Pritchard's is Hannibal Carrache; Woodward's is Paul Veronese; and Macklin's, who overshadows them all in design, is Michael Angelo (30 December 1751).

In the discussion of acting techniques that will

follow, I shall relate, where appropriate, gesture in painting to gesture on the stage. This will be done in two ways: firstly, by indicating how the stage provided subject matter for painters, and, secondly, how eighteenth-century players resorted to painting as a means of studying character.

In the third chapter, I stressed the growing significance of action and voice in the pulpit. I also argued that pulpit oratory and stage shared some fundamental principles which originated in the psychological/physiological theory of the eighteenth century. (19) In some ways, acting theories were developed not simply as a result of current philosophical orientations but also to suit the dramatic production of the period under discussion.

The theatre of the eighteenth century was the carrier proper of sentimentality due to the conviction that feelings were too sublime for the printed word and could only be expressed in gesture and countenance. Rogerson describes "the technique of expression" as the "essential property of sentimentalism". (20) The main reason for this was the physical proximity of the spectator to the actor whose mental energy could reach and inflame the hearts of all within his sight.

It must have so far emerged that a new theory of

acting had begun to be formulated from the beginning of the eighteenth century which gradually developed into what they then used to call "natural" or "new" as opposed to "artificial" or "old". I say "gradually" because even Betterton had introduced new ideas at the beginning of the eighteenth century, and some of the parts he acted had great similarities in effect to those of Garrick.

The two opposing modes were "nature" and "art". Although it was unanimously accepted that one should act from the heart, one found oneself the butt of criticism for deviating from what others had carefully worked out to be "natural". Actors entered into the particulars of acting and broke down passions to their physical constituents in a scientific way that exemplified almost every other aspect of life in the eighteenth century. The theory of passions, as I have shown in Chapter Two, was the central idea round which revolved all theories of acting. Rogerson confirms the fact that "before the eighteenth century little was written on the stage-delivery of the passions, though an occasional teacher of oratory could be found quoting Quintilian on the subject." (21)

Despite the professed departure from the "old" conventionalized style of acting which was basically founded on rhetorical tradition reinforced by painting theory from France through the numerous translations of Le Brun in English and his subsequent influence on Hogarth, the

theoretical basis of the "new" or "natural" acting was the same universality of passions and gestures as espoused by the "old" school. At least we can assume that not only from the writings of Aaron Hill -- the main stage theoretician -- but also from the work of Charles Macklin, who was supposed to belong to the stage innovators:

Now, unless the Actor knows the genus, species, and characteristic, that he is about to imitate, he will fall short in his execution. The Actor must restrict all his powers, and convert them to the purpose of imitating the looks, tones, and gestures, that can best describe the characteristic that the Poet has drawn: for each Passion and Humour has its genus of looks, tones, and gestures, its species, and its individual characteristic. Avarice, for instance, has its genus, species, and individual characteristic. Moliere has given the genus. (22)

The concepts of "naturalness" and "premeditation" were very much involved in acting and theatrical criticism in the same way that "feeling" and "reason" were treated in the philosophical works of the same period. It was Garrick's practice to observe carefully people of all walks of life in their daily manifestations and then to try to imitate their action. The ability of the actor to distance himself from the part he was acting was an essential for preventing emotion from getting the better of the actor. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that Theophilus Cibber attacked Garrick several times on the grounds of "unnaturalness" and "premeditation".

Players were also judged on the basis of their natural attributes which qualified them for some parts and disqualified them for others. Again this explains why Garrick was criticized from all sides for choosing to act Othello knowing that the lack of volume in his voice would not enable him to cope with the high tones which this specific part required.

A new criterion for eighteenth-century actors was "sensibility" , that is, the range of passions a player could go through in a simple part. The more passions one included in his gamut, the more parts he could undertake and the closer one could get to the audience. John Hill was of the opinion that tragedy required strong powerful passions whereas comedy asked for a greater variety of passions rather than intensity:

By the term sensibility, people are too apt to conceive nothing but a feeling for the tender and melancholy passions; but it is applicable to all. The difference between the comic and the tragic player in this respect, is that the first must have a more general, and the other a more powerful sensibility. The comedian is expected to feel more passions than the tragedian, but the tragedian must feel them the more strongly. (23)

Although the eighteenth century viewed the ability to feel as a value, imitation was not totally discarded by the players; on the contrary, it was common practice to imitate gesture and countenance from everyday life and from

the arts -- especially, painting.

Modern critics have attempted to place eighteenth-century actors and acting techniques under categories. Even if some patterns may gradually emerge, there is a continuity in the theory of expression which was first presented in rhetoric manuals that does not allow for divisions by period or group of actors. There is no denying Garrick's and Macklin's innovations, but it goes without saying that both of them conformed to classical modes of expression as those were depicted in paintings or recommended in stage treatises. Therefore, I shall discuss a number of actors and actresses, active in the first three quarters of the eighteenth century. The organization of the discussion will be chronological, and my intention is to indicate how and why some generalizations can be made, and some patterns can emerge. These patterns can be traced in the expectations of the spectators who used to rush from one theatre to another in order to compare different interpretations of the same part.

In practice, a good deal depended on the relationship between actor and spectator: as long as the audiences were pleased with a certain interpretation, the expert's or the actor's views did not matter much. Lichtenberg, a learned physician and theatre critic bears testimony to this division in critical opinion. Comparing Weston's and Garrick's *Abel Drugger*, Lichtenberg makes the following

remark:

Most of the audience clap and laugh, and even the critic smiles at the ridiculous fellow (Weston as Abel Drugger). But when Garrick plays Abel Drugger it is the critic who leads the applause. Here we have a vastly different creature, an epitome of the author's purpose, heightened by a comprehensive knowledge of his characteristic traits, and interpreted so that he may be clearly understood from the top gallery downwards. (24)

Many conflicts among critics resulted naturally from different definitions of "natural" and "artificial". Despite the downright denunciation of imitation by John Hill and most other critics of the period, "art" couched either as "understanding" or as a recommendation to the players to study paintings as an ancillary means of instruction was never really displaced. As Taylor points out, in spite of the fact that eighteenth-century stage players perceived emotional reality in terms of passions, when it came to the actual process, they applied an intellectual approach to gesture as would indicate their rehearsals in front of a mirror and the number of treatises on painting and sculpture brought to their assistance:

What I think this interpretation of behaviour in terms of passion also explains, is the practice of eighteenth-century actors of making isolated and individual points, rather than seeking the overall development of the character. The actor who could convey one specific passion in a single line or gesture caused the whole audience to applaud that one "stroke of nature", unlike a modern audience which

watches the gradual unfolding of a personality through the development of the action of a play, withholding their applause until the whole process, or life of the performance, has been completed. A fine example of this is Garrick's famous start at seeing the ghost in Hamlet. (25)

If the problem of piecing together and reconstructing gestures and facial expressions in the eighteenth-century theatre and trying to attach the label of "naturalness" or "artificiality" is daunting, the task of doing the same with speech is insurmountable. One has reason to believe that theatrical speech in the eighteenth century -- though it had moved a long way from Restoration patterns -- never really became natural, only an approximation of our concept of naturalness nowadays. From converging descriptions of speech delivery on the Restoration stage, it seems that there was some kind of monotony -- much more so in tragedy because of the limitations imposed by the verse form. This is the first characteristic attributed to theatrical speech in that period with a second one accompanying it almost as a natural corollary; and that was loudness or "exertion of the lungs".

The problem that arises is evidently how one defines this monotony so much spoken of and condemned later by eighteenth-century actors and critics. John Hill enumerates the faults as: a) sameness of tone and pronunciation, b) sameness in the close of all periods, and c) repetition of the same accents and inflexions. Hill's description can give

us a clearer idea of the above notions:

The greatest obstacle to true recitation is, the straining the voice: and this many attempt, supposing noise to be that force we speak of. ... The second obstacle to truth in recitation, is monotony. This many have run into from an affected declamatory manner, for the cadences in this form of speaking are too similar. Of this fault there are three distinct kinds. The one is an eternal sameness of tone and pronunciation: this is the fault of only the worst players, and always arises from their attempts at the declamatory manner. The second, is a sameness in the close of all periods; this the old players seem to have been, in general, guilty of. The third kind of monotony is, a repetition of the same accents and inflexions, on all occasions. This is too much the fault of the most considerable of the present players. Many are monotonists of this kind, who never were accused of it. In general, whether we see Jaffeir, or Lear, or Chamont, or Othello, the inflexions of the voice are too much the same in the performer. This is met in nature; but there seems a merit in certain modulations of voice to the player himself; and being applauded for them in one part, he repeats them in twenty. (26)

Cibber, though by no means free of the fault he condemned in others, had already explained that elocution did not lie in the "strength of the lungs" nor did it abide in the "solemn sameness of pronunciation". (27) Betterton was the actor who had never committed that fault, as Cibber observes. The fact that Betterton was aware of the problem of monotony confirms the view that changes had started taking place at the end of the seventeenth century under the influence of treatises on rhetoric either intended for the pulpit or for the stage.

John Hill took it upon himself to answer the claims of those who defended declamation on the grounds of sublimity. He made a nice distinction between sublimity and pomposity placing the latter under oratory rather than under tragedy:

Many have supposed an air of declamation natural to tragedy, because of the grandeur and sublimity of its manner. But things may be too sublime without being pompous; and in this, in a very great degree, consists the difference between tragedy and oration. (28)

And yet, he makes further allowances for parts of Rowe's and Otway's tragedies in which declamation might still have some place due to the pompous style those were written in:

The plays of Rowe and Otway have many parts that will bear this ostentatious, formal, and oratorical manner of recitation, for they are florid, pompous, and descriptive. But those of Shakespear charm us with the fire and fury of Demosthenes, and they should be spoken as that immortal Greek pronounced his similar pieces, with rapidity and force, and freedom and variety. (29)

In comedy, all this is unjustifiable and unnatural and had better be avoided at all costs:

In comedy there is little danger of this, because where every thing is dictated by nature, there is no place for what is so unnatural; but in tragedy it is very difficult to guard against it. (30)

As for gesture, the initiation of innovations in voice dates back to 1692 when Betterton cut out all rant and whining in his acting. What was now desirable is vaguely described as a "musical" voice, an ear for music. This, one

can assume, is labelled as cadence later on in the eighteenth century and is closely linked to the elocutionary movement of Walker and Sheridan. The assumption was that there is an in-built musicality with syllables standing for notes:

The Operation of Speech is strong, not only for the Reason or Wit therein contained, but by its Sound. For in all good Speech there is a sort of Music, with respect to its Measure, Time and Tune. Every well-measured Sentence is proportional Three ways, in all its Parts to the Sentences, and to what is intended to express, and all Words that have Time allowed to their Syllables, as is suitable to the Letters whereof they consist, and to the Order in which they stand in a Sentence. Nor are Words without their Tune or Notes even in common Talk, which together compose that Tune, which is proper to every sentence, and may be pricked down as well as any musical Tune: only in the Tunes of Speech the Notes have much less variety, and have all a short Time. With respect also to Time and Measure, the Poetic is less various, and therefore less powerful, than that of Oratory; the former being like that of a short Country Song repeated to the End of the Poem, but that of Oratory is varied all along, like the Divisions which a skilful Musician runs upon a Lute. (31)

Apparently, the lack of musicality in the Restoration was owing to the fact that actors did not feel their parts. They had a good understanding of them but did not transcend themselves to get into the roles they played. This is a very interesting theory in view of the newly formulated notion of the "sympathetic mechanism". It implies, of course, that once this mechanism begins to

operate, then the physical manifestations will necessarily follow:

But before I mention what Success the Peer (Lord Rochester) had with his Pupil, to give the Reader a clearer Idea, it was certain Mrs. Barry was Mistress of a very good Understanding, yet she having little, or no Ear for Music, which caused her to be thought dull when she was taught by the Actors, because she could not readily catch the Manner of their sounding Words, but ran into a Tone, the Fault of most young Players; this Defect my Lord perceiving, he made her enter into the Nature of each Sentiment; perfectly changing herself, as it were, into the Person, not merely by the proper Stress or Sounding of the Voice, but feeling really, and being in the Humour, the Person she represented, was supposed to be in. (32)

Until at least the retirement of Booth and Cibber, this musical tone existed and was required of the actors. (33) Proceeding to the period between 1730 and 1770, the ranting and blustering had not completely disappeared from the stage as Davies had reason to complain:

Among his (Powell's) worst faults we may reckon an inclination sometimes to rant and bluster, and sometimes to a propensity to whine and blubber. There is no part of acting so difficult as that sort of feeling which is expressed by loud sorrow; the tragic ear, if too wantonly shed, becomes ridiculous, and is apter to excite laughter in an audience than to awaken sensibility. (34)

That which was once and for all dropped from the stage was the "claptrap", the exertion of the voice at the last part of the speech -- and this thanks to Garrick's

efforts, who, according to Davies, "entirely dropt that anxious exertion at the close of a speech, both in look and behaviour, which is called by the comedians a claptrap".(35) Although Davies is prejudiced in crediting Garrick with the changes to the better as far as natural speech is concerned, the merit belongs to Macklin who rather obscurely strove to make natural speech acceptable on the stage and took the pains to teach the members of his company the same:

There was a time when that extravagance, which has been just recommended for farce, had its place in tragedy both in action and delivery. The gestures were forced, and beyond all that ever was in nature, and the recitation was a kind of singing. We are at present getting more into nature in playing; and if the violence of gesture be not quite suppressed, we have nothing of the recitative of the old tragedy. It is to the honour of Mr. Macklin, that he began this great improvement. There was a time when he was excluded the theatres, and supported himself by a company whom he taught to play and some of whom afterwards made no inconsiderable figure. It was his manner to check all the cant and cadence of tragedy; he would bid his pupil first speak the passage as he would in common life, if he had occasion to pronounce the same words; and then giving them more force, but preserving the same accent, to deliver them on the stage. (36)

In the same vein, but, in a way, generalizing this turn toward natural rhythms, Wilkes places the change within an overall modified style of acting:

Formerly a turgid vociferation or effeminate whine accompanied with the most outrageous and unnatural rants, were mistaken for the best display of the heroic and tender passions; but as the established

maxim of our modern Stage is always to keep Nature in view, a great part of this vicious action and utterance has been deservedly exploded; and I believe that, for this reason, Acting is in far greater perfection than ever it was in the days of our forefathers. (37)

An important aspect of speech was the pauses, (38) which were now based on meaning rather than grammar. The innovator was Garrick who was praised for his meaningful units as much by his disciples as he was vehemently attacked by his opponents. Meaningful pauses were not monopolized by Garrick; they were in fact used by various other actors who were striving for natural effects. It also emerges from contemporary accounts and theatrical criticism that the visual aspect was so important as to eclipse, in some cases, the vocal part. Besides, the precedence of action over voice constitutes some proof about this priority even if it was physiologically accounted for in contemporary treatises (Aaron Hill's Essay on Acting). Murphy gives us the following application of this doctrine in Garrick's Hamlet:

In all these shiftings of the passions, his (Garrick's) voice and attitude changed with wonderful celerity, and, at every pause, his face was an index to his mind. On the first appearance of the ghost, such a figure of consternation was never seen. He (Garrick) stood fixed in mute astonishment, and the audience saw him growing paler and paler. After an interval of suspence, he spoke in a low trembling accent, and uttered his questions with the greatest difficulty. (39)

From the above comment one can assume that the audience were

looking out for expression, and secondarily, voice. This momentary suspension of voice set their imagination at work about what was going to follow.

As it will appear in due course, pauses were necessary for a number of reasons. For one thing, actors needed some time before they could go through to the next passion in which they put on the appropriate facial expression and slided into the right posture. One criterion for good acting was to run the whole range of passions in one speech; apparently, this put to the test both muscles and voice. Besides, eighteenth-century play-goers seem to have enjoyed those transitions from one passion to another. They felt they participated in the play by trying to guess which words would best match the visual change in the actor. To illustrate this point, I shall cite Victor's advice to Garrick about the latter's Othello:

I think you shou'd look longer after him before you speak, and in the three places in that speech, if the pauses are not a little longer than you made them, the transitions appear too sudden. (40)

Before discussing the practice of some representative actors and actresses in the eighteenth century, I shall provide a list of those that will occupy the rest of this chapter. Betterton and Mrs Bracegirdle, the last important Restoration players, had abandoned the stage by 1710. I shall only refer to them occasionally. Those who came into

prominence the following three decades were Booth, Wilks and Colley Cibber. In the 1740s David Garrick and Charles Macklin made their spectacular appearance. It is fair to say that Macklin had been experimenting with a new style of acting for some time before Garrick made his debut but had not met with any acknowledgement. James Quin (died in 1766), though strongly opposed to Garrick's style, was in fact acting at the same time and will be discussed together with the latter. Mrs Porter (died in 1762) and Mrs Cibber (died in 1766) also belong to the same period though they were both outlived by Garrick and Macklin by a decade or so. The Barrys were active as long as Garrick (Barry died in 1777). Garrick's ascendancy only ended with his retirement in 1776. Finally, Mrs Pritchard and Mrs Clive retreated from the stage at approximately the same time (1768 and 1769, respectively). Of course, occasional mention may be made of actors who were introduced to the stage as late as the 1760s. Those are King, Shuter and Palmer.

Betterton's greatest part must have been Hamlet if we can go by contemporary critics' accounts of Betterton in this part. Cibber, in his Apology, juxtaposes Betterton's Hamlet to that of various other minor actors who strained themselves in rage and fury or embarked on a needless vociferation at the appearance of the ghost. On the contrary, what was needed on the occasion, according to

Cibber, was "a breathless astonishment ... rever'd". (41)

As Macbeth and Henry VIII, Betterton fell in with the views of Davenant and the fashion of the times. Betterton was inimitable as Macbeth, and no-one ever approached the excellence he achieved in acting the king. Cibber assures his reader that Betterton never mistook elocution for "strength of the lungs" or the "solemn sameness of pronunciation".(42) What is equally significant, Cibber informs us that in Betterton's acting gesture preceded voice in a way anticipating Garrick's practice later on:

In all his (Betterton's) soliloquies of moment, the strong intelligence of his attitude and aspect, drew you into such an impatient gaze, and eager expectation, that you almost imbibed the sentiment with your eye, before the ear could reach it. (43)

The practice of copying one's parts from elders in the profession did not always come off so well as in the case of Betterton who knew how to transform a part by adapting it to his own needs. Thus, Cibber criticizes Wilks after his first appearance at the Theatre Royal for ineffectually copying his Spanish Friar from his predecessor's, Tony Leigh's:

His (Wilks's) first part here, at the Theatre Royal, was the Spanish Friar, in which, tho' he had remembered every Look, and Motion of the late Tony Leigh, so far as to put the spectator very much in mind of him; yet it was visible through the whole, notwithstanding his Exactness in the Out-lines, the true Spirit, that was to

fill up the figure, was not the same, but unskilfully dawb'd on, like a Child's painting upon the Face of a Metzo-tinto: it was too plain to the judicious, that the Conception was not his own, but imprinted in his Memory, by another of whom he only presented a dead Likeness. (44)

In his tragic roles, Wilks used as his model Monfort though again, in Cibber's view, he did not achieve the same effects as the latter. As Macduff in Macbeth, Wilks acted the two scenes in the second act with success but "far short of that happier skill and Grace, which Monfort had formerly shewn, in them". (45) Wilks was generally suited to scenes which required tenderness and vivacity of spirit rather than gravity. Davies acknowledges the propriety of this "vivacity" in showing strong emotions and regards Wilks as unparalleled "in exhibiting the emotions of the overflowing heart with corresponding look and action". (46)

Although Wilks was gifted with elegance and gracefulness, he lacked variety in voice which made him pronounce his words rather too forcibly. As Mark Antony in Julius Caesar, Davies tells us, Wilks deported himself successfully ("a graceful dignity accompanied the action and deportment of this actor" (47)). He was the right person for the funeral harangue over the body of Caesar. "His address through the whole was easy and elegant; but his voice wanted that fulness and variety, requisite to impress the sentiments and pathos with which the speech abounds: besides, Wilks was apt to strike the syllables too forcibly

as well as uniformly."(48) This violent vivacity with which Cibber charged Wilks made him shine as Edgar in King Lear. According to Davies, Wilks in the part of Edgar "excelled in the scenes of love and gallantry, nor was he deficient in the assumed madness". (49) The same suitability for love scenes was evinced in Wilks's Hamlet. Davies grants the fairness of Addison's and Cibber's criticism about the scene with the ghost, but highly praises Wilks's action in his conduct towards his mother:

If Addison and Cibber justly blamed Wilks, for his behaviour to the Ghost in the first act, they could not possibly censure his conduct with his mother in the third. His action was indeed a happy mixture of warm indignation, tempered with the most affecting tenderness. His whole deportment was princely and graceful: when he presented the pictures, the reproaches his animation produced were guarded with filial reluctance; and, when he came to that pathetic expostulation, of:
 "Mother, for love of grace!"
 there was something in his manner inexpressibly gentle and powerfully persuasive. (50)

Macklin preferred Wilks to anyone else in the expression of grief. (51)

Wilks attempted several comic parts with great success. Such were Belmour in Congreve's Old Batchelor and his accomplished Mirabel in The Way of the World. Kirkman gives us Macklin's opinion about Wilks's Lord Townly in The Provoked Husband verbatim. Macklin draws attention to the actor's gentlemanlike behaviour on the stage and also

stresses the fact that, before Wilks spoke, the passions were painted on his face. Another significant comment Macklin makes is that Wilks respected the performance as a group activity, which cannot be said of Garrick:

Lord Townly, as he stands in relation to society in general, must be considered as a man, whose title, fortune, virtues, fine understanding, polished manners, and purity of morals, raise him to the highest dignity and worth that we can conceive of a British Nobleman. As he stands particularly related in the play, he is a benevolent, tender husband; patient under a wife's dissolute follies, and most solicitous for her reformation; a loving brother, and an anxious, sincere friend.

In every situation that the Poet has placed him -- be it in sorrow, joy, patience, anger, love, anxiety, raillery, or even a careless conversation upon the most indifferent subjects, he has been most careful to mark a benevolent heart, and a most polished mind. These characteristics Mr Wilks observed to such a degree of amiable and elegant imitation, that they seemed, indeed, as they were in a great degree, the native and habitual qualities of the man himself.

As soon as the curtain was drawn up, before he spoke a word, the audience might behold in his visage, position, and the gesture that introduced and accompanied the words -- "Why did I marry !" an oppression of spirits, mixed with a benevolence and tender anxiety, and accompanied with a politeness of mien and manner, that completely gave that mixed and pleasing idea which the mind conceives of an accomplished man of fashion, and a nobleman in such a situation.

His very dress, in make and fancy, was that of a man of sense and taste. He was not harnessed or loaded with tinselled finery, but dressed modestly, in distinguished elegance. He had no sooner uttered the words that begin the play --

"Why did I marry!" than the audience became intimate with his condition -- So feelingly were they spoken, and so absorbed did he seem, at once, in conjugal solicitude; and, all through that soliloquy, he was sunk in the deepest conjugal anxiety.

All the various starts of the mind, marked, and painted by an anxious sagacity of reasoning; and distinguished and pointed by shrugs, looks, tones, and gesture, that seemed the native efforts and emanations of the heart; yet, all tempered by an apparent tenderness and unalterable affection for the woman he was censuring, were truly and naturally delineated by Mr Wilks.

He was remarkable for being always busy upon the stage -- never idle; always in attention to the characters in the scene with him, or else in a restless perturbed motion and agitation, from the supposed passion and circumstances of the character he represented. (52)

If Wilks lacked in variety and his voice was too rush to achieve a broad range of emotions in a single speech, Booth possessed such control over his voice that even "the blind might have seen him". Aaron Hill credits Booth with "learning" and "judgement" which helped him decide whether his character agreed with the parts he was to act. His face wore the appropriate expression and his body slid into the right posture before uttering a word of his speech. This was, of course, in agreement with the theatrical conventions of the time:

He (Booth) had a talent at discovering the passions, where they lay hid, in some celebrated parts; having been buried under a prescription of rantings and monotony, by the practice of other actors: When he had discover'd, he soon grew able to express 'em. And his secret, by which he attain'd this great lesson of the Theatre, was an

association, or adaption of his look to his voice; by which artful imitation of nature, the variations, in the sound of his words, gave propriety to every change in his countenance. So that, among Players, in whom it is common to hear pity pronounc'd with a frown upon the forehead, sorrow express'd, by a grin upon the eye, and anger thunder'd out, with a look of unnatural serenity, it was Mr. Booth's peculiar felicity, to be heard, and seen the same; whether as the pleas'd, the griev'd, the pitying, the reproachful or the angry; one would almost be tempted, to borrow the aid of a very bold figure, and to express this excellence the more significantly, beg permission to affirm, that the blind might have seen him, in his voice, and the deaf have heard him, in his visage.

His gesture, or, as it is commonly call'd, his action, was but the result, and necessary consequence of this dominion over his voice, and countenance; for having, by concurrence of two such causes impress'd his imagination, with the stamp, and spirit, of a passion, his nerves obey'd the impulse by a kind of natural dependency, and relax'd, or brac'd, successively, into all that fine expressiveness, with which he painted what he spoke, without restraint, or affectation. (53)

Cibber attributed the same qualities to Booth in a comparison with Wilks. According to Cibber, while Wilks formed his style of acting on the model of Monfort, Booth did so on that of Betterton:

Booth and he (Wilks) were Actors so directly opposite in their Manner, that, if either of them could have borrow'd a little of the other's Fault, they would both have been improv'd by it: if Wilks had sometimes too violent a Vivacity; Booth as often contented himself with too grave a Dignity: The Latter seem'd too much to heave up his Words, as the Other to dart them to the Ear, with too quick, and sharp a Vehemence:

Thus Wilks would too frequently break into the Time, and Measure of the Harmony, by too many spirited Accents, in one Line; and Booth, by too solemn a Regard to Harmony, would as often lose the Necessary Spirit of it: So that (as I have observ'd) could we have sometimes rais'd the one, and sunk the other, they had both been nearer to the Mark. Yet this could not be always objected to them: They had their Intervals of unexceptionable Excellence, that more, than balanc'd their Errors. (54)

Booth succeeded Betterton in the part of Henry VIII. Although, according to Davies, this part requires great dignity, it must at the same time retain a vein of humour, which renders the actor's task very taxing. Booth was highly admired in this performance by Quin who tried to imitate Booth's example but fell far short of it:

Booth succeeded Betterton in Henry VIII. To support the dignity of the prince, and yet retain that vein of humour which pervades this character, requires great caution in the actor. Without particular attention, Harry will be manufactured into a royal bully or ridiculous buffoon. Booth was particularly happy in preserving the true spirit of the part through the whole play. Mr. Macklin, who had the good fortune to see him several times in Harry, has declared that he shone in the character with particular lustre. Quin, who had the good sense to admire and imitate Booth, and the honesty to own it, kept as near as possible to his great exemplar's portrait; but Quin was deficient in flexibility as well as strength of voice; he could not utter impetuous and vehement anger with vigour, nor dart tremendous looks; all which were suited to the happier organs and countenance of Booth. He was, besides, a stranger to grace in action or deportment. -- Booth walked with the ease of a gentleman and the dignity of a monarch. The grandeur and magnificence of Henry

were, in Booth, sustained to the height.
(55)

The part of Pistol in the same play was taken on by Theophilus Cibber, who was immortalized in that character by Hogarth. Cibber gained such a reputation for his comic action in that part that he kept the nickname of Pistol for the rest of his life. Davies provides a vivid description of Cibber's action:

He (Theophilus Cibber) assumed a peculiar kind of false spirit, and uncommon blustering, with such turgid action, and long unmeasurable strides, that it was impossible not to laugh at so extravagant a figure, with such loud and grotesque vociferation. (56)

Booth made good use of his judgement and understanding when it came to reinterpreting and adapting parts to his own abilities and needs. An example of this is his King Lear. Booth realized that it was impossible to imitate Betterton in this part unless he made some changes of his own as Powell did later with Garrick's Lear. Although Davies admits that "Booth was more rapid than Garrick, his fire was ardent and his feelings were remarkably energetic" he thinks that Booth's feelings "were not attended with those powerful emotions of conflicting passions, so visible in every look, action, and attitude, of our great Roscius". (57) However, if we heed Betterton's views on the enactment of Alexander's madness, (58) Booth possessed this "smoothness" in voice which would have saved him from an

unwanted hoarseness with which Theophilus Cibber charged Garrick later. Booth's voice could reach high pitch without affecting its musical tone, and this was the main advantage at hand. His masterpiece was Hotspur in Henry IV partly because of the asset of his voice as Davies informs us:

Booth's Hotspur was, in the opinion of the critics who saw him in the character, one of the most perfect exhibitions of the stage. His strong, yet harmonious, pipe, reached the highest rate of exclamatory rage without hurting the music of its tone. His gesture was ever in union with his utterance, and his eye constantly combined with both to give a correspondent force to the passion. His tread in this part was quick, yet significant, accompanied with princely grandeur. (59)

Garrick, later on, did not avoid the fault of extreme loudness and hoarseness as his voice would not sustain him throughout the part.

Colley Cibber was a far inferior actor to both Wilks and Booth. He was better suited to comic roles while he was vehemently criticized in tragic ones. One of the worst mistakes Cibber fell into was mimicking an action without accompanying it with words. Critics did not need a "new" school of acting to tell them that this was wrong. Betterton had strongly criticized "dumb shews" before.(60) Davies writes of Cibber as Wolsey:

The action of Colley Cibber, in speaking this ("This candle burns not clear; 'tis I must snuff it, and out it goes"), I have heard much condemned: he imitated, with his fore-finger and thumb, the extinguishing of a candle with a pair of snuffers. But

surely the reader will laugh at such mimicry, which, if practised, would make a player's action as ridiculous as a monkey's. (61)

Generally speaking, "Colley Cibber's pride and passion, in Wolsey, were impotent and almost farcical. His grief, resignation, and tenderness, were inadequate, from a deficiency of those powers of expression which the melting tones of voice, and a corresponding propriety of gesture, can alone bestow". (62)

Davies, not very complimentary to Cibber, taxes him with a hypocritical streak improper to acting. In tragic roles, Cibber was deplorable and was only suffered to undertake such parts as Iago because of his merit in comic ones:

Iago he (Colley Cibber) acted in a style so drawling and hypocritical, and wore the mask of honesty so loosely, that Othello, who is not drawn a fool, must have seen the villain through his thin disguises. (63)

Cibber claimed some success with his Bayes as he managed to delineate his character "sufficiently ridiculous" though "he rather exhibited the laughter at Bayes's extravagances than the man that was enamoured of them". (64) As Witwou'd in The Way of the World, Cibber met with great applause. The character was of his own drawing and the volubility of his speech resembled that of King in the same part. (65) Finally Cibber's Sir John Brute must have been superb for Davies to give preference to Cibber's drunken scene rather than Garrick's:

After enlarging so much on the great perfection of acting which Cibber displayed in the closet-scene, where Constant and Heartfree are discovered, I cannot there give the preference to Garrick, though of all the actors of drunken-scenes he was allowed to be the most natural and diverting; but impartiality requires me here to give the palm to Cibber. (66)

From the above outline of the three prominent actors before the appearance of Garrick and Macklin, it seems that the impact of the Traité and the new elocution had made itself felt on the stage too. The musicality of the voice, the precedence of gesture over speech, variety in action and speech were by now the most essential attributes in one's acting. Despite the fact that both Macklin and Garrick had a different, in some ways, new perception of acting techniques, in practice there were hardly any signs justifying the common theoretical background. Besides, the two actors not only followed a totally dissimilar course of action but also exerted severe criticism against each other. In all fairness, Macklin held the sceptre in intensity and frequency though he was, many times, seconded by critics and other actors sharing his views.

After Garrick had entered into a covenant with Fleetwood (1743), thus breaching his pledge to Macklin to support the latter till victory over the management, Macklin was disengaged from Drury Lane. Macklin "collected together a company of persons, almost wholly unacquainted, at that

time, with the business of an Actor, among whom were, the celebrated Mr. Foote, Dr. Hill, and several others; and undertook to instruct them in the science of acting". (67) Macklin's method of instructing his pupils was highly acclaimed by John Hill whose ambition was to free the stage from all cant and cadence. However, the time was not ripe for such radical innovations and Macklin's attempts simply failed. Macklin himself had to leave London and continue his acting career in provincial theatres.

The concept of a strong "sensibility" was by now firmly rooted in acting theory while rules had been rationalized and couched in pseudo-scientific terms. Thus, Mrs Cibber was said to possess "that sensibility which despised all art";(68) and yet, she was praised for being able to concentrate all feelings and emotions in the look of her eyes -- an originally neoclassical doctrine that was transferred to acting through Le Brun's influence on English philosophy. (69)

One of the differences between older actors such as Quin and those who made their debut in the 1740s was their relationship with the audience. Quin opted for the more austere roles whose dignified and grave action predominated over passions. Therefore, it is hardly likely that Quin would have been able to draw himself close to the spectator and involve him in participating in stage action:

To Mr. Quin's various excellences in acting

I have endeavoured to do equal justice; and in general we have authority to say, that to his various parts in comedy may be added no mean list of dignified characters in tragedy, where sentiment and gravity of action and not passion, predominated. (70)

Garrick, on the other hand, remoulded those characters -- to the delight of his audience -- rendering them more accessible to his audience than any of his predecessors had ever done. As Leigh Woods points out, Garrick inserted a sentimental component in his style of acting. The term "sentimental" needs clarification as it is not meant to imply merely a response to an audience's developed sensibility, or, more bluntly, disposition for crying, but rather to help communication with the audience. Through a number of devices, Garrick brought several of the heroes he acted closer to the audience, allowing, therefore, for an identification of average spectator and character, which had not been possible before. Garrick exploited the inherent belief in sentimental drama that a character can change and reform. As a result, he attempted a sympathetic enactment of the characters who had before appeared austere, remote, or even callous. An example of this transformation is the part of Hamlet on which Davies commented in his Dramatic Miscellanies (see p. 186 of this chapter). Jocelyn Powell locates the difference between Restoration and eighteenth-century acting as an antithesis of intellectual vs passionate approach. According to this critic, in the

Restoration drama sought to convey a moral by appealing to the understanding rather than the emotions of the audience. Restoration acting was formal rather than mechanical to suit the poetic truth of the texts it presented. (71)

From the accounts we have about different actors, there arises a pattern of role assignment which depended on fixed qualities and natural attributes. Actors avoided trespassing on others' territory in case they were overshadowed. Barry's Othello, for example, was thought to be superior to any other's including Booth's and Betterton's. Barry was admired for his excellence in parts which involved tender and soft passions rather than violent ones. Due to those preconceptions, contemporary critics turned against Barry's venture to undertake the parts of Richard III and Macbeth:

Richard the Third and Macbeth, he never should have attempted, for he was deficient in representing the violent emotions of the soul; nor could a countenance so placid as his ever wear the strong impressions of despair and horror. (72)

A considerable number of eighteenth century productions were based on Shakespearian plays. Garrick made his debut on 9 October 1741 with Richard III -- a part in which Cibber had been much admired. Davies capitulates the general impression Garrick's style made on critics, thus, foreshadowing the direction in which stage controversies would move:

Mr. Garrick's easy and familiar, yet forcible style in speaking and acting, at first threw the critics into some hesitation concerning the novelty as well as propriety of his manner. They had been long accustomed to an elevation of the voice, with a sudden mechanical depression of its tones, calculated to excite admiration, and to intrap applause. To the just modulation of the words, and concurring expression of the features from the genuine workings of nature, they had been strangers at least for some time. (73)

One of those critics who were seriously disturbed by Garrick's innovations was Theophilus Cibber. Although Cibber may have been prejudiced against Garrick's person, his complaints prefigure similar criticism that was to follow from even more sympathetic advocates of the "natural" school with Macklin the most representative of the latter category. To return to Cibber, however, he thought that "the frequent starts" "tire the Eye" and "offend the Understanding" when they occur so frequently as in Garrick's Richard. (74)

Modern critics have pointed out that, despite the professed departure from convention, some of Garrick's gestures in Richard III were founded on rhetorical tradition reinforced by painting theory from France.(75) Hogarth's great portrait of Garrick as Richard the Third in the Tent Scene depicts Garrick as he appeared at that moment in the actual performance.(76) According to Alastair Smart, Hogarth painted this portrait as he had done his Rakewell. The latter had been drawn on Le Brun's mean between horror and admiration:

"In Horror"; Le Brun says, "the face will appear of a pale colour; the Lips and Eyes a little upon the livid"; and he directs that the hands must be open "and close pressed to the body". (77)

The correspondence between the real gesture and the theoretical description of Le Brun shows that Garrick was bent on the artistic goal of dramatic effect, bringing intelligent calculation to his performing. It may be the case that Garrick responded to Aaron Hill's urge to keep a notebook containing drawings of figures in different attitudes for reference purposes:

But the only certain advantageous use of the compendium, for an art of picturing the passions, to so supreme a master of that art, as you already are, is in a way, to ease your study; by a course of memorandum figures, referential to a note book, proper to each part, of consequence. And marked with all its passions, and apt hints, of striking opportunities, for attitude. (78)

The above practice recommended by Hill presupposes the use of studied gesture and, therefore, poses the question of "natural" vs "artificial" in eighteenth-century acting and, by implication, of whether Garrick really broke away from tradition or compromised the "old" and the "new". Alastair Smart very appropriately points out the difficulties in distinguishing what was "natural" or "theatrical" in different periods:

The further question arises whether certain gestures and expressions which today would be considered unnatural or theatrical were once habitual. The difficulty is to

distinguish between the simply natural and the convention that has become "second nature": but when we consider how profoundly modes of sensibility and ways of thinking have changed throughout the centuries, it seems less difficult to accept the idea that habitual gesture may have altered no less radically. Conventional gesture, certainly, has undergone quite extraordinary changes, with the consequence that what may be taken for the theatrical or the affected in a painting, even outside the recognized conventions of the history-picture may be nothing of the kind. (79)

Garrick's success in Richard III notwithstanding, Mossop fared well in the same part later on. Eighteenth-century audiences were drawn to the play-house by Mossop's harmonious voice. In a way reminiscent of Garrick, Mossop established his theatrical reputation with the same part as Garrick had before. Murphy admits to Mossop's superiority in voice though he charges him with lack of grace in movement:

His (Mossop's) movements wanted ease and grace, but that defect was overlooked on account of his superior excellence. His voice was manly, strong, and of great compass, without the melody of Barry, but harmonious from the lowest note to the highest elevation. His first appearance on the London stage, was early in September, in the character of Richard III, an arduous undertaking, but, notwithstanding Garrick's superior excellence, he met with unbounded applause. (80)

Garrick had been preparing his Macbeth for some time before the actual performance. In anticipation of the reactions that would follow his interpretation, he published An Essay on Acting in 1744, which contains valuable

information about Garrick's conduct in crucial scenes. Some passages from the Essay confirm the view that Garrick had a clear image of the physical attitudes he would assume in the actual performance. In a minute description from the Essay we learn exactly how Macbeth reacted to Duncan's murder:

When the Murder of Duncan is committed, from an immediate Consciousness of the Fact, his Ambition is ingulph'd at that Instant by the Horror of the Deed; his Faculties are instantly riveted to the Murder alone, without having the least Consolation of the consequential Advantages, to comfort him in that Exigency. He should at that Time, be a moving Statue, or indeed a petrify'd Man; his Eyes must Speak, and his Tongue be metaphorically silent; his Ears must be sensible of imaginary Noises, and deaf to the present and audible Voice of his Wife: his Attitude must be quick and permanent; his Voice articulately trembling, and confusedly intelligible; the Murderer should be seen in every Limb, and yet every Member, at that Instant, should seem separated from his Body, and his Body from his Soul: This is the Picture of a compleat Regicide, and as at that Time the Orb below should be hush as death; I hope I shall not be thought minutely circumstantial, if I should advise a real Genius to wear Cork Heels to his Shoes as in this Scene he should seem to tread on Air. (81)

Although Garrick did not escape the criticism for cluttering his action with too many starts, (82) in the part of Macbeth he had the opportunity to exhibit his skills to the best. He "excelled in the expression of convulsive throes and dying agonies".(83) Physically speaking, Quin was better suited to the part than Garrick, but he was inhibited by a lack of modulation in his voice and could not,

therefore, "assume the strong agitation of mind before the murder of the king, nor the remorse and anguish in consequence of it: -- much less could he put on that mixture of despair, rage and frenzy, that mark the last scenes of Macbeth. During the whole representation he scarce ever deviated from a dull, heavy, monotony. (84)

An illustrative example of the different approaches of Garrick and Quin is contained in the description of clutching the air-drawn dagger. Garrick implicitly criticizes Quin for his eye movement in the dagger scene and his clutching gestures while at the same time he preconceives his reader about the way he intended to conduct himself:

In this visionary Horror, he should not rivet his Eyes to the imaginary Object, as if it really was there, but should show an unsettled Motion in his Eye, like one not quite awakened from some disordering Dream; his Hands and Fingers should not be immoveable, but restless and endeavouring to disperse the Cloud that over shadows his optic ray, and bedims his intellects; here would be Confusion, Disorder, and agony! "Come let me clutch thee!" is not to be done with one motion only, but by several successive catches at it, first with one Hand and then with the other, preserving the same Motion at the same Time, with his Feet, like a Man, who out of his Depth, and half drowned in his Struggles, catches at Air for Substance: this would make the Spectator's blood run cold, and he would almost feel the Agonies of the Murderer himself. (85)

Garricks's theoretical postulations are enough proof

that he disciplined his action and that he developed the art to conceal art. At least this is suggested by Dawes's painting (86) of Garrick as Macbeth in Act IV, Scene i, which captures the exact moment in the witches' cave during Garrick's production. In this painting, Garrick stands in the centre in the familiar ballet posture with the left hand projected in front of him in the same manner that we find it in Hogarth's rendition of the Tent Scene in Richard III.

Responding to the sensibility of eighteenth-century audiences, Garrick increased the pathos of the last moments of Macbeth by providing a death scene which was preserved into the nineteenth century. Jean Georges Noverre, who has given us a detailed account of the scene and its effects, observes that the French spectators were impressed by it whereas English play-goers literally relished it. Such representations were rather rare on the French stage and quite appealing to the English spectators due to a different attitude toward the representation of violence on the stage. Noverre comments on the scene at length emphasizing the inner agony that attended Garrick's dying scenes rather than the bodily pain:

I shall add only one word more regarding this distinguished actor to prove the superiority of his talents. I have seen him represent a tragedy which he had touched up, because in addition to his merits as an actor he was one of the most pleasing poets of his country. I have seen him represent a tyrant who, appaled at the enormity of his crime, dies torn with

remorse. The last act was given up to regrets and grief, humanity triumphed over murder and barbarism; the tyrant obedient to the voice of conscience, denounced his crimes aloud; they gradually became his judges and his executioners; the approach of death showed each instant on his face; his eyes became dim, his voice could not support the efforts he made to speak his thoughts. His gestures, without losing their expression, revealed the approach of his last moment; his legs gave way under him, his face lengthened, his pale and livid features bore the signs of suffering and repentance. At last, he fell; at that moment his crimes peopled his thoughts with the most horrible forms; terrified at the hideous pictures which his past acts revealed to him, he struggled against death; nature seemed to make one supreme effort. His plight made the audience shudder, he clawed the ground and seemed to be digging his own grave, but the dread moment was nigh, one saw death in reality, everything expressed that instant which makes all equal. In the end he expired. The death-rattle and the convulsive movements of the features, arms and breast, gave the final touch to this terrible picture. (87)

Beside Garrick, Mrs Pritchard was an inimitable Mrs Macbeth. She was no less praised in the display of feeling and agitation, especially, in the banquet scene and the one following the murder. Davies has immortalized the banquet scene in the following account:

This admirable scene (the banquet scene) was greatly supported by the speaking terrors of Garrick's look and action. Mrs. Pritchard shewed admirable art in endeavouring to hide Macbeth's frenzy from the observation of the guests, by drawing their attention to conviviality. She smiled on one, whispered to another, and distantly saluted a third; in short, she practiced every possible artifice to hide

the transaction that passed between her husband and the vision his disturbed imagination had raised. Her reproving and angry looks, which glanced towards Macbeth, at the same time were mixed with marks of inward vexation and uneasiness. When, at last, as if unable to support her feelings any longer, she rose from her seat, and seized his arm, and, with a half-whisper of terror, said, "Are you a man!" she assumed a look of such anger, indignation, and contempt, as cannot be surpassed. (88)

Ryan as Macduff was so persuasive in assuming the expression of terror and astonishment that -- Davies informs us -- he was the only actor to impose on his spectator that he had seen his king murdered. However, he had one fault to fight against: the harshness of his voice. (89)

Garrick's Hamlet became the subject of controversy in contemporary theatrical criticism. Answering the demands of his audience, Garrick "sentimentalized" Hamlet to affect their sensibilities with "a tear of anguish". Davies must have been well aware of Garrick's aim:

But here it must be owned that Garrick rose superior to all competition: his self-expostulations, and upbraidings of cowardice and pusillanimity, were strongly pointed, and blended with marks of contemptuous indignation; the description of his uncle, held up at once a portrait of horror and derision. When he closed his strong paintings with the epithet, kindness villain! a tear of anguish gave a most pathetic softness to the whole passionate ebullition. One strong feature of Hamlet's character is filial piety: this Garrick preserved through the part. By restoring a few lines, which preceding Hamlets had omitted, he gave a vigour, as well as

connection, to the various members of the soliloquy. (90)

Garrick preserved some of the conventions that rhetoricians had recommended for the expression of astonishment. As Stone remarks, "Garrick did not discard completely the ways and means of gaining theatrical effects suggested by the rhetoricians -- the stance, the gesture, position of hands, arms, direction of gaze, and opening of mouth were those pretty much set forth by Le Brun and the early theoreticians".(91) Garrick's first encounter with the ghost an adequate description of which has been provided by Lichtenberg is an illustration of the influence of painterly modes on the actor:

Hamlet appears in a black dress, the only one in the whole court, -- Horatio and Marcellus, in uniform, are with him and they are awaiting the ghost; Hamlet has folded his arms under his cloak and pulled his hat down over his eyes; it is a cold night and just twelve o'clock; the theatre is darkened, and the whole audience of some thousands are as quiet, and their faces as motionless, as though they were painted on the walls of the theatre; even from the farthest end of the playhouse one could hear a pin drop. Suddenly, as Hamlet moves toward the back of the stage slightly to the left and turns his back on the audience, Horatio starts, and saying, "Look my lord, it comes," points to the right, where the ghost has already appeared and stands motionless, before anyone is aware of him.

At these words Garrick turns sharply and at the same moment staggers back two or three paces with his knees giving way under him; his hat falls to the ground and both his arms, especially the left, are stretched out nearly to their full length,

with the hands as high as his head, the right arm more bent and the hand lower, and the fingers apart; his mouth is open: thus he stands rooted to the spot, with legs apart, but no loss of dignity, supported by his friends, who are better acquainted with the apparition and fear lest he should collapse. His whole demeanour is so expressive of terror that it made my flesh creep even before he began to speak. The almost terror-struck silence of the audience, which preceded this appearance and filled one with a sense of insecurity, probably did much to enhance this effect. At last he speaks, not at the beginning, but at the end of a breath, with a trembling voice: "Angels and ministers of grace defend us!" words which supply anything this scene may lack and make it one of the greatest and most terrible which will ever be played on any stage. (92)

Lichtenberg's description of Garrick perfectly corresponds with Wilkes's recommended action for the expression of astonishment. Wilkes's mentor, however, must have been Le Brun with whose model of astonishment Wilkes's passage can compare:

Simple admiration occasions no very remarkable alteration in the countenance; the eye fixes upon the object; the right-hand naturally extends itself with the palm turned outwards; and the left-hand will share in the action, though so as scarcely to be perceived, not venturing far from the body; but when this surprise reaches the superlative degree, which I take to be astonishment, the whole body is actuated: it is thrown back, with one leg before the other, both hands elevated, the eyes larger than usual, the brows drawn up, and the mouth not quite shut. (93)

In all particulars, Garrick's encounter with the ghost was reminiscent of Betterton's as we have it from Cibber, thus,

reinforcing the observance of rhetorical rules about gesture. (94) In his Apology Cibber juxtaposes Betterton's Hamlet to that of various other minor actors who strained themselves in rage and fury or embarked on a needless vociferation at the appearance of the ghost. On the contrary, says Cibber, what was needed on the occasion was

a breathless astonishment, or an impatience, limited by filial Reverence, to enquire into the suspected Wrongs that may have rais'd him from his peaceful Tomb! and a Desire to know what a Spirit so seemingly distressed, might wish or enjoin a sorrowful Son to execute towards his future Quiet in the Grave? This was the Light into which Betterton threw this scene which he open'd with a Pause of mute Amazement! then rising slowly, to a solemn, trembling Voice, he made the Ghost equally terrible to the Spectator, as to himself! and in the descriptive part of the natural Emotions which the ghastly Vision gave him, the boldness of his Expostulation was still govern'd by Decency, manly, but not braving; his Voice never rising into that seeming outrage, or wild Defiance of what he naturally rever'd. (95)

Even though Garrick was credited with the method of particularizing his character to render him familiar and approachable, his use of props in Hamlet was condemned both by those who feared the intrusion of particulars where universals should prevail (Theophilus Cibber) and by those who approved of such methods (Davies). According to Davies, the twirling of the handkerchief in Act III, scene i (96) became a hackneyed trick unworthy of the great actor:

"For some must laugh, while some must weep;

Thus runs the world away." In the uttering of this line and a half, it was Garrick's constant practice to pull out a white handkerchief, and, walking about the stage, to twirl it round with vehemence. This action can incur no just censure, except from its constant repetition. He, of all the players I ever saw, gave the greatest variety to action and deportment; nor could I help wondering, that so great an artist should, in this instance, tie himself down to one particular mode, when his situation would admit of so many. The conforming to an uniform method of action makes the whole appear a lesson got by rote rather than the effort of genuine feeling. (97)

For the same reason that he disapproved of the trick with the handkerchief, Davies condemned Garrick's habitual "kicking down" the chair in his encounter with the ghost in Act III, Scene ii :

At the appearance of the Ghost, in this scene, Hamlet immediately rises from his seat affrighted; at the same time he contrives to kick down his chair, which by making a sudden noise, it was imagined would contribute to the perturbation and terror of the incident. But this, in my opinion, is a poor stage-trick, and should be avoided; it tends to make the actor solicitous about a trifle, when more important matter demands his attention. (98)

One more impropriety in Garrick's Hamlet was found to be the habit of pulling down a hat over his eyes. Justifiably, Theophilus Cibber hammered at the use of such unorthodox props that violated the rhetorical rule requiring the eyes to be in full view of the audience.(99)

From the first performance of Hamlet in August 1742,

Garrick had many and varying responses. That which seems to have been a constant target for criticism was Garrick's regulation of voice, his pauses and suspensions. Garrick substituted natural for artificial pauses; that is, he suspended his voice when the meaning or the emotions required it instead of observing the grammatical divisions of a period. In a letter to Hall Hartson, Garrick provides a theoretical defence of his pauses:

"Shakes so my single --" If I stop at ye last word, it is a glaring fault, for the Sense is imperfect -- but my Idea of that passage is this -- ... I have been frequently abus'd by ye Gentlemen of ye Pen for false Stops; and one in particular wrote against me for stopping injudiciously in this Line in Hamlet.

"I think it was to See -- my Mother's Wedding" I certainly never stop there, (that is, close ye Sense) but I as certainly, Suspend my Voice, by which Your Ear must know, that ye Sense is suspended too -- for Hamlet's Grief causes ye break & with a Sigh, he finishes ye sentence -- "my Mother's Wedding--" I really could not from my feelings act it otherwise; & were I to have ye Pleasure of talking this Matter over with You, I flatter myself, that I could make You, by various Examples, feel the truth of my Position. but to return -- I am sorry to differ with You, about the joining "Angels & Trumpet-tongu'd," together. I really think ye force of those Exquisite four Lines & a half would be partly lost for want of a small Aspiration after "Angels"-- the Epithet may agree with Either of ye Substantives, but I think it more Elegant to give it to the "Virtues", & ye Sense is ye Same, for if his "Virtues", are like "Angels" they are "trumpet-tongu'd", & may be spoke justly Either way -- "Heaven's Cherubin hors'd," wth a Stop is certainly wrong, & was not so intended to be spoken, but when ye mind's

agitated, it is impossible to guard against these Slips "-- quas incuria fudit & c. and such an Instrument I was to Use." I think, Sir, that both ye words "Was" & "Use" should be equally, tho slightly, impress'd as I have mark'd 'em -- & if you please to consider the passage, You will find, they are both Emphatical -- The Vision represents what was to be done -- not -- what is, doing, or what had been done -- but in many Passages like this -- the Propriety will depend wholly upon ye Manner of ye Actor. (100)

The order in which Garrick gave substance to his passions reflected the physiological principles of the eighteenth-century manuals. First he ensured that the passion was visible in his face and posture and then he went on to give voice to the passion. Murphy's description of Garrick's encounter with the ghost bears witness to this priority:

When Garrick entered the scene, the character he assumed, was legible in his countenance; by the force of deep meditation he transformed himself into the very man. He remained fixed in a pensive attitude, and the sentiments that possessed his mind could be discovered by the attentive spectator. When he spoke, the tone of his voice was in unison with the workings of his mind, and as soon as he said "I have that within me which surpasses shew," his every feature confirmed and proved the truth. The soliloquy, that begins with, "O that this too, too solid flesh would melt," brings to light, as it were by accident, the character of Hamlet. His grief, his anxiety and irresolute temper, are strongly marked. He does not as yet know that his father was poisoned, but his mother's marriage excites resentment and abhorrence of her conduct. He begins with it, but as Smith observes in his excellent notes on Longinus, he stops

for want of words. Reflections crowd upon him, and he runs off in commentation of his deceased father. His thoughts soon turn again to his mother; in an instant he flies off again, and continues in a strain of sudden transitions, taking no less than eighteen lines to tell us, that in less than two months, his mother married his father's brother, "But no more like his father, than he to Hercules." In all these shiftings of the passions, his voice and attitude changed with wonderful celerity, and, at every pause, his face was an index to his mind. On the first appearance of the ghost, such a figure of consternation was never seen. He stood fixed in mute astonishment, and the audience saw him growing paler and paler. After an interval of suspence, he spoke in a low trembling accent, and uttered his questions with the greatest difficulty. (101)

Macklin's criticism of Garrick's Hamlet was in many ways the same as Theophilus Cibber's.(102) Both Macklin and Cibber had reached the conclusion that Garrick "strutted" and "bustled" too much on the stage, which deprived the character of dignity and elegance. He paid too much attention to the particulars to the detriment of the overall unfolding of the character:

For, if, while one person speaks, in an interview of business, which every well wrought scene is, another pays no attention but chafes, struts, stalks, and pulls out his handkerchief, wipes his face, puts up his handkerchief and pulls it out again; varies his gait -- walks up the stage, and down the stage, and across the stage, it is a breach of good manners; it is an interruption, a contempt, and an injury to the other actor; a little, pitiful, avaricious ambition in the fellow that does it, and a total contradiction to the ways of nature.

... All Garrick wanted, in order to make

him a great actor, were -- consequence, dignity, elegance, and majesty of figure; a voice that would last through a part, for his was generally hoarse in the two last acts; the deportment and the manners of a gentleman; a knowledge of the passion and character, and how to dress with propriety.
(103)

Contrary to Garrick's starts and forceful, or rather, violent action, Macklin managed to control all terror and astonishment after the first sight and preserve the dignity this character required throughout. Macklin's interpretation, though different from both Betterton's and Garrick's, merits all the respect and admiration:

Mr. Macklin, whose judgement merits the utmost deference, differs in his opinion respecting the behaviour of Hamlet to the Ghost, from Betterton and Garrick. With pleasure I have heard him recite the speech of Hamlet to the Ghost, which he did with much force and energy. After the short ejaculation of "Angels and ministers of grace, defend us!" he endeavoured to conquer that fear and terror into which he was naturally thrown by the first sight of the vision, and uttered the remainder of this address calmly, but respectfully, and with a firm tone of voice, as from one who had subdued his timidity and apprehension. Mr. Henderson, a most judicious actor and accurate speaker, seems to have embraced a method not unlike that of Mr. Macklin.
(104)

Garrick gained great applause as King Lear. The torrentious stream of passions following and blending into each other was a series of masterstrokes which no other actor had achieved before. The enactment of the curse as given by Davies reinforces the view that the classical rules

were conformed to on many occasions and that the painterly mode was a means both of comparison and instruction for actors:

Garrick rendered the curse so terribly affecting to the audience, that, during his utterance of it, they seemed to shrink from it as from a blast of lightning. His preparation for it was extremely affecting; his throwing away his crutch, kneeling on one knee, clasping his hands together, and lifting his eyes towards heaven, presented a picture worthy the pencil of a Raphael.
(105)

Indeed, Garrick's conception of the scene may have been partly inspired by Hayman's letter to him. The conventions governing the art of painting seem to have had a definite influence on Garrick's art of acting. The most characteristic movement would have been the raising of the eyes toward the heaven to indicate the address to a superior being. Hayman's suggestion to Garrick about the enactment of the above scene is very revealing in itself:

... if you intend altering the scene in Lear (which by the way cannot be mended either in design or execution) what think you of the following one. Suppose Lear mad, upon the ground, with Edgar by him; his attitude should be leaning upon one hand & pointing wildly towards the Heavens with the other. Kent & Footman attend him, & Gloster comes to him with a Torch; the real Madness of Lear, the frantic affectation of Edgar, & the different looks of concern in the three other characters, will have a fine effect. Suppose you express Kent's particular care & distress by putting him upon one knee begging & entreating him to rise & go with Gloster. But I beg your pardon for pretending to give you advice in these affairs, you may

thank yourself for it, it is your Flattery
has made me impertinent...(106)

Despite Davies's absolute approval of Garrick's Lear, adverse criticism was not escaped. Theophilus Cibber (107) and Macklin (108) concurred that Garrick was too mechanical in his madness and that he ignored the realistic effects that could be convincingly achieved by an old man. John Hill joined the other two critics against Garrick's violent action, which he thought far-fetched and unnatural. Theophilus Cibber's fear that Garrick's Lear was on the verge of the ridiculous was shared by Hill:

Mr. Garrick's great natural sharpness is the cause of failing in this, for excellencies may give birth to faults; and we see in some passages of his Lear, excellent as he is in many parts of it, the king sunk into the satyr, as we before saw the hero. (109)

Betterton had recommended for King Lear that preservation of temperance which would give the passion a smoothness in the midst of the torrent and would save the actor from hoarseness.(110) Barry managed this smooth transition from one passion to another with the simultaneous maintenance of a majestic gravity, and was highly admired in this part by Theophilus Cibber. The latter wrote of Barry:

When the pious Cordelia, as the only Means of escaping the Anguish of a Father's Death, entreats the Ruffians to dispatch her first; which the Villains seem ready to comply with:-- while Lear is with-held, from the vain Efforts, of a fond Father, to preserve his Darling, -- his Action, Look, and Voice most exquisitely expressed his

distressful situation; his quick Progression, from Surprise to Terror, thence to Rage, 'till all were absorbed in Anguish, and Despair, -- were Master--strokes. At length his roused Spirits, catching the alarm, endeavouring to snatch her from her Fate, -- his Recollection of his unhappily being unarmed, and unable to preserve her, when he throws himself on his knees, preserving Majesty in his Distress, -- his whole Figure, and Manner, are finely expressive of the reduced Monarch, and Heart-torn Father. (111)

Another actor who fared well in the character of King Lear was Powell, who replaced Garrick at Drury Lane during the latter's absence in France. According to Davies, "Powell's King Lear ought not to be forgotten, it was a fair promise of something great in future. He had about him the blossoms of an excellent actor; many scenes of the choleric king were well adapted to his fine conceptions of the passions, and especially those of the softer kind." (112)

In the part of Edmund excelled Walker, who was instructed by Booth. He was "extremely easy and natural: his tread was manly, and his whole behaviour and deportment disengaged and commanding." (113)

The best Cordelia, in Lichtenberg's view, was Mrs Barry. Only she could match Garrick's Lear. In the following account of Mrs Barry, we have an example of the disposition of eighteenth-century audiences to see actresses crying and to sympathize with the players' misfortunes by shedding tears themselves:

Of all the actresses here, Mrs. Barry is,

in my opinion, the greatest, or at least the most versatile, being in this respect the only one who could bear comparison with Garrick. ... I saw her as Cordelia in King Lear, when, raising her large eyes, gleaming with tears, to heaven and silently wringing her hands, she hastens towards her forlorn old father and embraces him with great propriety of demeanour and, so it seemed to me, the radiant countenance of one transfigured. In this remarkable scene he surpasses all other actresses in the same style, and it still provides a feast for my imagination and will live in my memory until my dying day. (114)

If there was one single part for which Garrick, by common consent, was not suited, this was Othello. Murphy put the blame on the expressiveness of Garrick's face which was disguised by the black complexion and "the expression of the mind was wholly lost." (115) Kirkman thinks that Garrick was a failure as Othello and once acted (1749-50), he dropped the part never to resume it again (Kirkman, i, 329). Finally, Benjamin Victor found Garrick, as John Hill had done on other occasions, too violent:

As you have the happiness of a most expressive countenance, you may safely trust more to that; which with your proper and pathetic manner of speaking would charm more successfully, if those violent, and seeming artful emotions of body were a little abated. (116)

An interesting point about Garrick's painterly conception of character (117) and his compliance with classical rules is his description of Othello to Francis Hayman for an appropriate painting for the play. Garrick had a definite idea of the place each character would occupy and

of the exact gestures they would assume depending on the emotions they wanted to express. The physical manifestation of horror as it is imagined by Garrick in his letter to Hayman complied with the classical model in all its details:

I shall now send You my thoughts upon Othello. The Scene wch in my Opinion will make the best Picture, is that point of Time in the last Act, when Emilia discovers to Othello his Error about the Handkerchief. "Emil -- Oh thou dull Moor! That Handkerchief & c --"

Here at once the Whole Catastrophe of the play is unravell'd & the Groupe of Figures in this scene, with their different Expressions will produce a finer Effect in painting, than perhaps Any other in all Shakespear, tho as yet never thought of by any of the Designers who have publish'd their Several Prints from ye same Author. The back Ground you know must be Desdemona murder'd in her bed; the Characters upon the Stage are Othello, Montano, Gratiano & Iago: Othello (ye Principal) upon ye right hand (I believe) must be thunder-struck with Horror, his whole figure extended, wth his Eyes turn'd up to Heav'n & his Frame sinking, as it were at Emilia's Discovery. I shall better make you conceive my Notion of this Attitude & Expression when I see you; Emilia must appear in the utmost Vehemence, with a Mixture of Sorrow on account of her Mistress & I (think) should be in ye Middle: Iago on ye left hand should express the greatest perturbation of mind, & should Shrink up his body, at ye opening of his Villany, with his Eyes looking askance (as Milton Terms it) on Othello, & gnawing his Lip in anger at his Wife; but this likewise will be describ'd better by giving you the Expression when I see you; the other less capital Characters must be affected according to ye circumstances of the scene, & as they are more or less concern'd in ye Catastrophe. (118)

Where Garrick had failed, Barry won liberal applause. Barry was the most accomplished lover on the stage. His great assets were "the symmetry and proportion" of his "whole frame" as well as the "harmony" of his voice "in the tempest and whirlwind of the passions." (119) Wilkes makes a fine point about the expression of anger by Barry in an "uninterrupted voice" and the display of fury in action. The following passage on Barry's Othello must have been intended as indirect criticism of Garrick's inopportune starts and pauses:

Othello is his (Barry's) masterpiece; and his acting of it cannot be transcended. He addresses the assembled senate with an account of the whole process of his wooing better than any man I ever saw. In the two scenes in the third and fourth Act, where Iago works upon his credulity, so as to inflame him to the highest pitch of jealousy, his perturbations are natural and noble. His perplexity and anger in "Villain! be sure you prove my love a whore. Be sure of it." are beautifully represented; and his attitude, when kneeling by the side of Iago, he vows vengeance against his unhappy wife, is truly graceful. Here he shews us, that he has properly considered the passion of anger, which in man never breaks out in loud words, but is kept in under an uninterrupted voice; and discloses its utmost fury rather in action. (120)

According to Davies, so unique was Barry in his conception of Othello that Colley Cibber preferred his Othello to the performances of Betterton and Booth. "For they ... though most excellent actors, owed a great deal of their applause

to art. Every word which Barry spoke in this the greatest character of the greatest poet, seemed to come from the heart." (121)

To Barry's Othello, Macklin played Iago with comparable success. Kirkman informs us that in the soliloquy which concluded the first act Macklin "displayed great powers -- he wrought with great judgement and propriety upon Othello's openness of temper, and warmth of heart. The insidious villainy, and hypocritical diffidence, with which the double dealing Ancient works up Othello to impatient curiosity, he portrayed with singular ability". (122)

Another wrong choice of Garrick was the part of Hotspur in which Booth had excelled before. Garrick, according to his biographer, had neither the figure nor the voice to match the part. (123) It is understandable, therefore, that the hoarseness of his voice became the butt of Theophilus Cibber's satire.

The best Falstaff in Henry IV since the days of Betterton was Quin. He possessed all those features that were required in scenes of satire and sarcasm: "his voice (was) strong and pleasing: his countenance manly, and his eye piercing and expressive. ... His supercilious brow, in spite of assumed gaiety sometimes unmasked the surliness of his disposition; however, he was, notwithstanding some faults, esteemed the most intelligent and judicious Falstaff since the days of Betterton". (124)

As it has emerged from the discussion of Garrick's merits and faults, the main obstacle to undertaking certain parts was his voice. However, in some cases vanity got the better of Garrick and, as a result, he tried parts from which he should have abstained. One of those parts was Hubert in King John. Garrick committed the mistake for which Macklin so often blamed him: he tried to dominate the stage. His art was "too visible and glaring; his inclination and fear were not equally suspended; the hesitations of a man big with murder and death were not happily and sublimely expressed". (125)

On the contrary, Quin as King John had his share of merit, and even though the effect was not perfect, "his solemn and articulate whisperings were like soft notes in music". (126)

If the male characters were not wholly satisfactory, Mrs Cibber as Lady Constance delighted eighteenth-century audiences. Both Davies (127) and Murphy admired the way she managed to pass from one passion to another without a falter:

Mrs. Cibber eclipsed all competition; her grief for the loss of her son, her rage, her tenderness, rising alternately, and often blended in one mixed emotion, penetrated every heart, and melted every eye in tears. Her voice, though often felt on former occasions, was never expanded to such a degree. It was harmony in an uproar: in fact, she was the admiration of the public. (128)

In the above passage, it is clear that Murphy attaches greater significance to the smooth transition from one passion to another than to the general effect. This attitude was not isolated; it reflected the general spirit of the age. John Hill made similar judgements on the same basis about the Romeo of Garrick and Barry. In effect, Hill claimed that Barry's Romeo was better than Garrick's because it was distinguished more by love than by rage. And while Garrick was "naturally violent", Barry was unsurpassable as a lover. However, neither of them balanced love and rage to the degree of perfection in Hill's view. (129) Sensibility got the better of Barry:

Thus we see in the character of Romeo a scene of distress, to which no other can be equal: his wife, on whose suppos'd death he had swallowed poison, revived, and himself dying of the effect of that poison; and we see, as Mr. Barry plays it, his sensibility getting the better even of his articulation; his grief takes effect upon the organs of his voice; and the very tone of it is altered: it is broken, hoarse, and indistinct. (130)

According to Murphy, in the season of 1748-49 at Drury Lane Barry as Romeo and Mrs Cibber as Juliet in Otway's The History of the Fall of Caius Marius enchanted the public. (131) Kirkman's account is more or less the same. The emphasis on the tendency to shed tears is remarkable. For Kirkman, Barry's triumph over Garrick was definitive:

The amorous harmony of Mr. Barry's features, his melting eyes, and unequalled

plaintiveness of voice, and his fine graceful figure, gave him very great superiority over Mr.Garrick in this contest. Mr.Barry was confessedly the best lover that ever appeared on the stage. In the garden scenes of the second and fourth act, and in the tomb scene, he was super-eminently great and affecting: indeed, he bore away the palm from Mr.Garrick in this part. (132)

For the same reason that Barry distinguished himself as Romeo, Mrs Cibber captivated eighteenth-century audiences as Juliet. Critics saw an intrinsic quality in Mrs Cibber that qualified her for a lover:

If we ask why Mrs.Cibber is more herself in Juliet, than in any other character, it is because Mrs.Cibber has an heart more formed for love than for any other passion; and if we approve Miss Bellamy in her declarations of love in the same character, more than in any other, it is because she has an heart also more susceptible of tenderness than of any other passion. (133)

After the desertion of Barry and Mrs Cibber to Covent Garden, Garrick and Mrs Bellamy undertook the parts of Romeo and Juliet at Drury Lane on 28 September 1750. This created a rather strong competition between the two theatres and caused the audiences to shift from Covent Garden to Drury Lane after the end of the third act to see Garrick's passionate Romeo in the last two. Years after the battle was over, Wilkes evaluated Garrick's Romeo and decided him to be superior in any other passion than love, especially, in the last act:

All through the character of Romeo, I think him at least equal to any one who ever

performed; and where other passions besides love are to be displayed he is vastly superior. This is evidenced particularly in the last act; his transition from the settled satisfaction of his presages, to silent horror and despondency, on receiving news of Juliet's death, that despair which he ever after maintains thro' the character, are as strong proofs as I know of his judgement and abilities. The attitude into which he throws himself, when disturbed by Paris in the Church-yard, is very striking. (134)

Garrick, as it was his practice in tragedies, added a pathetic death scene in which he surpassed any rival:

In the dying scene he is particularly happy; his manner of expressing this single line -- "Parents have flinty hearts, and children must be wretched," carries with it so much of that sort of frenzy proper to Romeo's melancholy situation, and is delivered in a tone so affecting, so different from anything we before heard him express, that it makes one's blood run cold. (135)

Barry's fine figure was well-suited for the part of Mark Antony, but his voice, as in Wilks's Antony before, did not support him to the end:

Mr. Barry's fine person and pleasing manner were well adapted to Mark Antony, but his utterance in recitation was not sufficiently sonorous, nor his voice flexible enough, to express the full meaning of the author in the opening of the address. When roused by passion, Barry rose superior to all speakers. His close of the harangue was as warm and glowing as the beginning was cold and deficient. (136)

The only actor who acquitted himself successfully in Mark Antony was in Davies's view, William Milward. The latter "opened the preparatory part of the oration in a low but

distinct and audible voice; for nothing can atone for the want of articulation". He "began low, and, by gradual progress, rose to such a height, as not only to inflame the populace on the stage, but to touch the audience with a kind of enthusiastic rapture". (137)

Both contemporary and later critics overestimated Garrick's contribution to the eighteenth-century stage to the point of ignoring other major actors in the same period. One of those who worked diligently to bring about some changes and to dispense with those conventions that acted as a brake to "free expression" was Charles Macklin. The latter may have been prejudiced in his criticism against Garrick, but most of his complaints were seconded by other critics both favourable and unfavourable to Garrick. Macklin's main objection was to Garrick's habit of domineering the stage, thus, overshadowing the other actors. His masterpiece was the part of Shylock in The Merchant of Venice, which became the opportunity to display his concept of "natural" acting. Macklin had been rehearsing his part for some time without revealing the way he intended to speak his lines. At the première, he took everyone by surprise with the naturalness of his delivery and the variety in his expression. Kirkman, his biographer, summarizes Macklin's achievement in the following passage:

There is no doubt but that Mr. Macklin looked, as well as spoke, the part much

better than any other person. In the level scenes, his voice was most happily suited to that sententious gloominess of expression the author intended; which with a sullen solemnity of deportment, marked the character strongly. In his malevolence, there was a forcible and terrifying ferocity.

... He broke the tones of utterance -- he was at once malevolent and then infuriate, and then malevolent again: the transitions were strictly natural, and the variation of this countenance admirable. In the dumb action of the trial scene he was amazingly descriptive; and through the whole, displayed such unequalled merit, as justly entitled him to that very comprehensive, though concise, compliment paid him by Mr. Pope, who sat in the stage box, on the third night of the representation, and who emphatically exclaimed -- "This is the Jew, that Shakespeare drew". (138)

It can be safely said that the most admirable Portia in the eighteenth century was Mrs Woffington, whose figure and deportment were her great assets for undertaking male parts. Although her voice did not exactly carry her through the declamatory speeches of her part, eighteenth-century audiences could dissociate action from voice and thoroughly enjoy the one while ignoring the other. Francis Gentleman wrote about Mrs Woffington as Portia:

Mrs Woffington, whose deportment in a male character, was so free and elegant, whose figure was so proportionate and delicate, notwithstanding a voice unfavourable for declamation, must, in our opinion, stand foremost; her first scene was supported with an uncommon degree of spirited archness; her behaviour during Bassanio's choice of the caskets, conveyed a strong picture of unstudied anxiety; the trial scene she sustained with amiable dignity, the speech upon mercy she marked as well as

any body else; and in the fifth act, she carried on the sham quarrel in a very laughable manner; to sum up all, while in petticoats, she shewed the woman of solid sense, and real fashion; when in breeches, the man of education, judgement and gentility. (139)

The most popular of Jonson's plays in the eighteenth century were The Alchemist (1610) and Every Man in his Humour (1598). Although Garrick was credited with freeing the stage "from the false spirit, ridiculous squinting, and vile grimace,"(140) in the character of Abel Drugger, Davies offers the sceptre to another contemporary, Weston, whom he calls a "genuine child of nature". (141) Lichtenberg takes issue with Davies on the matter of who was the more successful Drugger. For Lichtenberg, Garrick's acting delighted the critic while Weston's animation was more popular with the audience. His lively account sheds some light on the way actors perceived and executed their parts; therefore, I shall cite him at length:

Weston is one of the drollest creatures on whom I have ever set eyes. Figure, voice, demeanour and all about him move one to laughter, although he never seems to desire this and himself never laughs. Scarcely has he appeared on the stage than a large part of the audience becomes oblivious of the play and heeds nothing but him and his antics. You see, then, that before such judges a man like this cannot play badly. People have eyes for him alone. With Garrick it is quite otherwise, for one perpetually sees him as an effective part of the whole and a faithful mirror of nature. Therefore he could play his part badly in the eyes of his England, while Weston could scarce do so. Now Ben Jonson

has indicated only a few points in Abel Drugger's character; and if a player can once get his line from this, he can proceed more or less à son aise with no fear of overstepping the mark. Weston has an excellent opportunity of ridding himself of his own personality, especially in the long intervals when Abel Drugger is dumb and in a room where there are, besides a few astronomers and exorcisers, human skeletons, crocodiles, ostrich eggs and empty vessels, in which the devil himself could sit. I can almost see him with terror at every violent movement of the astrologer or at the least noise of which the cause is not apparent, standing like a mummy with feet together; only when it is over does life return to his eyes and he looks about him, then turns his head round slowly, and so forth. ... I only mention one feature, which Mr. Weston could not even imitate and assuredly could not have invented, and of which I do not suppose the author himself had thought. When the astrologers spell out from the stars the name, Abel Drugger, henceforth to be great, the poor gullible creature says with heartfelt delight: "That is my name." Garrick makes him keep his joy to himself, for to blurt it out before every one would be lacking in decency. Garrick turns aside, hugging his delight to himself for a few moments, so that he actually gets those red rings round his eyes which often accompany great joy, at least when violently suppressed, and says to himself: "That is my name." The effect of this judicious restraint is indescribable, for one did not see him merely as a simpleton being gulled, but as a much more ridiculous creature, with an air of secret triumph, thinking himself the slyest of rogues. Nothing like this can be expected of Weston. (142)

Many a time public taste acted as a regulator of what appeared on the stage. For instance, in the same play Garrick as Abel Drugger included the stage-trick of the

broken urinal which Colley Cibber had introduced by mere accident. (143)

The other Jonsonian play, Every Man in his Humour, is an example of how Garrick promoted the "star" system in eighteenth-century theatre. In Seymour-Smith's words, Garrick "butchered" the play and built the adaptation round the figure of Kately (144) by adding more dialogue to this character and by cutting out large sections that seemed irrelevant to his performance.(145) It is interesting to see how isolated gestures in this play were singled out as proof of Garrick's "natural" acting while the overall development of character was blatantly ignored. Accordingly, Murphy writes that when in front of Justice Clement "Kately interposes saying, in a sharp eager tone, "I found her there," he who remembers how Garrick uttered those words, slapping his hand on the table, as if he made an important discovery, must acknowledge, trifling as it may now be thought, that it was a genuine stroke of nature". (146)

From statistics drawn up by modern critics, we know that Restoration plays had a generous share in eighteenth-century repertoire, in particular, the tragedies of Otway and most comedies. A predilection for gore and horror was not a characteristic of Restoration audiences only. It carried on well into the eighteenth century.

Until 1732, the part of Pierre in Venice Preserved (1682) had been played by Mills very much to the taste of

the audiences (147) while Mrs Cibber as Belvidera had held her spectators captive. (148) Quin's heavy declamatory voice scarcely qualified him for the part of Pierre, and he should not have tried it according to the critic of the Dramatic Censor :

Mr. Quin, who was by many esteemed a standard of perfection, rolled most heavily through the part; he recitativated the calmer, and bellowed the more spirited scenes; in the line "I could have hugg'd the greasy rogues, they pleas'd me;" his execration of the senate, and a few passages in the dying scene, he was very fortunate, but through all the rest much more like a heavy-headed, methodical, saturnine pedagogue, than what the author meant. (149)

Garrick, soon after he had taken up the part of Pierre, dropped it to undertake Jaffier. Barry was given the part of Pierre for which he was ill-suited, and he exchanged it for that of Jaffier in which he competed with Garrick (Barry was then employed at Covent Garden):

Barry, it must be acknowledged, did not shine in the part of Pierre. The character was not suited to him: his voice was too soft and tender for that rough hero. He felt himself fitter for Jaffier; and, during the run of the play, kept his eye on Garrick, resolved, with all the ideas he could glean from that great master, to enter the lists with him at a future day. This he did on Covent-Garden stage, with such harmonious notes, that he was allowed to rival Garrick, and, in some passages, to surpass him. (150)

Comparisons between actors who played the same part

at the same time were inevitable. A writer for The Craftsman makes the following comment about Garrick's and Barry's Jaffier:

Mr. Garrick seems to speak out but half his mind, as if there was more working in his breast, while Mr. Barry by throwing out his voice seems to vent all his grief, and so leaves nothing for the imagination of his audience to supply. (151)

Comments like the above are very useful for a better understanding of what eighteenth-century audiences were looking for. Apparently, the kind of acting that conveyed meaning through action rather than voice was highly esteemed as it set the imagination at work. The principle of active participation through someone's imagination was properly exploited by Garrick. One can assume that it enhanced the suspense as to what words would match a specific gesture or facial expression.

Davies agrees with Wilkes that the best Pierre ever played was by Mossop. The latter achieved such cadences in his voice that were "equally adapted to the loudest rage and the most deep and solemn reflection, which he judiciously varied." (152) Wilkes elaborates on the general interpretation of the character, expressing the view that Mossop could have done with more weight, but even so he was admirable throughout. (153)

Other actors who were distinguished in Venice Preserved were Holland as Pierre and Powell as

Jaffier. (154) Mrs Cibber's Belvidera could only be matched by Garrick's Jaffier. Wilkes notes that Mrs Cibber gave "fresh strength to this most amiable picture of conjugal affection" (155) and that the spectator could not but pity Garrick (as Jaffier) "for being liable to such temptation as can flow from the tongue of a Cibber, whose mellifluous tones are not less persuasive than his, than which nothing can be more pleasing or melodious". (156)

Zoffany's painting of Garrick and Mrs Cibber as Jaffier and Belvidera in Act IV, ll.511-20 shows them in a formal gesture which indicates the still prevalent mode of expression as that was designated by rhetoricians and painters. Jocelyn Powell makes the following comment on this painting:

This must be both designed and experienced by the actors to achieve its effect, as in the famous picture of Garrick and Mrs Cibber in the scene. The drawing back of the arm, her kneeling and placing her hand on his wrist are both formal gestures that need to be clearly articulated. (157)

The parts of Horatio and Lothario in Otway's The Fair Penitent (1703) required such natural attributes in the two actors who would undertake those parts as to bring out the contrast between the characters. Barry as Horatio was very agreeable thanks to his fine figure and pleasing voice but "he was faint and insipid in sustaining the spirit and sedateness of the character". (158) On the contrary, Quin, who "was greatly admired in this part", possessed "this mere

weight and pomposity of expression" that set off "the spirited vivacity of Lothario". In spite of Gentleman's complaints that Quin's "laborious formality of action offended the critical eye, and a monotonous cadence of voice palled the distinguishing ear", (159) the majority of the spectators delighted in his performance.

Sciolto was played by Macklin "whose transitions of countenance, breaks of expression, and melting cadences of grief, were happily suited to the character, and received the stamp of approbation from Public Taste". (160) Finally, Miss Macklin as Calista was "highly pleasing to the cultivated taste", in Kirkman's words. (161)

During his career Garrick performed forty-six different comic roles. In the beginning, he included in his satire a lot of personal mimickry, which he later abandoned to attack the style of acting he was driving at more clearly. His Bayes soon became the subject of controversy between those who thought that Garrick gave pleasing freshness to The Rehearsal (1671) with his satire on pompous acting and those who declared that Garrick fell below the level of dignity and passed into the realm of buffoonery. According to Murphy, Garrick deflated all "strutting, mouthing, and bellowing", which then dominated the stage:

To the Duke of Buckingham's admirable satire, Garrick was able to make a considerable, and, indeed requisite addition. The actors had lost all judgement; the vicious taste of the poets

introduced a total departure from nature; and, to vie with their authors, the best performers of the day had recourse to strutting, mouthing and bellowing. This was altogether repugnant to Garrick's school of acting, and, accordingly, he seized the opportunity to make the Rehearsal a keen and powerful criticism on the absurd stile of acting that prevailed on the stage. (162)

The actor who was primarily affected by Garrick's mimicking talent was the ranting declaimer Delane. As Murphy informs us "Delane was at the head of his profession. He was tall and comely; had a clear and strong voice, but was a mere declaimer. Garrick began with him: he retired to the upper part of the stage, and drawing his left arm across his breast, rested his right elbow on it, raising a finger to his nose, and then came forward in a stately gait, nodding his head, as he advanced, and, in the exact tone of Delane, spoke the following lines". (163)

On the other hand, as I mentioned above, there were those who saw Garrick's mimickry as a mean attack against the actors' weaknesses:

... Thus The Rehearsal was no longer consider'd as a witty satyr on the Foibles, and Faults, of Authors, -- and a Reproof of the Town for their false Taste of the Drama: -- it became a motley Medley of Buffoonery, to explode the Actors. But, where did he attack 'em? -- On their weak side, indeed -- where they cou'd not be on their Guard: Instead of critically pointing out their Want of Taste, or Judgement, -- he cruelly turn'd the whole Artillery of his Mockery against their natural Defects, or such Particularities of Voice, which did not misbecome them; nor met with Reproof,

'till his Vice of taking off, as it is call'd, became the foolish Fashion; -- and taught School-Boys to be Critics. (164)

Foote's adaptation of the same play kept more closely to the original in that it was directed at the quality of dramatic production rather than mannered acting. Davies is very complimentary to Foote's Bayes:

The Bayes of Foote was an odd mixture of himself and the Duke of Buckingham; the old building was new-faced with a modern front. He contrived to adapt, as well as he could, his new super-structure to the old ground-work. His fancy was so exuberant, his conceptions so ready, and his thoughts so brilliant, that he kept the audience in continual laughter. Public transactions, the flying follies of the day, debates of grave assemblies, absurdities of playwrights, politicians and players, all came under his cognizance, and all felt the force of his wit; in short, he laid hold of every body that would furnish merriment for the evening. Foote could have written a new Rehearsal equal to the old. (165)

In Restoration comedy, Quin was a "most valuable performer". (166). He excelled in the central character of Congreve's The Old Batchelor. Davies, in a comparison between Harper and Quin as Heartwell, prefers the latter's compelling representation:

The Old Batchelor of Drury lane was Harper, a good low comedian, but whose understanding was not of that size to give force to the sarcastic poignancy of expression, the whimsical struggles of amorous passion, or the violent rage on discovered folly in Heartwell; all which Quin perfectly conceived, and justly represented many years at Lincoln's-inn fields and Covent-garden. (167)

As Fainall in The Way of the World (Covent Garden, 1732), "Quin was a judicious speaker of Fainall's sentiments, but heavy in action and deportment". (168) Walker, his successor in this part, "understood and expressed the assumed spirit and real insolence of this artful character much better". (169) Ryan as Mirabel never approached his predecessor's, Wilks's, perfection while Chapman's Witwou'd was very comic -- though not of the calibre of Cibber's. Chapman's "quickness of speech resembled the articulate volubility of Mr. King, who is likewise a very pleasing representer of Witwou'd". (170)

Garrick, as other managers before him, succumbed to the demand of the public for the new genre: sentimental comedy. The move toward a more affective, less abusive, and primarily instructive form has its roots in the seventeenth century. Robert Hume, in his well-substantiated study of late-seventeenth-century drama, points out that "in the early nineties hard and humane comedy are both in vogue". "The trend toward exemplary morals", he adds, "is unmistakable, and pressures from "the Ladies" are well documented by J.H. Smith". (171) Even the descendants of hard comedy (The Provoked Wife, The Relapse, Love for Love) have made significant concessions to the "humane" outlook. The publication of Collier's A Short View of the Immorality and Profaneness of the English Stage (1698) triggered off a stage controversy which was to last for a long time. Of the

Restoration playwrights, Congreve retired while Farquhar and Vanbrugh had to adapt to the changing times. As Hume observes, "The Beaux Stratagem can be denounced for dishonest romanticism by a proponent of hard comedy, but it is scarcely very Steele-ish". (172) Vanbrugh took up Collier on the morality of his plays and endeavoured to contradict him instead of defending his plays on aesthetic grounds. He even apologized in public for "some flaws in the moral" of The Provoked Wife, which he allowed Colley Cibber to revise "where the wantonness of his (Vanbrugh's) wit and humour, had (originally) made a rake talk like a rake, in the borrowed habit of a clergyman". (173)

For many years Quin had been the Sir John Brute (The Provoked Wife, 1697) at Lincoln's -Inn-fields. His comic talent notwithstanding, Quin "wanted variety, and that glow and warmth, in colouring the extravagances of this merry rake, without which the picture remains imperfect and unfinished". (174) For the same reason that Quin had failed Garrick excelled in the part of Sir John Brute, The latter had "a more expressive countenance, and a much happier tone of voice; his action, too, was more diversified, and his humour less confined". (175) In a comparison between Garrick and Colley Cibber, Davies finds Garrick superior in the Bacchanalian scene with Lord Rake and his gang:

In the Bacchanalian scene, with Lord Rake

and his gang, from deficiency of power and look, Cibber fell greatly short of Garrick; here the latter was most triumphantly riotous, and kept the spectators in continual glee. Cibber's pale face, tame features, and weak pipe, did not present so full a contrast to female delicacy, when in woman's apparel, as Garrick's stronger-marked features, manly voice, and more sturdy action. The cap, which he ordered, to be made for this scene, was a satirical stroke upon the vast quantity of gauze, ribbon, blond lace, flowers, fruit, herbage, & c. with which the ladies, about eight years since, used to adorn their heads. (176)

However, in the drunken scene, the palm is given to Cibber in spite of the fact that Garrick was reputed to be at his best in such scenes. (177)

Garrick's ability to individualize his parts was best manifested in The Provoked Wife. He enriched his action with such props as a wig and a hat which he wore on top of the wig, and he emphasized his words with the help of a stick. Lichtenberg was impressed by Garrick's extraordinary action in the drunken scene. His vivid account is worth citing at length as it gives us an insight into Garrick's acting techniques:

Sir John Brute is not merely a dissolute fellow, but Garrick makes him an old fop also, this being apparent from his costume. On top of a wig, which is more or less suitable for one of his years, he has perched a small beribboned, modish hat so jauntily that it covers no more of his forehead than was already hidden by his wig. In his hand he holds one of those hooked oaken sticks, with which every young poltroon makes himself look like a devil of a fellow in the Park in the morning (as

they call here the hours between 10 and 3). It is in fact a cudgel, showing only faint traces of art and culture, as is generally the case also with the lout who carries it. Sir John makes use of this stick to emphasize his words with bluster, especially when only females are present, or in his passion to rain blows where no one is standing who might take them amiss.

In all playhouses there is generally one or another of the actors who can represent a drunken man very tolerably. ... Mr Garrick plays the drunken Sir John in such a way that I should certainly have known him to be a most remarkable man, even if I had never heard anything of him and had seen him in one scene only in this play. At the beginning his wig is quite straight, so that his face is full and round. Then he comes home excessively drunk, and looks like the moon a few days before its last quarter, almost half his face being covered by his wig; the part that is still visible is, indeed, somewhat bloody and shining with perspiration, but has so extremely amiable an air as to compensate for the loss of the other part. His waistcoat is open from top to bottom, his stockings full of wrinkles, with the garters hanging down, and, moreover -- which is vastly strange -- two kinds of garters; one would hardly be surprised, indeed, if he had picked up odd shoes. In this lamentable condition he enters the room where his wife is and in answer to her anxious inquiries as to what is the matter with him (and she has good reason for inquiring), he, collecting his wits, answers:

"Wife, as well as a fish in the water"; he does not, however, move away from the doorpost, against which he leans as closely as if he wanted to rub his back. Then he again breaks into coarse talk, and suddenly becomes so wise and merry in his cups that the whole audience bursts into a tumult of applause.

... As I remarked above, Garrick possesses a talent for giving individuality to everything in so high a degree that it contributes not a little to his superiority; and yet one would have thought

that this might easily be acquired, at least to a certain extent, from the observation not of actors, but of polite society. If the actors but knew what to observe! A stage puppet will remain frozen and lifeless, in spite of the outfit provided for him by the author, especially when this is all French trash, unless the actor can clothe him afresh in living warmth. Garrick will sooner thrust his left hand into his right-hand pocket, if need arise, than let go a pinch of snuff that he has between the fingers of his right hand. When disguised as a raw, awkward fellow, he can carry his best Spanish cane in such a way that you might think he was taking it for his master to the silversmith's to be sold, or that it contained a barometer. A table of equations containing such features would be no small boon to players, and, between ourselves, to dramatic authors and novelists. (178)

Mrs Centlivre's Busy Plot (1709) had a considerable number of performances in the eighteenth century probably because of its incipient sentimentalism which was properly exploited. Until 1758 at Drury Lane the part of Marplot had been exclusively held by Woodward, who "excelled in displaying the airy and impertinent sallies of a pretended fine gentleman". (179) Woodward had distinguished himself in most comic parts he had undertaken without ever borrowing anything from Garrick and always relying on his own resources. Davies's description of Woodward as a "pretended gentleman" is most perceptive:

He (Woodward) was an actor, who for various abilities to delight an audience in comic characters, had scarce an equal. His person was so regularly formed, and his look so serious and composed, that an

indifferent observer would have supposed that his talents were adapted to characters of the serious cast; to the real fine gentleman, to the man of graceful deportment and elegant demeanor, rather than to the affecter of gaiety, the brisk fop, and pert coxcomb. But the moment he spoke, a certain ludicrous air laid hold of his features, and every muscle of his face ranged itself on the side of levity. The very tones of his voice inspired comic ideas; and though he often wished to act tragedy, he never could speak a line with propriety that was serious. (180)

After Woodward had deserted Drury Lane, Garrick, motivated by vanity, decided to replace the former in the part of Marplot. He proved mistaken. As Murphy tells us, "the deserter to Dublin (Woodward) could put on such a vacant innocent countenance, that all the mischief he did by being busy in other people's affairs, appeared to be the effect of accident; whereas Garrick had so much meaning, such strong intelligence in his countenance, that he seemed to do every thing by design". (181) Murphy's criticism, understandably so, sounds mild compared to Kirkman's. In the latter's view, Garrick was "too mechanical" and had to drop the part soon after he had undertaken it. On the contrary, Macklin

gained great applause in this part. Foolishness and stupidity he depicted admirably by his countenance, and, therefore, most unquestionably excelled Mr. Garrick, who afterwards attempted to play Marplot. Mr. Garrick's representation was lively and expressive, but too mechanical; in short he could not, as Mr. Fox wittily said of him, look foolish enough for the part; and, knowing his

deficiency, wisely relinquished his intimacy with Marplot. (182)

The same complaint of restraint was directed at Garrick's Lord Townly in The Provoked Husband (1728). According to Davies, Garrick "kept back his natural impetuosity so much, that he lost the spirit of the Provoked Husband". (183) On the contrary, "Barry in happily mixing the various passions which arise in the breast of a good man and reconciled husband, exceeded all conception". (184) Macklin's criticism of Garrick's Lord Townly was more profound, and included a character analysis to which Wilks's performance only had answered. (185)

The character of Sir Francis Wronghead was delightfully represented by Macklin beyond competition. Kirkman quotes the opinion of an older critic according to whom

Mr Macklin, beyond all doubt, filled the author's ideas of this part, and conveyed them to the audience admirably. Consequential stupidity sat well painted in his countenance, and wrought laughable effects, without the paltry resource of grimace; where he affected to be very wise, a laborious, emphatic slyness, marked the endeavour humorously; while the puzzles between political and domestic concerns occasioned much food for merriment. (186)

Another actor who displayed his excellent abilities in the part of Sir Francis Wronghead was Mr. Yates. (187)

In the part of Sir Paul Pliant, Foote received contradictory criticism from his contemporaries. Davies,

probably prejudiced in favour of Garrick, describes Foote as "a despicable player in almost all parts but those which he wrote for himself". (188) As for Foote's Sir Paul Pliant, Davies thinks it worse than his Ben "for fear restrained him from being outrageous in the sailor: but, in the knight, he gave a loose to the most ridiculous burlesque, and the vilest grimace".(189) Despite his own expert opinion, Davies had to admit that "the people laughed heartily" with Foote's performance. Wilkes took issue with those critics who were unfavourably disposed to Foote:

This is a cast (Sir Paul Pliant) in which he is happy in exerting his judgement, and displaying his admirable talents for humor; the latter part is, in his hands, a new creation. With him it appears in a light very different from any thing that I had ever seen presented by any other actor. He renders the ridicule of it so striking, without trick or grimace, that he not only commands the applause of the judicious, but of the million. In the third Act he keeps up finely all the awe in which Sir Paul stands of his wife. His admiration of her wit and person here, when she compliments Mr. Careless, and his silent action, as well as his humorous manner of throwing in half lines of rapture and affection, add considerably to the scene. His performance in the fourth Act of this Play is true Comedy; his reading of the letter is masterly; and his change of looks from despondency to joy, at supposing lady Pliant's excuse true, and the whole of what is past a contrivance of Careless to abuse him, is easy, natural, and spirited, and free from any Strokes of mimicry: it is nature finely copied. (190)

The play in which Garrick displayed his extraordinary readiness in alternating roles and moving from

one passion to another was Farquhar's The Beaux Stratagem (1707). As Wilkes observes, Garrick was "the footman, the gallant, and the gentleman by turns. His addresses to Cherry were easy and jocular. With Mrs. Sullen he was polite and unaffected, particularly in the gallery scene, where the gentleman's education ought to shine upon the manners of the footman where he talks of pictures and mythology". (191)

Much as he admired Garrick as Archer, John Hill regarded Wilks as superior in natural nobleness and, therefore, ranks him higher than Garrick:

It was to this opportunity of exerting a various sensibility and ready change that Mr. Wilks owed the great praise he obtained in this part; and if it became more considerable in itself as Mr. Wilks play'd it, than as Mr. Garrick does, the only reason was, that Mr. Wilks threw into it the ease and address of the gentleman: a character which he perfectly came up to; and which, (not to make the deficiency reflect upon Mr. Garrick,) we entirely want at this time on the stage. (192)

Garrick found in Weston an excellent Scrub to match. The expressiveness of Weston's face and the natural naiveté of his movements gained him a reputation beside Garrick's Archer. Lichtenberg, in a minute description of Act III, Scene iii, conveys the spirit of the two actors' performances:

This scene (III, iii) should be witnessed by any one who wishes to observe the irresistible power of contrast on the stage, when it is brought about by a perfect collaboration on the part of author

and player, so that the whole fabric, whose beauty depends entirely on correct balance, be not upset, as usually happens. Garrick throws himself into a chair with his usual ease of demeanour, places his right arm on the back of Weston's chair, and leans towards him for a confidential talk; his magnificent livery is thrown back, and coat and man form one line of perfect beauty. Weston sits, as is fitting, in the middle of his chair, though rather far forward and with a hand on either knee, as motionless as a statue, with his roguish eyes fixed on Garrick. If his face expresses anything, it is an assumption of dignity, at odds with a paralysing sense of the terrible contrast. And here I observed something about Weston which had an excellent effect. While Garrick sits there at his ease with an agreeable carelessness of demeanour, Weston attempts, with back stiff as a poker, to draw himself up to the other's height, partly for the sake of decorum, and partly in order to steal a glance now and then, when Garrick is looking the other way, so as to improve on his imitation of the latter's manner. When Archer at last with an easy gesture crosses his legs, Scrub tries to do the same, in which he eventually succeeds, though not without some help from his hands, and with eyes all the time either gaping or making furtive comparisons. And when Archer begins to stroke his magnificent silken calves, Weston tries to do the same with his miserable red woollen ones, but, thinking better of it, slowly pulls his green apron over them with an abjectness of demeanour, arousing pity in every breast. In this scene Weston almost excels Garrick by means of the foolish expression natural to him, and the simple demeanour that is apparent in all he says and does and which gains not a little from the habitual thickness of his tones. (193)

The painterly attitude of Garrick as he was leaning forward corresponds to the Hogarthian "line of beauty" and was immortalized in an engraving by an unknown artist, now

belonging to the Harvard Theatre Collection.

Garrick performed the part of Scrub occasionally, but as Genest informs us, (194) his biographers remain silent as to that character. Macklin, on the other hand, performed the same part very often and with equal success. Kirkman writes of Scrub:

The character of Scrub is very strongly marked -- He is simple, yet cunning; forward, though timid; a tattler affecting secrecy; and a fool, assuming wisdom. The situations in which he is placed in the play are happily grotesque, and pregnant with much pleasantry. Mr. Macklin found an opportunity, in Scrub, of displaying his comic powers to advantage, and made his audience both laugh heartily, and applaud loudly. He performed this character often; and, by an admirable maiveté of execution, stood unrivalled in the part. (195)

A sentimental comedy that became a stock play was Edward Moore's The Foundling (1748). Garrick and Macklin appeared together at the première (13 February 1748 at Drury Lane): the former as Young Belmont and the latter as Faddle. Genest cites The Dramatic Censor on the excellent cast:

Garrick's peculiar qualifications and happy use of them, added amazing spirit to the piece, and gave more consequence to Young Belmont than can well be imagined -- Macklin, who never had in voice, figure or features much capacity for the fop cast, yet struck out some things in Faddle, that have not been since equalled, particularly in marking the obsequious knave throughout -- Barry in the 4th act supported his character with emphatic dignity and in the last with melting tenderness -- the part of Rosetta was undoubtedly conceived for Mrs. Woffington, and she did it particular

justice -- the elegance, the notions of love, and the vanity of admiration, which are united in Rosetta, were natural to Mrs. Woffington, so that she had the advantage of looking and speaking in her own character -- the softness and pathos, which distinguished Fidelia sat with much ease on Mrs. Cibber. (196)

Kirkman, in all justice to Garrick, more or less agrees with the above description while he gives us some additional information about Mrs. Woffington.

Addison's Cato was, perhaps, the only neoclassical tragedy proper written in the eighteenth century though it met with strong criticism from Dennis's quarters. The latter supported the view that Cato's stoical disposition results in a lack of tragic conflict, and his death appears to contradict all professed duty to his country. Garrick refused to undertake the part of Cato, and in this choice he was backed by Davies whose critical opinion was that "admirably suited, as the flexibility of his powers was to all the various passions of the human heart, and to all the rapid transitions of them, he wanted that fulness of sound, that os rotundum, to roll with ease a long declamatory speech, or give force and dignity to mere sentiment". (197)

In the light of Macklin's previous criticism about Garrick's lack of dignity in acting, the above comment is illuminating concerning the kind of parts for which Garrick was suited, and is reinforced by Aaron Hill's urge to Garrick:

Soon after the run of Merope, Mr. Hill tried all his art to make Mr. Garrick in love with his great idol Coesar. To this purpose, knowing that he admired the energy of passion more than dignity of character, or weight of sentiment, he took great pains to convince him of his error, assuring him, that sentiment was the soul of tragedy. "There is", says he, "but one walk in acting, which you have left untrodden; the walk I mean is the sublimely solemn one, the walk of weight and dignity; but not the cold declamatory and somniferous. Our unimpassioned Catos, and half-passioned Tamerlanes, were left too little animated by their authors; but were never written with so frostily congealed a chillness as their actors have been pleased to lend them". (198)

Aaron Hill was seconded by John Hill about the actor's ability to "sentimentalize" the part of Cato which initially appeared callous. The way of doing that was typical of the eighteenth-century general attitude toward tears:

It has been observed already, that as a single word will sometimes do more than a whole sentence, so one tear will affect an audience, where they would have despised a flood of them. The single drop of sorrow, the involuntary tribute of humanity, may be unworthy and contemptible.

... From this consideration, were I an actor who had power to do it, I would make a single tear steal down the unaltered face of Cato while he speaks the famous line:

"Thanks to the gods, my boy has done his duty".

This I would do, tho' at the expense of striking out the succeeding observation, "that Rome filled his eyes with tears that flow'd not o'er his own dead son".

As it is, there is something brutal in the severity of Cato; and virtue never took that character. The Roman, rigid and firm as he was, yet must be a man as well as a hero; and I would let the man weep while the hero triumphed. No matter that the

virtue and steadiness of Cato disdained the womanish effect of sorrow, at least so far mingle themselves with the General and the Roman: and while his dignity disowned the tear, still let humanity and paternal affection call it forth. The resignation and triumph of the illustrious character would thus be seen with redoubled lustre, because we should see the parent and the man at the bottom: without it the greatness of the sentiment carries with it something barbarous. (199)

Booth had played Cato with great applause, and so did Quin after him. Despite Aaron Hill's promptness to dismiss Quin's Cato and Gentleman's prejudiced views, (200) Davies notes that "Cato was never acted by Quin without great and well-merited applause; and what is still better, never without the best approbation, the strict attention of the audience". (201) In fact Genest, referring to the performance of 25 March 1742, mentions:

Mrs. Milward says, that many persons who had taken tickets at her former benefit could not get room, and that their tickets would be received on this night, Mr. Rich having generously given her the use of his theatre. (202)

Quin is, therefore, ascertained to have deported himself extremely well in parts which required solemnity and dignity and a declamatory manner of speaking as that of Cato.

The domestic tragedy in which Garrick shone was Aaron Hill's adaptation of Voltaire's Merope (1749). Davies gives us a detailed account of the cast of the play when it was first acted on 15 April 1749 and for eleven nights in succession:

The author was extremely anxious to have his play cast with the full strength of the company; but the principal actors are not easily led to play such parts as they imagine are unsuitable to their powers. Mr. Garrick, indeed, was born to act Eumenes; but though Mrs. Cibber had given a sort of promise that she would perform Merope, yet after a long hesitation she gave it up: whether she imagined the part did not suit her maidenly slim figure, or from what other reason, I know not; but she refused to act it. The author pressed Poliphontes upon Barry, which he disliking, with much impudence Hill expected he would act Narbas, a very inferior character. Mrs. Pritchard accepted Merope, Mr. Havard engaged for Poliphontes, and Barry was well pleased with Narbas. (203)

Again the pathetic effects of Garrick's and Mrs Pritchard's (204) acting have not been lost on critics. Murphy wrote that both players "made the spectators pant with terror and pity and at last drew tears of joy from every eye". (205)

The other domestic tragedy that became a staple play in Garrick's repertoire was Zara, an adaptation of Voltaire's Zaire by Aaron Hill, which scored eighth in number of performances of tragic parts by Garrick since he first undertook it (25 March 1754). Zara is noteworthy for another reason in theatrical history; it was the play in which Mrs Cibber made her debut as a tragic actress. However, the play had been originally staged at the theatre of York with Mr Bond in the part of Lusignan and Hill's nephew in the part of Osman. Zara was given to a young

actress. The play was acted several times in spite of Bond's death "who expired almost upon the stage, and at the very time when the people were applauding him for his natural exhibition of an aged and dying monarch". (206)

Not much later Zara (1753) was brought on stage at Drury Lane (2 January 1736). Contrary to all declarations about "naturalness" and spontaneity in acting, Aaron Hill decided to instruct his pupil, Mrs Cibber, in every single detail of the part of Zara. "He interlined her part with a kind of commentary upon it; he marked every accent and emphasis; every look, action, and deportment proper to the character, in all its different situations, he critically pointed out." (207)

The same schooling was repeated with Hill's nephew though it was not crowned by success. "The young gentleman's figure and voice were by no means disagreeable, but a certain stiffness in action, and too laboured and emphatical an emphasis in speaking, disgusted the critics, who too severely corrected a young performer, whom, on the first night of his acting, they cruelly exploded." (208)

The play, however, ran for fourteen nights successively thanks to the charms of Mrs Cibber, who drew the audiences to the theatre in crowds. She was "agreeable, with a set of features uncommonly expressive; she possessed a very plaintive, mellow, powerful voice: in grief and distraction, no idea could go beyond her execution". (209)

The part of Lusignan was undertaken by Mr Milward who was greatly admired for his voice and action in his interview with Nerestan and Zara. When Garrick succeeded Milward in the part of Lusignan, he streamlined the long declamations of the Hill text and restored emphases and lines from Voltaire's original. There is scant information about Garrick's performance from his biographer Davies. There is, however, Hannah More's sentimentalized account of Garrick's Lusignan. The eighteenth-century emphasis on action rather than voice and the practice of isolating certain gestures and attitudes for comment can be distinguished in More's extract:

Yes I have seen Him! I have heard Him! -- & the Music of his Voice, & the Lightening of his eyes still act so forcibly on my imagination, that I see, & hear Him still. He play'd Lusignan last Night, & we had the good Fortune to get Places about the Middle of the Pit.

... The Part was most barbarously short; -- but the "excess compensated the Date." His Pronouncing the little Pronoun you in a certain doubtful, apprehensive, tremulous interrogatory Tone gave me a more precise Idea of Perfection, than all the Elocution I ever heard from the Stage: -- yet divinely, as he speaks, Speech is almost superfluous in Him, & I would undertake to translate his Looks and Attitudes into words, tho' perhaps with some Abatement of the Author's Poetry, & his Expression. -- No Rant, no Pomp. ... What an enchanting Simplicity! What an eternally varying Cadence, yet without one Stop, one Inequality. (210)

I have so far examined a representative number of plays which met with success between 1700 and 1760. From contemporary views about these performances, it emerges that the "new" consisted in a freer experimentation with new techniques. It does not necessarily follow that old conventions were dispensed with. Far from that some of those were incorporated into the "new" style though couched in different terms. The audience understood innovation to consist in a seeming freedom from premeditation and deliberate design, in fidelity in representing attitudes or events, and in the effects of ease and particularization. The success of a play was secured by the personal glamour of the players and not by its intrinsic literary quality. The overall development of a character was sacrificed to the actor's "points", that is, the isolated "strokes of nature" which a player could include in his acting. The term "new", as this was used by contemporary critics, did not imply a unified school of acting. Garrick, for instance, who retained a full range of set poses and never hesitated to exhibit violent passions, was, in many ways, less revolutionary than Macklin, who fought for familiar intonations and naturally broken utterances. In my view, however, the development which has not been fully appreciated so far and which could account for one more link between drama and novel is the formation of a new metalanguage in the eighteenth century resulting from the

ever-increasing body of critics, including, among the latter, novelists aspiring to become playwrights. (211)

Notes to Chapter Four

1. ... if they were good actors, why not? How should they have been able to act, or rise to any excellence, if you suppos'd them not to feel, or understand what you offer'd them? Would you have reduc'd them, to the meer mimickry of parrots, and monkies, that can only prate, and play a great many pretty tricks, without reflection? Or how are you sure, your friend, the infallible judge, to whom you read your fine piece, might be sincere in the praises he gave it? Or indeed, might not you have thought the best judge a bad one, if he had disliked it? Consider too, how possible it might be, that a man of sense would not care to tell you a truth, he was sure you would not believe.

Colley Cibber, An Apology for the Life of Mr Colley Cibber (London, 1740), p. 343.

2. Charles Macklin, Covent Garden Theatre; or Pasquin Turn'd Drawcansir, The Augustan Reprint Society (Los Angeles, 1946-), 116 (1965), 13.
3. George R. Kernodle, From Art to Theatre: Form and Convention in the Renaissance (Chicago, 1944).
4. Ronald Paulson, Emblem and Expression: Meaning in English Art of the Eighteenth Century (London, 1975), p.128.
5. Jonathan Richardson, An Essay on the Theory of Painting (London, 1715), p. 180.
6. Aaron Hill, The Works of the Late Aaron Hill, 4 vols (London, 1753), iv. 387.

7. Gerard de Lairese, The Art of Painting, translated by John Frederick Fritsch (London, 1778), p.41.
8. John Dryden, Essays, edited by W.P.Ker, 2 vols (Oxford, 1926), ii, 147.
9. Emblem and Expression, p. 45.
10. Richardson, p. 66.
11. Dryden, ii, 140.
12. Ibid., ii, 142-43.
13. Aaron Hill indirectly corroborates the French influence on Garrick via painting:

If ever any painter, statuary or engraver, in the world, had such creative power, as one life-painter has, whom nature lodged in Mr.Garrick's fancy,'tis in France, he must be looked for. They have their innumerable prints; all filled in masterly perfection, with whatever is, or was, most celebrated, in the history-pieces, and fine statues, of antiquity. And a well-chosen collection, from the best of these, would furnish infinite supply of hints, to so compleat a judge of attitudes, as I here, wish 'em viewed by. I say hints, because, in many of the very finest of 'em all, there are defects, which you could rectify. For you will see, with pleasure, they grew chiefly (as I every where observed, in Italy) from some unnerved remissness, in the joints, that lamed the purposed animation, in the posture; and you cannot fail to draw a proof from that remark, how much the painters may improve, by copying Mr.Garrick, and what little room there is, for his improving, by the painters.

The Works of the Late Aaron Hill, ii, 385-86 (3 August 1749).

14. Richardson, pp. 69-70.

15. Joseph Addison and Richard Steele, Critical Essays from the Spectator, edited by Donald F. Bond (Oxford, 1970), pp. 218-19.
16. John Ireland, Hogarth Illustrated, second edition, 3 vols (London 1804), iii, 25, 26, 27.
17. William Hogarth, The Analysis of Beauty, edited by Joseph Burke (Oxford, 1955), p. 161.
18. Ibid., p. 162.
19. See Chapter Two.
20. Rogerson Brewster, "The Art of Painting the Passions", Journal of the History of Ideas, 14 (1953), 68-94 (p.93).
21. Ibid., p. 76.
22. James Thomas Kirkman, Memoirs of the Life of Charles Macklin, 2 vols (London, 1799), i, 364.
23. John Hill, The Actor: or, A Treatise on the Art of Playing (London, 1745), p.75.
24. Georg Christoph Lichtenberg, Lichtenberg's Visits to England, translated by Margaret L. Mare and W.H. Quarrell (Oxford, 1938), p.3.
25. George Taylor, "'The Just Delineation of the Passions": Theories of Acting in the Age of Garrick", in The Eighteenth-Century English Stage, edited by Kenneth Richards and Peter Thomson (London, 1972), 51-72 (pp.60-61).
26. John Hill, pp. 246-47.

27. Colley Cibber, p.61.
28. John Hill, p.244.
29. Ibid., p. 245.
30. Ibid., p.247.
31. Thomas Betterton, The History of the English Stage (London, 1741), p.46.
32. Ibid., p.16.
33. Thomas Davies, Dramatic Miscellanies, 3 vols (London, 1785), i, 222.
34. Thomas Davies, Memoirs of the Life of David Garrick, 2 vols (London, 1781), ii, 91-92.
35. Ibid., ii, 99.
36. John Hill, pp. 239-40.
37. Thomas Wilkes, A General View of the Stage (London, 1759), p. 107.
38. See Chapter Two.
39. Arthur Murphy, The Life of David Garrick, 2 vols (London, 1801), i, 46-47.
40. Benjamin Victor, Original Letters, Dramatic Pieces and Poems, 3 vols (London, 1776), i, 98 (14 March 1744).
41. Colley Cibber, pp. 60-61.
42. Ibid., p.61.
43. Ibid., p. 66.
44. Ibid., pp. 174-75.
45. Ibid., p. 239.

46. Dramatic Miscellanies, ii, 183.
47. Ibid, ii, 241.
48. Ibid., ii, 244.
49. Ibid., ii, 322.
50. Ibid., iii, 113.
51. Kirkman, i, 249-50.
52. Ibid., i, 244-47.
53. The Works of the Late Aaron Hill, ii, 117-18.
54. Colley Cibber, pp. 337-38.
55. Dramatic Miscellanies, i, 355-56.
56. Ibid., i, 294.
57. Ibid., ii, 279.
58. Betterton, p. 10.
59. Dramatic Miscellanies, i, 222.
60. Betterton, p.70.
61. Dramatic Miscellanies, i, 397.
62. Ibid, i, 407.
63. Ibid., iii, 440-41.
64. Ibid., iii, 301-02.
65. Ibid., iii, 371.
66. Ibid., iii, 430.
67. Kirkman, i, 292.
68. Memoirs of the Life of David Garrick, ii, 109.
69. "Le Brun pushed expression in the direction of a mere spectrum of lexicon of facial responses."
Emblem and Expression, p. 129.

70. Memoirs of the Life of David Garrick, ii, 111.
71. Jocelyn Powell, Restoration Theatre Production (London, 1984), p. 92.
72. Memoirs of the Life of David Garrick, ii, 240.
73. Ibid., i, 40.
74. In Cibber's Epistle To David Garrick (London, 1759) there is an extensive account of his interpretation of the character of Richard III and what he thought to be Garrick's improprieties.
75. "Garrick's new "naturalistic" style retained much of the posing and posturing of the earlier actors. It was, however, infused with a vitality and spirit which took the town by storm."
- Kalman A. Burnim, David Garrick, Director (Carbondale, 1973), p. 57.
76. Burnim sees in eighteenth-century paintings of Garrick a greater fidelity to nature that compares well with the "natural" gestures in Garrick's acting:

Most of the theatrical portraits of Garrick, by Hogarth, Dance, Hayman, and especially Zoffany, are characterized by "their greater fidelity to natural gestures". Consequently, the settings reflect a greater realism: not an absolute fidelity to historical fact and setting -- that would come later -- but a sweeping away of theatricality in the way that Garrick's new style had swept away Quin's old style when they confronted each other on the stage of Covent Garden in a performance of The Fair Penitent one night in the season of 1746-47.

- Kalman A. Burnim, "Looking Upon his Like Again: Garrick and the Artist", In British Theatre and the Other Arts : 1660-1800, edited by Shirley Strum Kenny (Washington and London, 1884), 182-218 (p.189).
77. Alastair Smart, "Dramatic Gesture and Expression in the Age of Hogarth and Reynolds", Apollo, 82 (1965), 90-97 (p.93).
78. The Works of the Late Aaron Hill, ii, 382 (3 August 1749).
79. Smart, p. 94.
80. The Life of David Garrick, i, 222-23.
81. David Garrick, An Essay on Acting (London, 1744), p.9.
82. John Hill, pp. 34-35.
83. Dramatic Miscellanies, ii, 119.
84. Ibid., ii, 133.
85. Garrick, p. 18.
86. Knowledge of this painting is derived from a line engraving by Alexander Bannerman dating from 1763.
87. Jean Georges Noverre, Letters on Dancing and Ballet, translated by Cyril Beaumont, originally published in 1760 (London, 1930), pp.84-85.
88. Dramatic Miscellanies, iii 166-67.
89. Ibid., ii, 183.
90. Ibid., iii, 70-71.
91. George Winchester Stone and George M. Kahrl, David

Garrick : A Critical Biography (Carbondale and Edwardsville, 1979), p. 547.

92. Lichtenberg, pp. 9-10.
93. Wilkes, p.118.
94. For detailed account, see The Life of David Garrick, i, 177-78.
95. Colley Cibber, pp. 60-61.
96. We have Lichtenberg's description of Garrick's entrance in the same scene:

Thus he comes on the stage, sunk in contemplation, his chin resting on his right hand, and his right elbow on his left, and gazes solemnly downwards. And then, removing his right hand from his chin, but, if I remember right, still supporting it with his left hand, he speaks the words "To be or not to be" etc. softly, though, on account of the absolute silence (not because of some particular talent of the man's, as they say even in some of the newspapers), they are audible everywhere.

Lichtenberg, p.16.

97. Dramatic Miscellanies, iii, 93-94.
98. Ibid., iii, 108.
99. Theophilus Cibber, To David Garrick, Esq; with Dissertations on Theatrical Subjects (London, 1759), second dissertation, p. 21.
100. The Letters of David Garrick, edited by David M.Little and George M.Kahrl, 3 vols (Oxford, 1963), i, 350-52.
101. The Life of David Garrick, i, 45-47.
102. Theophilus Cibber, second dissertation, pp.21-22.
103. Kirkman, i, 247-48, 249.

104. Dramatic Miscellanies, iii, 29-30.
105. Ibid., ii, 280.
106. Holograph letter, Folger Library.
107. Theophilus Cibber, second dissertation, pp. 31-40. His account includes an interesting interpretation of the character of King Lear.
108. Kirkman, i, 247-48.
109. John Hill, pp. 233-34.
110. For in the very Torrent, Tempest, and I may say the Whirlwind of Passion, you must acquire and get a Temperance, that may give it SMOOTHNESS. I remember, among many, an Instance in the Madness of Alexander the Great, in Lee's Play. Mr. Goodman always went through it with all the Force the part requir'd, and yet made not half the Noise as some who succeeded him; who were sure to bellow it out in such a manner, that their Voice would fail them before the End, and lead them to such a languid and enervate Hoarseness, as entirely requires, and which is the Perfection of beautiful Speaking; Smoothness, is all that can be desir'd.
- Betterton, p. 110.
111. Theophilus Cibber, second dissertation, pp. 39-40.
112. Dramatic Miscellanies, ii, 281.
113. Ibid., iii, 325.
114. Lichtenberg, pp. 31-32.
115. The Life of David Garrick, i, 106.
116. Victor, i, 100 (14 March 1744).
117. Aaron Hill praises Garrick for bringing the passions before his eyes "paintedly" in King Lear and Tancred.
The Works of the Late Aaron Hill, ii, 372-73.

118. The Letters of David Garrick, i, 82-83.
119. The Life of David Garrick, i, 114, 115.
120. Wilkes, p. 293.
121. Memoirs of the Life of David Garrick, ii, 239-40.
122. Kirkman, i, 301-02.
123. Dramatic Miscellanies, i, 225-26.
124. Ibid., i, 249.
125. Ibid., i, 54.
126. Ibid., i, 53.
127. Ibid., i, 35.
128. The Life of David Garrick, i, 364-65.
129. John Hill, pp. 65-66.
130. Ibid., p. 56.
131. The Life of David Garrick, i, 153.
132. Kirkman, i, 326-27.
133. John Hill, p. 198.
134. Wilkes, p. 251.
135. Ibid.
136. Dramatic Miscellanies, ii, 244.
137. Ibid., ii, 245.
138. Kirkman, i, 260-61, 264.
139. Francis Gentleman, The Dramatic Censor; or, Critical Companion, 2 vols (London, 1770), i, 296.
140. Dramatic Miscellanies, ii, 107.
141. Ibid., ii, 108.

142. Lichtenberg, pp. 2-4.

143. The stupid confusion which he shews at breaking the urinal, and his satisfaction at going out without its being taken notice of, are peculiar to himself. The introducing this incident was first owing entirely to accident. It happened to old Cibber, who was allowed to play this character well. He, while the other personages were employed, rather than stand idle, was fiddling about the table of the Alchymist; and by way filling up time, took up the urinal, and held it to the light, when it by chance slipping through his fingers, broke to pieces; and he had presence of mind to put an air of distress happy to the time and the place; it told to admirable purpose. He played the part afterwards as usual; but the audience obliged him to restore the accidental addition; and it has been ever since retained by every other performer. Abel Drugger is certainly the standard of low comedy; and Mr. Garrick's playing it the standard of acting in this species of comedy.

Wilkes, pp. 257-58.

144. Ben Jonson, Every Man in his Humour, The New Mermaids edition (New York, 1979), p. xxii.

145. Ibid., p.xvi.

146. The Life of David Garrick, i, 207-08.

147. Dramatic Miscellanies, iii, 239.

148. Ibid., iii, 242-43.

149. Gentleman, i, 337-38.

150. The Life of David Garrick, i, 144.

151. Forster Collection, "News Clippings", no. 126.

152. Dramatic Miscellanies, iii, 247.

153. Wilkes, pp. 270-71.

154. The Life of David Garrick, ii, 8-9
155. Wilkes, p. 281.
156. Ibid., p. 244.
157. Powell, p. 171.
158. Kirkman, i, 349.
159. Gentleman, i, 271.
160. Kirkman, i, 349.
161. Ibid., i, 350.
162. The Life of David Garrick, i, 51-52.
163. Ibid., i, 53.
164. Theophilus Cibber, first dissertation, pp. 44-45.
165. Dramatic Miscellanies, iii, 304-05.
166. Ibid., iii, 428.
167. Ibid., iii, 366-67.
168. Ibid., iii, 371.
169. Ibid.
170. Ibid.
171. Robert Hume, The Development of English Drama in the Late Seventeenth Century (Oxford, 1976), p.396.
172. Ibid., p.435.
173. Colley Cibber, p. 331.
174. Dramatic Miscellanies, iii, 428.
175. Ibid., iii, 429.
176. Ibid., iii, 429-30.
177. Ibid., iii, 430.

178. Lichtenberg, pp. 17-20.
179. Memoirs of the Life of David Garrick, i, 130.
180. Ibid., i, 265-66.
181. The Life of David Garrick, i, 327.
182. Kirkman, i, 243.
183. Dramatic Miscellanies, iii, 439.
184. Ibid., iii, 440.
185. Kirkman, i, 244-48.
186. Ibid., i, 251-52.
187. Wilkes, pp. 271-72.
188. Memoirs of the Life of David Garrick, i, 191.
189. Ibid.
190. Wilkes, p. 237.
191. Ibid., p. 255.
192. John Hill, p. 70.
193. Lichtenberg, pp. 26-27.
194. John Genest, Some Account of the English Stage from the Restoration in 1660 to 1830, 10 vols (Bath, 1832), iv, 144.
195. Kirkman, i, 241-42.
196. Genest, iv, 238-39.
197. Memoirs of the Life of David Garrick, i, 154.
198. Ibid., i, 152-53.
199. John Hill, pp. 27, 28-29.
200. To personate this character (Cato) happily, requires consequence both of person and countenance; a mellifluous extensive

fullness of voice and depth of judgement; theatrical chicanery cannot be of any service; we doubt not, but it will seem treason against the majesty of established criticism, to doubt Mr. Quin's superiority within the last thirty years; yet we must venture the bold assertion, that deducting his figure, aspect and suitable voice, he was as erroneous as such attributes would admit; his action had a laboured sameness in it; his utterance appeared more subservient to the cadences of measure than the periods of sense, and his tones frequently swelled into offensive pomposity; in some of the lines to Decius, he struck out beauties; in receiving the news of Marcus's fall, he was fine, and wept for his country in the following scene like a great man; but his soliloquy and most other parts of the character were chaunted in a very culpable manner; so far that we will be hardly enough to assert, to a nice ear he proved himself more of the methodical spouter, than the affluent orator.

Gentleman, i, 455.

201. Memoirs of the Life of David Garrick, i, 153-54.
202. Genest, iv, 8.
203. Memoirs of the Life of David Garrick, i, 146-47.
204. The part of Merope had been previously held by Mrs Cibber with great success. Wilkes writes fo her:

No woman supports better the dignity of Tragedy. I never observed her to descend into the familiar in the Queens of Hamlet or Merope; in the latter she preserves such a majesty of grief and maternal distress for her son Eumenes, as always highly affects and pleases.

Wilkes, p. 284.

205. The Life of David Garrick, i, 170.
206. Memoirs of the Life of David Garrick, i, 136.

207. Ibid., i, 137.
208. Ibid.
209. Kirkman, i, 206.
210. Quoted in Stone/Kahrl, p. 566.
211. Tobias Smollett provides an example of over-interpretation of a poet's lines in Peregrine Pickle (ii,241-42, Everyman's Library edition). The following passage refers to Quin as Zanga in Young's Revenge:

"He took it up;
 But scarce was it unfolded to his sight,
 When he, as if an arrow pierced his eye,
 Started and trembling dropt it on the
 ground."

In pronouncing the first two words this egregious actor stoops down, and seems to take up something from the stage; then proceeding to repeat what follows, mimicks the manner of unfolding the letter; when he mentions the simile of the arrow piercing his eye, he darts his forefinger towards that organ, then recoils with great violence when the word "started" is expressed; and when he comes to "trembling dropt it on the gound", he throws all his limbs into a tremulous motion, and shakes the imaginary paper from his hand.

The latter part of the description is carried on with the same minute gesticulation while he says,

"Pale and aghast a while my victim stood,
 Disguised a sigh or two and puffed them
 from him;

Then rubb'd his brow and took it up again."

The player's countenance assumes a wild stare, he sighs twice most piteously, as if he were on the point of suffocation, scrubs his brow, and bending his body, apes the action of snatching an object from the floor.

Nor is this dexterity of dumb show omitted, when he concludes his intimation in these three lines:

"At first he look'd as if he meant to read
it,

But, check'd by rising fears, he crush'd it
thus,

And thrust it like an adder in his bosom."

Here the judicious performer imitates the
confusion and concern of Alonzo, seems to
cast his eyes upon something from which
they are immediately withdrawn, with horror
and precipitation, then shutting his fist
with a violent squeeze, as if he intended
to make immediate application to Isabella's
nose, he rams it in his own bosom, with all
the horror and agitation of a thief taken
in the manner. ...

Nothing can be more trivial, forced,
unnatural, and antic than this superfluous
mummery.

CHAPTER FIVE

A THEATRICAL READING OF TRISTRAM SHANDY

So far Sterne has been charged with plagiaries from almost every writer on whose works critics could lay a hand. One aspect of outside influence, however, has not been thoroughly explored: the converging theories of pulpit oratory and acting in the eighteenth century, especially, in connection with painting. In the second chapter, I dealt with the philosophical links of acting and, to a lesser extent, of pulpit oratory. I have also attempted to prefigure how these theoretical considerations emerge in Tristram Shandy. What remains now to be done is to examine in what ways Sterne exploited both his theoretical and empirical knowledge of pulpit and stage action in Tristram Shandy.

As I have indicated in the conclusion of the preceding chapter, a new metalanguage made its appearance with the development of theatrical criticism which consisted in a minute description of gesture. This, of course, was justifiable in critical works though not in creative ones. Tristram Shandy, if not dramatic in an ordinary way, is structured in a way which is in part strongly reminiscent of the theatrical language of the day. While other novelists illustrated their characters through their behaviour and the

analysis of their motives, Sterne opted for a detailed account of their physical reactions, which was placed within a meaningful context of allusions to contemporary acting techniques. He cultivated an idiosyncratic method of creating stagey effects in Tristram Shandy by evoking -- either intact or slightly modified, but still recognizable -- gestures and postures of contemporary players. This is the first important aspect of stage influence, which will be developed further in this chapter.

The second aspect of the stage influence is the relationship between reader and characters in Tristram Shandy and the stage parallel in the period under discussion. Sterne invites the reader to think of his work as a drama which is being performed at the moment of reading and in which his readers participate. What contributes to a certain extent to the illusion of a drama being performed before the reader's eyes is the informal conversation in which the narrator and the reader are involved.(1) Precisely this conversational style is the development of a method first employed in Sterne's sermons as I have shown in Chapter Three. Fluchère has not failed to emphasize the role Sterne's profession played in his work:

We should not forget that Sterne's first stylistic exercises were in the form of sermons -- that is, orations intended to be heard in a state of emotion, and to persuade, by a joint appeal to reason and sensibility, an audience inclined to somnolence. (2)

The method of characterization in Tristram Shandy constitutes the main link with drama and theatre. While Fielding and Richardson broke away from the dramatic tradition into another sphere of realism in fiction, Sterne drew his characters on the basis of the Jonsonian doctrine of humours according to which a character talks and acts motivated by a blind devotion to a peculiar "humour" or "ruling passion". (3) The theory of ruling passions in the eighteenth century is the equivalent of the theory of humours in Restoration. In fact, the terms "passion", "humour", and "hobby-horse" are used interchangeably in Tristram Shandy:

When a man gives himself up to the government of a ruling passion, -- or in other words, when his hobby-horse grows headstrong, -- farewell cool reason and fair discretion.

II, 5 (p. 113)

A wise and a just man however would always endeavour to proportion the vent given to these humours, not only to the degree of them stirring within himself -- but to the size and all intent of the offence upon which they are to fall.

III, 10 (p. 181)

The practical implications of the narrator's choice are crucial in that the characters are bound to be flat and stylized, verging on the caricature rather than being based on a careful analysis of their real motives, which is the

case in the novel. (4) External behaviour and inner motivation are identical, and they both spring from an absent-minded attention to the "ruling passion", which distorts the character's judgement of all aspects of life so as to match his passion. The same view is held by Traugott, who observes that "Sterne never suggests that his humour characters are really just like us when you get to know their feeling hearts better. The sense of role is always maintained; his characters remain as roles, voices, in the dialectic of our mind. They are not whole, realistic figures; they are probable aspects of human motivation." (5) Sterne, in a humorous way, expounds this view of the inseparability of character from action in Tristram Shandy:

"A man and his HOBBY-HORSE, though I cannot say that they act and re-act exactly after the same manner in which the soul and body do upon each other: Yet doubtless there is a communication between them of some kind, and my opinion rather is, that there is something in it more of the manner of electrified bodies, -- and that, by means of the heated parts of the rider, which come immediately into contact with the back of the HOBBY-HORSE, -- By long journeys and much friction, it so happens that the body of the rider is at length filled as full of HOBBY-HORSICAL matter as it can hold; -- so that if you are able to give but a clear description of the nature of the one, you may form a pretty exact notion of the genius and character of the other.

I, 24 (pp. 98-99)

Even minor characters, who occupy less significant place in the overall pattern of action, are presented to act and respond guided by their preoccupations. (6) Susannah's

reaction to Bobby's death, for instance, is conditioned by a peculiar fancy for garments. On the same occasion, Obadiah's thoughts are automatically driven to the laborious task of the Oxmoor ahead of him. (7) Toby's and Trim's actions spring from their preoccupation with military affairs while Widow Wadman and Bridget are more materialistic in their concern about the two men, respectively. Dr Slop's hobby-horse is his interest in obstetrics whereas Yorick, in spite of the fact that he is favourably drawn, is not totally free of idiosyncratic habits as, for example, his use of an emaciated horse. Female characters tend to be less elaborately illustrated as is Mrs Shandy, who is presented as having not a single opinion of her own.

The application of the theory of humours, however, is best exemplified in major characters. Walter and Toby represent reason and emotion, respectively, developed as humours. Walter is the "natural" and "moral" philosopher. (In its eighteenth-century sense, philosophy was a broad term including all fields of knowledge). He provides a brilliant illustration of one who possesses knowledge but not wisdom: (8) "sciences may be learned by rote, but wisdom not" (V, 32, p. 385). Walter is so much lost in speculative philosophy, and his concern about his family is so theoretical that he is totally out of touch with the reality

of human needs and desires. His scientific approach to human affairs and his search for impersonal laws governing personal relations result in the miscarriage of all his carefully laid plans (II, 19). Duncan, in an investigation of the subject of the "stock" character of the scientist argues that from the foundation of the Royal Society (1660) (9) until the middle of the eighteenth century

...scientific humour found exploitation in the comedies of that period. ... While the old pseudo-sciences lingered on the stage as well as in the by-ways of life, they had lost their fresh appeal and were conventionalized. A new kind of material, as has been seen, was discovered by the play-writers -- material, drawn for comic uses directly from life. The virtuoso, a new scientist, was created to represent the new material. He quickly transplanted the older type. There was, to be sure, the accusation of pedantry and of pseudo-science levelled against him also, but alchemy, astrology and witchcraft, were not among his interests. (10)

The main objection levelled against the scientific type in all the plays based on the theory of humours is the idea that science is diametrically opposed to humanitarianism, as Miranda complains in The Virtuoso: "One who has broken his brains about the nature of maggots, who has study'd these twenty years to find out the spots of a spider and never cared for understanding mankind." (11)

By comparing the above passage to one taken from Tristram Shandy, we notice the same "religious" devotion to science on Walter's part and an identical reaction to it on

Toby's, the humanist's, part:

For God's sake, my uncle Toby would cry, -- and for my sake, and for all our sakes, my dear brother Shandy -- do let this story of our aunt's and her ashes sleep in peace; -- how can you, -- how can you have so little feeling and compassion for the character of our family? -- What is the character of a family to an hypothesis? my father would reply.

I, 21 (p. 92)

Unlike Walter, Toby is less articulate and more emotionally inclined. However, there is only a limited polarization of reason and feeling in Tristram Shandy as both characters share feeling to the extent that it allows them to maintain communication. The "contrariety of humours" results only in a "fraternal squabble" (I, 21). Contrary to what would be expected from a "sentimental" character in contemporary plays, Toby is, certainly, not a victimized model of virtue. In fact, he is an agent led by his preoccupation with warfare. Though his good intentions are undeniable, he can be charged with a few misdemeanours among which an obvious one is Tristram's circumcision. His impulsive pursuit of military fortification and his neurotic interpretation of everything that reaches his ears in military terms are the causes of substantial disturbance to his brother, and Toby often feels obliged to apologize for his inopportune and thoughtless comments:

Did ever man, brother Toby, cried my father, raising himself upon his elbow, and turning himself round to the opposite side

of the bed where my uncle Toby was sitting in his old fringed chair, with his chin resting upon his crutch -- did ever a poor unfortunate man, brother Toby, cried my father, receive so many lashes? -- The most I ever saw given, quoth my uncle Toby, (ringing the bell at the bed's head for Trim) was to a grenadier, I think in Mackay's regiment. -- Had my uncle Toby shot a bullet through my father's heart, he could not have fallen down with his nose upon the quilt more suddenly. Bless me! said my uncle Toby.

IV, 3 (p.276)

Characters in Tristram Shandy emerge as long matrices of gestures. Gestures dominate over narrative descriptions of feelings and emotions, unlike the work of other early novelists, and the reader is to interpret the emotions of the characters through their physical manifestations. Although "gesture is an indispensable element in the comedy, giving edge to individual portraits, contributing to the whole network of relationships, making emotional contact possible between the characters", "the revelation that gesture can make is only partial. It contributes to the story, but in itself it is only anecdotal. It cannot express the deepest inner life, those secret recesses which it is the novelist's most important task to reveal. (12) Besides, the preoccupation with the body has always had a direct relationship with acting.

Sterne, in Tristram's persona, very frequently seems to despair about the failure of language to express feelings. Gesture is a language understood universally. In

the Shandian world gestures are more important than words, for words can be misinterpreted, gestures never. Gesture defines relationships and creates the dramatic atmosphere from which events will spring. The superiority of gesture as against narrative account is confirmed by Tristram in the following passage:

The descent of the hat was as if a heavy lump of clay had been kneaded into the crown of it -- Nothing could have expressed the sentiment of mortality, of which it was the type and forerunner, like it, -- his hand seemed to vanish from under it, -- it fell dead, -- the corporal's eye fixed upon it, as upon a corps, -- and Susannah burst into a flood of tears.

V, 7 (p. 357)

The attitude described above is, of course, in line with the eighteenth-century belief that "some feelings were ... too sublime for words, certainly for the printed word, and expressible only in vital gesture and countenance". (13) The reason for that was "the physical proximity of the spectator to the actor, whose innate mental energy, like Garrick's "Electrical fire", could shoot outward and inflame all hearts within the radius of his flashing eyes". (14)

The narrator is himself an actor whose violent movements are reminiscent of isolated gestures in play performances of Sterne's day. No contemporary reader who had seen Garrick as Hamlet would have failed to recognize the recreation of the actor's gesture in his first encounter

with the ghost in the following passage from Tristram Shandy (see Chapter Four, p. 187):

By all that is hirsute and gashly! I cry, taking off my furred cap, and twisting it round my finger -- I would not give sixpence for a dozen such! -- But 'tis an excellent cap too (putting it upon my head, and pressing it close to my ears) -- and warm -- and soft.

VIII, 11 (p. 525)

In addition to the explicit or implicit references to Garrick's real practice on the stage, we have Sterne's own confession in one of his letters to Garrick that the actor was to find himself in Tristram Shandy. Critics have not paid attention to the author's statement and have, therefore, failed to search for Garrick's "presence" in Tristram Shandy in terms of allusions to his gestures. However, Sterne's message in the following letter is in accordance with his real habit of visiting Drury Lane at the time of Garrick's stay in France:

Since I wrote last I have frequently stept into your house -- that is, as frequently as I could take the whole party, where I dined, along with me -- This was but justice to you, as I walk'd in as a wit -- but with regard to myself, I balanced the account thus -- I am sometimes in my friend (Garrick)'s house, but he is always in Tristram Shandy's -- where my friends say he will continue (and I hope the prophecy true for my own immortality) even when he himself is no more. (15)

All silent action in Tristram Shandy is justifiable on theatrical grounds as only on the eighteenth-century stage could voiceless action convey more meaning than words.

Walter gives utterance to the significance of the minutest detail of gesture for the interpretation of character: (16)

There are a thousand unnoticed openings, continued my father, which let a penetrating eye at once into a man's soul; and I maintain it, added he, that a man of sense does not lay down his hat in coming into a room, -- or take it up in going out of it, but something escapes, which discovers him.

VI, 5 (pp. 701-02)

Gesture as an index to feeling in Tristram Shandy is well linked to the sentimental component of the new school of acting which was necessitated by the needs of the age. Martin Price corroborates my point about the sentimental connection of gesture:

The gesture, like music, combines formal clarity with suggestiveness, it gives the reader the experience of having his unconscious movement sharply defined before him. Gestures have much the same function for the artistry of feeling that suggestive forms may have for the painter. This artistry of the heart is an essential theme in Tristram Shandy, and we see it most clearly in the untutored movements of Corporal Trim. (17)

Sterne does not make any explicit distinction between "old" and "new" style of acting, but, to be sure, there is an underlying contrast between "natural" and, if not "artificial", "exaggerated" gesture. This dichotomy does not consist in a division of characters belonging to two schools; it extends to an intricate net of tableaux of gestures, which does justice to the complexity of the stage

theory and practice of the day. Occasionally, antitheses become so clear as to reveal the outlines of what was supposed to be natural or artificial. It is important to mention that more than often the allusions to contemporary theatrical practice are humorous and, most probably, are intended as a comical commentary on the different styles of acting. Nevertheless, they serve indirectly to depict the characters of Tristram Shandy. In the following passage, for example, the initial impression of the reader could be that the narrator simply overstates the appropriateness of using the right or left hand. However, the contemporary reader, who would be familiar with either pulpit or stage conventions, would have automatically brought to mind the obligatory rule about the use of the right hand.

Matters of no more seeming consequence in themselves than "Whether my father should have taken off his wig, with his right hand or with his left," -- have divided the greatest kingdoms and made the crowns of the monarchs who governed them, to totter upon their heads.

III, 2 (p. 172)

The association of "naturalness" and violence of movement, for which Garrick was criticized by his opponents and, in particular, by his predecessors, is attributed to the narrator in Tristram Shandy, and it reinforces the parallel between Garrick and the narrator as actor:

Instantly I snatched off my wig, and threw it perpendicularly, with all imaginable violence, up to the top of the room -- indeed I caught it as it fell but there was

an end of the matter; nor do I think any thing else in Nature would have given such immediate ease: She, dear Goddess, by an instantaneous impulse, in all provoking cases, determines us to a sally of this or that member -- or else she thrusts us into this or that place, or posture of body, we know not why.

IV, 17 (pp. 291-92)

The reader/spectator would have recognized in the above Garrick's familiar trick of whirling his wig at the apparition of the ghost in Hamlet. Of course, there is an underlying irony in the use of the term "nature" since Garrick's trick had been severely criticized as calculated and hackneyed.

However, Sterne must have had his own views about the feasibility of spontaneous acting which apparently coincided with those held by Garrick: detachment from emotion was necessary for its proper enactment. This opinion is brought up with regard to Toby's inarticulate or, at best, monosyllabic reactions:

When my uncle Toby got his map of Namur to his mind, he began immediately to apply himself, and with the utmost diligence, to the study of it; for nothing being of more importance to him than his recovery, and his recovery depending, as you have read, upon the passions and affections of his mind, it behoved him to take the nicest care to make himself so far master of his subject, as to be able to talk upon it without emotion.

II, 3 (pp. 108-09)

If there is an element of calculation, or, so to say, if gestures are, to a certain extent, studied, there

must be an ancillary means of conceiving gesture. This, for Sterne, is painting. In the first volume of Tristram Shandy, when the narrator is faced with the crucial decision about how to draw Toby's character, he evokes painting techniques as a parallel, and, after discarding several methods of drawing, he determines, at least on using "no mechanical help whatever" (I, 23, p. 98). The sketch the narrator originally provided in I, 22 did not tell the reader anything about Toby; only about the manner in which he was to be drawn. The style of drawing, by reference to Hogarth, informs us about the character of Toby:

Notwithstanding all this you perceive the drawing of my uncle Toby's character went on gently all the time; -- not the great contours of it; -- that was impossible, -- but some familiar strokes and faint designations of it, were here and there touched in, as we went along, so that you are much better acquainted with my uncle Toby now than you was before.

I, 22 (pp. 94-95)

In the above passage, the painterly conception of character evokes the dramatic theory of humours. Sterne decides on a few strokes. Hogarth's theory stated that the fewer the strokes are, the more ridiculous the character will appear. Since Toby does appear progressively ridiculous in the book, it would seem that Sterne was applying Hogarth's method.

I have already discussed Hogarth's alignment with Garrick's style of acting and what was thought requisite by

him for natural behaviour. This union of the painterly and stagey modes in Tristram Shandy is apparent in the description of Trim's posture during the delivery of the sermon.

The harmony of Trim's features and the Hogarthian "line of beauty" brought in by Sterne comply -- at least in word -- with the "new" acting school's requirements for a perfect agreement between gesture and feeling. Of course, Trim's posture is also reminiscent of pulpit orators' practice, especially, in the second quarter of the eighteenth century, which confirms the common theoretical basis of pulpit and stage rhetoric:

He stood, -- for I repeat it, to take the picture of him in at one view, with his body swayed, and somewhat bent forwards; -- his right leg firm under him, sustaining seven-eighths of his whole weight, -- the foot of his left leg, the defect of which was no disadvantage to his attitude, advanced a little, -- not laterally, nor forwards, but in a line betwixt them; -- his knee bent, but that not violently, -- but so as to fall within the limits of the line of beauty; --

He held the sermon loosely, -- not carelessly, in his left hand, raised something above his stomach, and detached a little from his breast; -- his right arm falling negligently by his side, as nature and the laws of gravity ordered it, -- but with the palm of it open and turned towards his audience, ready to aid the sentiment, in case it stood in need. Corporal Trim's eyes and the muscles of his face were in full harmony with the other parts of him; -- he looked frank, -- unrestrained, -- something assured, -- but not bordering upon assurance.

III, 17 (pp. 138-39)

Not only does Trim assume the most persuasive posture possible but he also reads the sermon like an actor performing a part, that is, carried away by the rhetoric of his piece, and using voice and gesture to give it maximum effectiveness. This is what makes Walter call the sermon "dramatic". The analogy between the methods of an actor and those of a religious orator is not surprising, coming from a writer who so much admired the oratorical gifts of Father Clément as well as the art of Garrick and Mademoiselle Clairon (see Chapter Three).

Trim's action is, generally speaking, elegant and graceful in the way Garrick's was. His gestures, like those of Garrick, are often supported by some kind of prop -- usually a stick, a hat, or a handkerchief:

Are we not here now, continued the corporal, (striking the end of his stick perpendicularly upon the floor, so as to give an idea of health and stability) -- and are we not -- (dropping his hat upon the ground) gone! in a moment!

V, 7 (p. 356)

Trim's gestures, despite the application of "natural" to them, are frequently painted in a formal way, and could evoke pictures of Garrick on the stage or of ecclesiastics in the pulpit; they conform to rules laid down by Charles Gildon and Aaron Hill. An example follows below:

...so giving a stout hem! to rally back the retreating spirits, and aiding Nature at the same time with his left arm-a-kimbo on one side, and with his right a little

extended, supporting her on the other -- the corporal got as near the note as he could; and in that attitude, continued his story.

IX, 6 (p. 579)

Trim's right hand is always free to support voice with action -- a practice common to pulpit orators and actors:

Corporal Trim laid his hand upon his heart, and made an humble bow to his master; -- then laying down his hat upon the floor, and taking up the sermon in his left hand, in order to have his right at liberty, -- he advanced, nothing doubting, into the middle of the room, where he could best see, and be best seen by, his audience.

II, 15 (p. 137)

Indeed, Trim -- not much later -- "bespeaks" attention with a slight movement of his right hand (II, 16, p. 137).

I have already mentioned that Trim is presented in a somewhat absurd way. This would be obvious to a contemporary reader/play-goer who would have recognized in Sterne's visual effects the stagey tricks of comic actors. In his capitulation against marriage in IX, 4, for instance, Trim waves a stick to emphasize his words. The same gesture was used by Garrick as Sir John Brute in the same context; that is, as a protest against the female yoke (see Chapter Four, p. 220):

Nothing, continued the corporal, can be so sad as confinement for life -- or so sweet, an' please your honour, as liberty. Nothing, Trim -- said my uncle Toby, musing -- Whilst a man is free, -- cried the

corporal, giving a flourish with his stick
thus --

A thousand of my father's most subtle
syllogisms could not have said more for
celibacy.

IX, 4 (pp. 575-76)

Sometimes, isolated formal gestures of Garrick are brought up at the wrong moment or are combined with comical movements, thus, creating absurd effects. (18) It is very likely that this may have been indirect criticism against Garrick's "new" school. Besides, one cannot ignore contemporary critics' complaints that Garrick's interpretations occasionally bordered on the ridiculous (see Chapter Four, p. 196). The latter part of the following passage, for example, would have put the contemporary reader in mind of Garrick's posture as Hamlet before the delivery of the soliloquy in Act III (see Chapter Four, note 96):

The corporal put his hat under his left arm, and with his stick hanging upon the wrist of it, by a black thong split into a tassel about the knot, he marched up to the ground where he had performed his catechism; then touching his underjaw with the thumb and fingers of his right hand before he opened his mouth, -- he delivered his notion thus.

V, 38 (p. 391)

If Trim, the "model" actor, is not devoid of some degree of "exaggeration", Walter emerges as a mixture of natural and artificial. This is done either by placing new acting theories in an old school context and vice versa or by alluding to one of the two schools on different occasions. In the following example, Hogarth's concept of

the "natural" as an "equal readiness to move" (19) is absurdly placed in an old school context as the word "mechanical" suggests:

'Twas well my father's passions lasted not long; Had ten dozen of hornets stung him behind in so many different places all at one time; -- he could not have exerted more mechanical functions in fewer seconds.

III, 41 (p. 244)

Walter's movements are stiff. It is as if there are only few muscles involved instead of a combination of several. The lack of variety referred to by both the "new" school of acting and Hogarth renders gesture ridiculous and inhibits the transition from one posture to the other. Sterne knows too well that "attitudes are nothing ... 'tis the transition from one attitude to another -- like the preparation and resolution of the discord into harmony, which is all in all" (IV, 6, p. 278). Thence, the exploitation of the above principle by Sterne to freeze Walter's attitudes makes the character appear ridiculous in the eyes of the reader/spectator. The above statement continues, therefore, in the same way:

For which reason my father played the same jig over again with his toe upon the floor -- pushed the chamberpot still a little further within the valance -- gave a hem -- raised himself to my uncle Toby -- when recollecting the unsuccessfulness of his first effort in that attitude, -- he got upon his legs and in making the third turn across the room, he stopped short before my uncle Toby; and laying the three first fingers of his right hand in the palm of

his left, and stopping a little, he addressed himself to my uncle Toby as follows.

IV, 6 (p. 278)

As in Trim's case, so with Walter gestures that appear absurd would have evoked in the reader/play-goer's mind similar images from contemporary comedies of the stage. No contemporary theatre-goer, for example, would have failed to recall Garrick's posture of thrusting his left hand in his right-hand pocket as Sir John Brute in The Provoked Wife while reading the following description in Tristram Shandy (see Chapter Four, p. 221):

Brother Toby, replied my father, taking his wig from off his head with his right hand, and with his left pulling out a striped India handkerchief from his right coat pocket, in order to rub his head, as he argued the point with my uncle Toby.

III, 2 (p. 172)

Sterne pushes the point by trying to imagine how easy Walter would have stood had this not happened, and by bringing up Reynolds's imaginary painting of Walter in that posture. Again the painterly and dramatic effects are brought together in the expression of gesture:

In this case, (unless indeed, my father had been resolved to make a fool of himself by holding the wig stiff in his left hand -- or by making some nonsensical angle or other at his elbow-joint, or arm-pit) -- his whole attitude had been easy -- natural -- unforced: Reynolds himself, as great and gracefully as he paints, might have painted him as he sat.

III, 2 (p. 173)

On still another occasion, Walter's gesture compares

to Garrick's in one of his comical roles:

... he generally gave a loud Hem! -- rubbed the side of his nose leisurely with the flat part of his fore finger...

III, 33 (p. 227)

To the modern reader, the rubbing of Walter's nose with his finger means next to nothing, but it would not have been so to the contemporary reader. Garrick's mimicry of Delane in The Rehearsal was far too familiar to miss (see Chapter Four, p. 215). The use of the forefinger is found in another description of Walter's gesture -- though this time between finger and thumb. In this case, the narrator's explicit gesture confirms the author's knowledge of the relevant episode while at the same time it implies a theatre audience as well as a reading public:

My father instantly exchanged the attitude he was in, for that in which Socrates is so finely painted by Raffael in his school of Athens; which your connoisseurship knows is so exquisitely imagined, that even the particular manner of the reasoning of Socrates is expressed by it -- for he holds the fore-finger of his left hand between the fore-finger and the thumb of his right, and seems as if he was saying to the libertine he is reclaiming -- "You grant me this -- and this: and this, and this, I don't ask of you -- they follow of themselves in course."

So stood my father, holding fast his fore-finger betwixt his finger and his thumb, and reasoning with my uncle Toby as he sat in his old fringed chair, valanced around with party-coloured worsted bobs -- O Garrick! what a rich scene of this would thy exquisite powers make! and how gladly would I write such another to avail myself of thy immortality, and secure my own

behind it.

IV, 7 (pp. 279-80)

Into every attitude -- including that which Walter adopts in imitation of Socrates, as represented by Raphael in his school of Athens -- there enters an element of play-acting, which the narrator turns into a compliment to Garrick. Referring to the above passage, William Farrell describes the narrator's choice of Garrick as unfortunate as it conflicts with the artificiality of the actual gesture. (20) However, Farrell, in his eagerness to accommodate Tristram Shandy to his own theory of "Nature versus Art", fails to recognize the theatrical component in characterization. Further, Farrell credits Sterne with a far more adequate knowledge of theories of rhetoric than he could have possessed; at least, this much is indicated by the copious references to the ancients for the vindication of Farrell's point. In my view, the immediacy of the theatrical experience is a more reasonable source of Sterne's knowledge.

One can say that Walter's movements are sudden, violent, even spasmodic:

Though my father was a good natural philosopher, -- yet he was something of a moral philosopher too; for which reason, when his tobacco-pipe snapped short in the middle, -- he had nothing to do, -- as such, -- but to have taken hold of the two pieces, and thrown them gently upon the back of the fire. -- He did no such thing; -- he threw them with all the violence in the world; -- and to give the action still

more emphasis, -- he started upon both his legs to do it.

II, 7 (p. 120)

Both Quin and Garrick were charged with violent action (see Chapter Four); thus, if Sterne was seeking for a model, he could have easily found it in either "old" or "new" acting.

One of the few straightforward illustrations of Walter's gestures as natural and unforced is highlighted as such by anticipating the reader's expectations about the opposite:

-- Make tea for yourself, brother Toby, said my father, taking down his hat -- but how different from the sallies and agitations of voice and members which a common reader would imagine! -- For he spake in the sweetest modulation -- and took down his hat with the genteelest movement of limbs, that ever affliction harmonized and attuned together.

IV, 16 (p. 291)

The character who is drawn in an absolutely negative way is Dr Slop. Sterne's intention to depict Dr Slop in a ridiculous manner is established in the following passage, in which again he raises Hogarth's painterly methods. Dr Slop is to be drawn as a caricature; deprived of any personal details or depth:

Such were the outlines of Dr Slop's figure, which, -- if you have read Hogarth's analysis of beauty, and if you have not, I wish you would; -- you must know, may as certainly be caricatured, and conveyed to the mind by three strokes as three hundred.

II, 9 (p. 124)

Dr Slop is degraded by evoking unpleasant theatrical parallels. Again Sterne makes an important assumption about the reader's acquaintance with the specific play performance to which he alludes:

He (Dr Slop) stood like Hamlet's ghost,
motionless and speechless, for a full
minute and a half, at the parlour door.

II, 10 (p. 126)

Even Toby, the par excellence sentimental character, does not come off unscathed by Sterne's humorous use of formal gestures. Lifting one's hands and raising the eyes to heaven was a well-known way of showing despair both on the stage and in the pulpit. Toby expresses this feeling according to the oratorical prescriptions for gesture, but makes a laughable addition, thus, spoiling the formality of the picture:

What is the character of a family to an hypothesis? my father would reply. -- Nay, if you come to that -- what is the life of a family? -- The life of a family! -- my uncle Toby would say, throwing himself back in his arm-chair, and lifting up his hands, his eyes, and one leg.

I, 21 (p. 92)

As I have argued in Chapter Four, speech in acting departed from an old-fashioned adherence to voicing grammatical or syntactical units with their monotonously uniform use of pauses or stops and concentrated more on the emotional meaning of utterances. The rhetorical declamatory style was rejected in favour of natural rhythms and intonation. While Trim clearly personifies this departure

from pompous declamation, Walter is again a more complex case to assess.

Trim is the par excellence orator. One may even assume that Sterne uses the term "elocution" in his description of Trim in the then new sense of "informally eloquent" as opposed to the old declamatory manner of speaking:

The fellow (Trim) loved to advise, -- or rather to hear himself talk; his carriage, however, was so perfectly respectful, 'twas easy to keep him silent when you had him so; but set his tongue a-going, -- you had no hold of him; -- he was voluble; -- the eternal interlardings of "your honour", with the respectfulness of Corporal Trim's manner, interceding so strong in behalf of his elocution, -- that though you might have been incommoded, -- you could not well be angry.

II, 5 (p. 115)

Walter, on the other hand, employs old rhetorical devices and relies more on the neoclassic practice of creating images through detailed verbal description though he does that with remarkable skill:

The one (Walter) proceeding from period to period, by metaphor and allusion, and striking the fancy as he went along, (as men of wit and fancy do) with the entertainment and pleasantry of his pictures and images.

The other (Trim) without wit or antithesis, or point, or turn, this way or that; but leaving the images on one side, and the picture on the other, going straight forwards as nature could lead him to the heart.

V, 6 (p. 354)

In spite of the use of classical rhetorical devices, Sterne applies the term of "natural" to Walter's eloquence:

But, indeed, to speak of my father as he was, -- he was certainly irresistible, both in his orations and disputations; -- he was born an orator; -- Θεοδίδακτος -- Persuasion hung upon his lips, and the elements of Logic and Rhetoric were so blended up in him, -- and, withal, he had so shrewd a guess at the weaknesses and passions of his respondent, -- that NATURE might have stood up and said, -- "This man is eloquent."

The contradictions in the description of Walter as a "natural" orator by the narrator at some other point are accurately related by Farrell:

Mr Shandy is a "natural" orator, in other words, and although persuasion might hang upon his lips, he could not be expected to use the formal techniques and devices of artistic rhetoric. It is especially ironic, then, that in his many harangues, philippics, and debates, this natural orator should employ the artistic proofs of the rhetoricians more extensively than they themselves recommend. To emphasize the artificial nature of Walter's speeches, the narrator will often play the role of Spenser's E.K., pointing out how Mr Shandy took advantage of the prolepsis here or how he broke off in a spirited epiphonema there. (21)

Toby's speech is by and large less articulate because of the interference of strong emotion, (22) and, thus, reminiscent of Garrick's loss of voice or Barry's inarticulate show of love as Romeo. Nevertheless, when Toby decides to defend his position for the continuation of the war, his "apologetical oration" (VI, 32) is described as a

"fine model of defence" (VI, 31, p. 441). (23)

With regard to the order of speech and gesture, Sterne must have been conscious of the distinction as is indicated by an insistence on giving an exact description of Trim's posture before he begins to speak:

But before the Corporal begins, I must give you a description of his attitude, -- otherwise he will naturally stand represented by your imagination, in an uneasy posture, -- stiff, -- perpendicular, -- dividing the weight of his body equally upon both legs; -- his eye fix'd as if on duty; -- his look determined, -- clinching the sermon in his left hand, like his firelock: -- In a word, you would be apt to paint Trim, as if he was standing in his platoon ready for action: -- His attitude was unlike all this as you can conceive.

II, 17 (pp. 137-38)

Sterne applies the same method that was in practice on the stage: he describes the gesture first, unleashes his reader's imagination to supply the words, and then satisfies his curiosity by actually providing the speech. This is consistent with the actor's practice of leaving a gap between physical manifestation of passion and its verbalization so that the spectator could work out the meaning of gesture. As Fluchère has rightly observed "the reader must be thoroughly imbued with the existence of this body set before its group of listeners, for all the value of the tableau, and thus of the whole scene, depends on this attitude". (24) The precedence of gesture is applied on the occasion of Trim's lamentation on Bobby's death. It seems

that the practice is constant with Trim as a model orator:

...He was alive last Whitsontide, said the coachman. -- Whitsontide! alas! cried Trim, extending his right arm, and falling instantly into the same attitude in which he read the sermon, -- What is Whitsontide, Jonathan, (for that was the coachman's name), or Shrovetide or any tide or time past, to this?

V, 7 (pp. 255-56)

The practice is constantly reiterated leaving no doubt about its conscious use:

The corporal put his hat under his left arm, and with his stick hanging upon the wrist of it, by a black thong split into a tassel about the knot, he marched up to the ground where he had performed his catechism; then touching his underjaw with the thumb and fingers of his right hand before he opened his mouth, -- he delivered his notion thus.

V, 38 (p. 391)

If Trim's gestures and speech have so far been shown to be a recreation of Garrick's acting on the stage, one more particular will be added to the whole picture because of the scorn and laughter it provoked. (25) Garrick was accused of having a weak voice, unsuitable for tragedy, which he sometimes "lost" on the stage. As it is known, most of the time this loss of voice was deliberate and was accounted for by the use of natural rather than grammatical pauses. In Tristram Shandy, Trim suffers the same loss of voice as Garrick on the stage:

The corporal returned to his story, and went on -- but with an embarrassment in doing it, which here and there a reader in this world will not be able to comprehend,

for by the sudden transitions all along, from one kind and cordial passion to another, in getting thus far on his way, he had lost the sportable key of his voice which gave sense and spirit to his tale; he attempted twice to resume it, but could not please himself; so giving a stout hem! to rally back the retreating spirits, and aiding Nature at the same time with his left arm-a-kimbo on one side, and with his right a little extended, supporting her on the other -- the corporal got as near the note as he could; and in that attitude continued his story.

IX, 6 (p. 579)

On the contrary, Dr Slop resembles more the farcical type (26) of the "dumb shews", who stretches and exhausts himself with mere gesticulation. In Dr Slop's case we observe a dissociation of speech from gesture which renders him incapable of emotion. One is supposed to watch him execute his frolicks rather than participate in the action. In II, 9, for example, Dr Slop's fall is described in such detail as to create grotesque effects, but is disengaged from speech. The Russian formalists, because of the application of this technique, have interpreted Dr Slop as a "dehumanized" figure. (27) And yet on a synchronic level, this would have been a customary way of rendering character ridiculous.

Generally speaking, on the plane of gesture, Trim is ascribed a "naturalness" of movement characteristic, at least in name, of Garrick's acting. At the other extreme, Dr Slop is presented as responding in a "mechanical" manner -- reminiscent of Quin's style of acting. His gestures are

degraded to mere gesticulation or mannerisms set off by a "realistic" expression of feeling in the character of Trim. Walter is depicted in terms of both "old" and "new" acting, which shows Sterne a critic of extremities in either of them. On the level of voice, there is a contrast between natural rhythms and pompous declamatory style. Trim embodies the naturally eloquent orator while Walter appears to be the old-fashioned orator though with "wit and fancy". Complete dissociation of speech from gesture is applied in Dr Slop's case only. Trim's gestures occasionally precede speech and so do Walter's.

From the many references to the theatre and the verbal recreation of gestures borrowed from specific performances, it appears that Sterne wrote Tristram Shandy having in mind a theatrical audience as well as a reading public. To strengthen the impression of a drama unfolding in front of his reader/spectator, he involved him/her in the action by setting him/her various tasks: the use or removal of stage paraphernalia, the change of scene, and the disposal of the characters.

In this "live" performance, the narrator holds the primary part. Of course, if we take into account Sterne's experience as a preacher, he would have had little difficulty in assuming his role again and playing a game or two with his reader. Throughout the book, the narrator

converses with the reader -- sometimes reasonably, but mostly mockingly. The reader is the audience who either listens to the preacher's moral lesson or is entertained by the comedian's prances.

Therefore, my dear friend and companion, if you should think me somewhat sparing of my narrative on my first setting out, -- bear with me, -- and let me go on, and tell my story my own way: -- or, if I should seem now and then to trifle upon the road, -- or should sometimes put on a fool's cap with a bell to it, for a moment or two as we pass along, -- don't fly off, -- but rather courteously give me credit for a little more wisdom than appears upon my outside; -- and as we jog on, either laugh with me, or at me, or in short do any thing, -- only keep your temper.

I, 6 (p. 41)

Sterne thinks of the reading act as a performance during which he draws the reader into the world of the book as the play-goer used to intrude upon the stage or behind the scenes. (28) Work says of the narrator-reader relationship in Tristram Shandy:

The door that is shut in the fourth chapter is never opened; the whole book is a conversation between Sterne and his reader, a drama in which they two play the principal parts. Sterne is constantly present, smiling at the reader and mocking, beckoning and obstructing, revealing and concealing, leading and misleading, intriguing and irritating and delighting him -- sometimes weeping, more frequently grinning; sometimes clear, more frequently inscrutable -- but eternally there. (29)

Sterne literally dramatizes the process of reading by writing dialogue for the reader and, in effect, by

defining the reader as a kind of actor,

he writes words for some of the parts the reader has to play. And in this way he very effectively symbolizes the reader's essential relationship to what he reads: he is in effect defining the reader as a kind of actor. (30)

The role which is attached to the reader is reinforced when the narrator asks him/her to interpret feelings through an index of physiognomical signs. The female reader who was rebuked in I, 20 for being inattentive with regard to the religious convictions of Mrs Shandy is called, in III, 5, to interpret Walter's feelings through their physical manifestation:

Any man, Madam, reasoning upwards, and observing the prodigious suffusion of blood in my father's countenance, -- by means of which, (as all the blood in his body seemed to rush into his face, as I told you) he must have reddened pictorially and scientifically speaking, six whole tints and a half, if not a full octave above his natural colour: -- any man, Madam, but my uncle Toby, who had observed this together with the violent knitting of my father's brows, and the extravagant contortion of his body during the whole affair, -- would have concluded my father in a rage.

III, 5 (p. 175)

Sterne naturally assumes in the above comment that anyone who attended the theatre often or read some treatises on acting would have been familiar with the various functions of the "deep red" in expressing violent passions.

In III, 29 the female reader is called upon to imagine Walter's and Toby's postures in a similar way that

the theatrical audience was relied upon to interpret action on the stage and attribute different meanings to different physical reactions: (31)

The moment my father got up into his chamber, he threw himself prostrate across his bed in the wildest disorder imaginable, but at the same time, in the most lamentable attitude of a man borne down with sorrows, that ever the eye of pity dropped a tear for.

III, 29 (p. 223)

The "eye of pity" suggests a witness or spectator to the scene of sorrow more than a reader at one distance removed from the scene. Likewise, there is a spectator to Walter and Trim when presented as diametrically opposed orators, and this spectator is identified as a "critick":

A curious observer of nature, had he been worth the inventory of all Job's stock -- though by the bye, your curious observers are seldom worth a groat -- would have given the half of it, to have heard Corporal Trim and my father, two orators as contrasted by nature and education, haranguing over the same bier.

V, 6 (p. 354)

Phrases like "a curious observer of nature" again assume a spectator, not a reader. If one bears in mind the two different modes of acting -- the "new" and the "old" -- in that period and their adherence to "nature" and "authority", respectively, the evocation of the critic is a further reiteration of the theatrical associations. Garrick's critics have been previously ridiculed for observing superficial rules and ignoring the overall effect of his

acting (III, 12, p. 192).

There is, in Tristram Shandy, an association between displeased readers and critics after the manner of associating audience and critics in the theatre. Initially, it occurs in II, 2 and is reinforced in subsequent volumes through a net of allusions:

Gentle critic! When thou hast weighed all this, and considered within thyself how much of thy own knowledge, discourse, and conversation has been pestered and disordered, at one time or other, by this, and this only: -- what a pudder and racket in COUNCILS about ουσία and υπόστασις ; and in the SCHOOLS of the learned about power and about spirit; -- about essences and about quintessences; -- about substances, and about space. -- What confusion in greater THEATRES from words of little meaning, and as indeterminate a sense; -- when thou considers this, thou will not wonder at my uncle Toby's perplexities, -- thou wilt drop a tear of pity upon his scarp and his counterscarp; -- his glacis and his covered way; -- his ravelin and his half-moon: 'Twas not by ideas, -- by heaven! his life was put in jeopardy by words.

II, 2 (p. 108)

Commenting on the above passage, John Preston, who has already pointed out the difficulty of disentangling the critic from the reader in Tristram Shandy, (32) observes:

In this kind of sequence Sterne draws the reader into a situation and then leaves him to act it out. He has begun to attach a personality to the word "Sir"; the reader begins to feel that an identity has been chosen for him. In fact, all through the novel, the vague outline of the second person, the "you" keeps sharpening into a definite character, a figure on the scene.

(33)

As dramatists and dramatic critics had complained about the amateurish and vehement critics among the theatrical audiences, the narrator differentiates between critics "by occupation" and those "by nature". The steadily increasing number of critics, their diversity, and their merciless criticism came under attack in Tristram Shandy:

There is nothing so foolish when you are at the expence of making an entertainment of this kind, as to order things so badly, as to let your critics and gentry of refined taste run it down: Nor is there any thing so likely to make them do it, as that of leaving them out of the party, or, what is full as offensive, of bestowing your attention upon the rest of your guests in so particular a way, as if there was no such thing as a critic (by occupation) at table.

-- I guard against both; for, in the first place, I have left half a dozen places purposely open for them; -- and, in the next place, I pay them all court, -- Gentlemen, I kiss your hands, -- I protest no company could give me half the pleasure, -- by my soul I am glad to see you, -- I beg only you will make no strangers of yourselves, but sit down without any ceremony, and fall on heartily.

I said I had left six places, and I was upon the point of carrying my complaisance so far, as to have left a seventh open for them, -- and in this very spot I stand on; -- but being told by a critic, (though not by occupation, -- but by nature that I had acquitted myself well enough, I shall fill it up directly, hoping, in the meantime, that I shall be able to make a great deal of more room next year.

II, 2 (pp. 105-06)

An interesting point about the above passage is that critics are allotted "space" in the literal sense of the word in the

narrator's "entertainment" (an eighteenth-century term for theatre entertainment), which effectively creates a theatre-like situation with critics in the audience.

In II, 17, the critic is brought in to interpret Trim's posture during the delivery of the sermon, a task which theatre critics eagerly embarked upon:

Let not the critic ask how Corporal Trim could come by all this; I've told him it shall be explained; -- but so he stood before my father, my uncle Toby, and Dr Slop, -- so swayed his body, so contrasted his limbs, and with such an oratorical sweep throughout the whole figure; -- a statuary might have modelled from it.

II, 17 (p. 139)

In III, 12, the reader as critic is identified with the dramatic critic of Garrick's delivery:

...And how did Garrick speak the soliloquy last night? -- Oh, against all rule, my Lord, -- most ungrammatically! betwixt the substantive and the adjective, which should agree together in number, case, and gender, he made a break thus, -- stopping, as if the point wanted settling; -- and betwixt the nominative case, which your lordship knows should govern the verb, he suspended his voice in the epilogue a dozen times, three seconds and three fifths by a stop-watch, my Lord, each time. -- Admirable grammarian! -- But in suspending his voice -- was the sense suspended likewise? Did no expression of attitude or countenance fill up the chasm? Was the eye silent? Did you narrowly look? -- I looked only at the stop-watch my Lord. -- Excellent observer! And what of this new observer! And what of this new book the whole world makes such a rout about? -- Oh, 'tis out of all plumb, my Lord, -- quite an irregular thing! -- not one of the angles at the four corners was a right angle. -- I had my rule

and compasses, and c. my Lord, in my pocket. -- Excellent critic!

III, 12 (p. 192)

The above passage confirms the parallel I have drawn between reader/critic and spectator/critic. As in contemporary plays, in Tristram Shandy, the theme of the critic is repeatedly raised and is reminiscent of its assimilation in Fielding's and Macklin's works. (34)

As in the prologues of contemporary plays, there is a reference to the critic in the preface of Tristram Shandy. The preoccupation of the playwright to predispose his audience favourably was evinced in the writing of prologues to anticipate the complaints of a censorious audience and to ingratiate the playwright with the audience. Garrick wrote in his Prologue to Arthur Murphy's Apprentice (1756):

Prologues precede the Piece, -- in mournful
verse;
As undertakers -- walk before the Hearse.
Trickt out in Black thus Actors try their
Art.
To melt that Rock of Rocks, -- the Critic's
Heart.

Sterne, in parody of this practice, inserts his preface in the middle of action as an off-stage activity and conspicuously addresses it to the critics:

All my heroes are off my hands; -- 'tis the
first time I have had a moment to spare, --
and I'll make use of it, and write my
preface ... Now my dear Anti-Shandean, and
thrice able critics, and fellow-labourers,
(for to you I write this Preface).

III, 20 (pp. 202, 203)

Bearing in mind the sentimental playwright's

recommendation of "reason" in their Prologues as well as in the speeches of their virtuous characters, it is easy to guess to whom Sterne was directing his barbs from the statement in his Preface of the problem of equilibrium between "wit" and "judgement". Sterne, like other critics of sentimental plays, deplored the lack of a comic element in them, and it is precisely this fault that he criticizes in his Preface. Locke is brought in as a philosopher who joined the anti-wit forces without, according to the narrator, giving the matter proper consideration. However, in the light of what has been said about the reason/passions relationship in moral philosophy and its projection in sentimental plays, and in view of the connections Sterne makes between critic and prologue-writing in III, 20, the logical conclusion is that Sterne's butt of satire was the drama rather than Locke's philosophy.

The narrator of Tristram Shandy is not involved as an actor only. He is a manager and a director as well. His directorial tasks he often shares with his readers. Like a theatrical director, the narrator arranges and controls his scenes simply by drawing or dropping the curtain. (35) Each time the narrator wants to insert one of his long digressions, he drops the curtain to perform his one-man show in front of his reader either mocking or pretending to be serious:

I have dropped the curtain over this scene for a minute, -- to remind you of one thing, -- and to inform you of another. -- When these two things are done, -- the curtain shall be drawn up again, and my uncle Toby, my father, and Dr Slop, shall go on with their discourse, without any more interruption.

II, 19 (p. 159)

The author's knowledge of various other kinds of literature, such as medicine, philosophy and history, is inserted as a monologue before the curtain, with the main characters waiting patiently behind to return. The narrator explicitly states the need of leaving his characters in the middle of action to have his own little conversation with the reader:

To explain this, I must leave him (Walter) upon the bed for half an hour; -- and my uncle Toby in his old fringed chair sitting beside him.

III, 30 (p. 224)

The time-span of his scenes, however, often becomes a cause of concern for the narrator. Despite his promises, dramatic time is too short and leads to frustration. Referring to the passage in III, 30 the narrator says:

... but there is no time to be lost in exclamations. -- I have left my father lying across his bed, and my uncle Toby in his old fringed chair, sitting beside him, and promised I would go back to them in half an hour, and five-and-thirty minutes are lapsed already.

III, 38 (p. 240)

The narrator's whimsical way of writing makes the use of the curtain necessary in order that the main action should appear independent of the narrator's prances:

A sudden impulse comes across me -- drop the curtain, Shandy -- I drop it -- Strike a line here across the paper, Tristram -- I strike it -- and hey for a new chapter!

IV, 10 (p. 282)

When the narrator, allegedly, cannot manage on his own, he involves his reader in the disposal of the characters and the clearance of the stage. This is consistent with the eighteenth-century "evil" habit of having the audience upon the stage and behind the scenes. (36) In the following passage, in which the reader has performed the director's tasks, there is an allusion to the critic of the London Chronicle. The latter, in one of the issues of this magazine, was complaining about the indecency of the relevant episode in Aphra Behn's The Rover: (37)

Mr Pope has passed a very just censure on this writer in the two following lines: "The Stage how loosely does Astraea tread, Who fairly puts all Characters to Bed?" In the play before us there is a very remarkable instance of this putting to bed. One of the personages of the drama takes off his breeches in the sight of the audience, whose diversion is of a complicated nature on this occasion. The ladies are first alarmed; then the men stare: the women put up their fans -- "My Lady Betty, what is the men about? -- Lady Mary, sure he is "not in earnest!" Then peep thro' their fans -- "Well I vow, the he-creature is taking off his odious breeches -- He -- he -- Po! -- is that all? -- the man has drawers on?" -- Then like Mrs Cadwallador in the new farce, -- "Well, to be sure, I never saw any thing in the shape of it." -- Mean time, the delight of the male part of the audience is occasioned by the various operations of this phenomenon on the female mind -- "This is rare fun, d -- n me -- Jack, Tom, Bob, did

you ever see any thing like this? -- Look at that Lady yonder -- See, in the Stage Box -- how she looks half-averted," etc, etc. It is a matter of wonder that the Upper Gallery don't call for an hornpipe, or "Down with the drawers," according to their custom of insisting upon as much as they can get for their money -- But to be a little serious it should be remembered by all managers that this play was written in the dissolute days of Charles the Second; and that decency at least is, or ought to be, demanded at present. (38)

I have cited the whole passage so that we can see how Sterne had a jibe at the critic's sense of dignity in those days and, also, how the Lady-reader of his book can be seen as the Lady/spectatress of the theatre. Besides, the method which the evoked critic employs of "putting to bed" the characters, that is, by "dropping the curtain at the stairs foot", is understood to be, by the narrator's rhetoric, the easiest: "I thought you had no other way for it" (IV, 13, p. 287). This again recalls the somewhat liberal use of convenient and practicable stairways, especially introduced on the Garrick stage, as Nicoll informs us. (39)

From volume V onwards, the role of the director, which was self-imposed, is pushed aside by the narrator. The dependence on a reader/spectator for the visualization of gestures is diminished while gesture itself is, to a large extent, interwoven into descriptive narrative form. The narrator provides detailed accounts of scenes, and rarely does he ask for the reader's assistance for managing the

disposal of his characters. Instead of the tableau-like presentation of two simultaneous scenes, the narrator undertakes his task of signposting simultaneity of action in a narrative passage:

Amongst these there was one, I am going to speak of, in which, perhaps, it was not altogether so singular, as in many others; and it was this, that whatever motion, debate, harangue, dialogue, project, or dissertation, was going forwards in the parlour, there was generally another at the same time, and upon the same subject, running parallel along with it in the kitchen.

V, 6 (p. 353)

There are, in the last few volumes reminders of the narrator/reader relationship established in the first volumes. In VI, 29, for instance, the narrator/director invites the reader/spectator to clear the stage:

I beg the reader will assist me here, to wheel off my uncle Toby's ordnance behind the scenes -- to remove his sentry-box, and clear the theatre, if possible, of horn-works and half moons, and get the rest of his military apparatus out of the way; -- that done, my dear friend Garrick, we'll snuff the candles bright, -- sweep the stage with a new broom, -- draw up the curtain, and exhibit my uncle Toby dressed in a new character, throughout which the world can have no idea how he will act.

VI, 29 (p. 438)

The theatrical rings of the above passage have not passed unnoticed by critics. While Traugott attributes to Tristram the role of the stage-hand appearing on the stage to require the help of the audience, (40) Preston comments on the same

passage as follows:

So it was all staged? All just pretending? Actually Tristram is also managing to confirm the impression that it is something we are all watching: it is artificial certainly, yet it is a representation, taking part of its significance from the way it is attended to. Also it is a representation in which the readers must collaborate, even collaborate as stage-managers. Is not the metaphor of scene-shifting a reminder, of the primacy of the reader's power to imagine, to set the scene for himself? He must make it happen. (41)

Besides the theatrical function of the reader, which is brought up by Preston, there is in the above-cited passage an accurate reference to the kind of lighting available at the theatre at the time volume V was written. (42) As for the military apparatus on the stage, Sterne, as an avid play-goer, must have had plenty of experience about the various props employed to represent battles on the stage. (43)

In the last two volumes of the book, we observe not simply a further move towards smoother narrative, which was in fact initiated in volume IV but a total lack of managerial directions on the part of the narrator. The insertion of story-within-story, as is the case with "the story of the King of Bohemia and his seven castles" (VIII, 19), reinforces and finalizes the shift in method. Garrick's name is not brought up, nor do we come across the theatrical allusions of the previous volumes. The links between scenes are established by some kind of narratorial introduction.

Gesture, which was -- on its own merit -- expression of feeling, is now qualified by the narrator's evaluation of the character's feelings:

My uncle Toby, on the contrary, took it like a lamb -- sat still and let the poison work in his veins without resistance -- in the sharpest exacerbations of his wound (like that on his groin) he never dropt one fretful or discontented word -- he blamed neither heaven nor earth -- or thought or spoke an injurious thing of any body, or any part of it; he sat solitary and pensive with his pipe -- looking at his lame leg -- then whiffing out a sentimental heigh ho! which mixing with the smoak, incommoded no one mortal.

VIII, 26 (p. 553)

Finally, the high frequency of the words "story" and "recount" in the last two volumes is a linguistic confirmation of the transference to conscious narrative writing.

Perhaps, one might wonder about the gradual elimination of the stage presence in Tristram Shandy. Still, it is understandable. Upon the completion of the first four volumes, Sterne had hoped to turn them into a stage comedy. This would have been an outlet for the financial problems the author was facing at the time. This plan, however, never materialized either because no-one took it seriously or because Sterne did not have the stamina to complete it. Despite any secret ambitions about a career as a playwright, Sterne had a family to support. Therefore, he must have given up his plans in favour of a more lucrative

alternative, which, in the circumstances, was the addition of some more volumes to the already existing ones.

Notes to Chapter Five

1. Howes says of the selections from Sterne's Tristram Shandy in Enfield's Speaker published in London in 1777:

Enfield's Speaker, a popular text on elocution, had ten selections from Sterne, a number exceeded only by those from Shakespeare. It might be added that a speaking voice appears to come through whenever it is read silently.

Alan B. Howes, Yorick and the Critics: Sterne's Reputation in England 1760-1868 (New Haven, 1958), pp. 67-68.

2. Henri Fluchère, Laurence Sterne: From Tristram to Yorick (Oxford, 1965), p. 424.
3. According to Nicoll, there was a revival of interest in comedies of humours after 1730, which was brought about chiefly by Henry Fielding, Charles Shadwell, and James Miller. Lady Science "a great pretender to learning and philosophy" (in Miller's The Humours of Oxford) is strikingly similar to Walter and also indicates the influence of Ben Jonson. Similarly, Fielding's The Miser is another instance of Jonsonian style: "Stock characters and rough realism allied to satire at once recall Jonson's plays".

Allardyce Nicoll, A History of Early Eighteenth-Century Drama: 1700-1750 (Cambridge, 1925), p. 177.

4. John Traugott places Sterne in the Augustan rather than the sentimental and romantic age on the grounds that his characters behave as actors and not as "whole realistic figures".

John Traugott, Tristram Shandy's World (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1954), p. 147.

5. Ibid., p. 147.

6. Sterne then applies the theory of humours to the whole family, especially to Aunt Dinah, who had married the coachman, and whose case greatly modified Uncle Toby's modesty.

Alan Dugald McKillop, The Early Masters of English Fiction (Lawrence and London, 1962), p. 200.

7. James Work notes that "nowhere in the book is Sterne's economy in characterization more happily displayed than in the dramatic use made of Locke's theory of the association of ideas in the famous kitchen scene, in which Trim, hat and stick in hand, surrounded by the other servants, and with Susannah's hand on his shoulder, delivers his moving oration on mortality".

The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman, edited by James Aiken Work (New York, 1940), p. lvii.

8. Wit is the manifestation of the ideas of the Restoration period and represents a unified view of man's mental world. The division of the intellect is an eighteenth-century phenomenon.

9. C.S. Duncan informs us that the source of materials for experiments conducted by the scientists was mainly the Philosophical Transactions published by the Royal Society. In Sterne's library, we come across Philosophical Transactions Abridged (596, 620).
10. C.S. Duncan "The Scientist as a Comic Type", MP, 14 (1916-17), 89-99 (p. 98).
11. Thomas Shadwell, The Virtuoso, edited by Marjorie Hope Nicolson and David Stuart Rodes (London, 1966), I, ii (p. 22).
12. Fluchère, p. 282.
13. Joseph R. Roach, The Player's Passion (Newark, 1985), p. 102.
14. Ibid.
15. Curtis, p. 235 (16 March 1765).
16. (Sterne) likes, by minute description, to give us an exact picture of bearing and gesture, without which the character would be incapable of touching either the imagination or the heart. ... The reader must be thoroughly imbued with the existence of this body set before its group of listeners, for all the value of the tableau, and thus of the whole scene, depends on this attitude.

Fluchère, p. 278.
17. Martin Price, To the Palace of Wisdom (Carbondale and Edwardsville, 1970), p. 333.
18. Fluchère concurs that "Trim's "dramatic" eloquence is not restricted to the interpretation of other people's

texts. His love of imitation may lead him into exaggerations of attitude and expression that obscure his real personality".

19. William Hogarth, The Analysis of Beauty, edited by Joseph Burke (Oxford, 1955), p. 161.
20. Now of all the actors of his day, the author of Tristram Shandy could not have picked another less suited for this scene than the manager of Drury Lane. As a champion and representative of the natural school of acting, Garrick is the very man who was most responsible at this time for driving the old rhetorical gestures and mannered movements from the English stage. It is very hard, then, to imagine this "naturalistic" actor placing his left forefinger between the thumb and forefinger of his right or driving his middle finger into the palm of his hand just below Venus's mount.

William J. Farrell, "Nature Versus Art as a Comic Pattern", ELH, 30 (1963), 16-35 (p. 23).

21. Ibid, p. 18.
22. My uncle Toby would never offer to answer this by any other kind of argument, than that of whistling half a dozen bars of "Lillabullero". -- You must know it was the usual channel through which his passions got vent, when any thing shocked or surprised him; -- but especially when any thing, which he deemed very absurd, was offered.
- I, 21 (pp. 92-93)
23. Everyone tries passionately, though with very different means of expression, to make himself understood. The different brands of eloquence that arise from the various "ruling passions" reveal character just as clearly as attitudes and gestures. The "sub-acid" humour that Tristram sees in his father appears in his aggressivity, his

brusqueness, and in that slight peremptoriness in argument that is impatient of reply and irritated by the slightest resistance. Toby's eloquence, like Trim's, is not stimulated by contradiction: on the contrary, it is based on sympathy, arises from an impulse of the heart, gathers strength from acquiescence, and is carried away by an overflow of generosity.

Fluchère, p. 298.

24. Ibid., p. 278.

25. In a discussion of Samuel Foote's mimickry of actors, Wilkinson mentions:

He (Foote) was also very severe on GARRICK, who was apt to hesitate, (in his dying scenes in particular) as in the characters of Lothario -- "adorns my fall, and chea -- chea -- chea -- chea -- chears my heart in dy-dy-dying".

Memoirs of Tate Wilkinson, 4 vols (York, 1790), i, 26.

26. There are another set of characters, the most remote from these imaginable; and yet which allow of the most violent gestures; these are those creatures of the fancy which we see exhibited in farce.

John Hill, p. 238.

27. Victor Shklovsky, "Art as Technique : Sterne's Tristram Shandy," in Russian Formalist Criticism, translated by Lee T. Lemon and Marion J. Reis (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1965).

28. The habit of the audience to intrude on the stage must have been very familiar to Sterne from his experience at the York theatre. Rosenfeld points out that this practice was still persistent in the second half of the

eighteenth century at York theatre:

On May 14 (1763) Wilkinson appeared as Horatio and Frodsham as Lothario in The Fair Penitent, after which The Minor was repeated. For his benefit on May 18, Wilkinson played Oakley in The Jealous Wife, Trappolin in A Duke and No Duke, and revived the entertainment of Tea. He found "a crowded audience, both before and behind the curtain; for the stage was filled with gentlemen, those frequenting the boxes being admitted behind the scenes".

Sybil Rosenfeld, Strolling Players and Drama in the Provinces: 1660-1765 (Cambridge, 1939), p. 159.

A more or less accurate description of the behaviour of the eighteenth-century audience is contained in Henry Woodward's A Lick at the Town (Drury Lane, 16 March 1751). In this play, there is a revolt of the actors against the author, which ends up in the possession of the stage by some gentlemen. The latter disappear at the author's request for their withdrawal to the boxes. But at that point, a bailiff enters to arrest the author for his debts, and the active participation of the audience is evoked by having the gentlemen come to the rescue of the author.

Henry Fielding's plays, which are likely to have been a more accessible influence on Sterne, further illustrate the complicated relations between audience, author, and actors. Especially, Tumble-Down Dick and Pasquin are remarkable for the constant intrusion of

the audience and the author and for their comments on the play.

29. Work, pp. lxxi - lxxii.

30. John Preston, The Created Self (London, 1970), p. 205.

31. When a skilful actor is so situated, his bare plaintive tone of voice, the cast of sorrow from his eye, his slowly graceful gesture, his humble sighs of resignation under his calamities: All these, I say, are sometimes without a tongue, equal to the strongest eloquence. At such a time, the attentive auditor supplies from his own heart, whatever the poet's language may fall short of, in expression, and melts himself into every pang of humanity, which the like misfortunes in real life could have inspir'd.

Colley Cibber, An Apology for the Life of Mr Colley Cibber (London, 1740); p. 102.

32. Preston, p. 202.

33. Ibid., pp. 202-03.

34. For the inclusion of critics in eighteenth-century plays, see Dane Farnsworth Smith, The Critics in the Audience of the London Theatres from Buckingham to Sheridan (New Mexico, 1953).

35. While the imaginative feat required is greater in the drama, the novel has the added obligation to produce a feeling of continuity between the dramatic scenes, for the equivalent of the curtain can be used only sparingly in fiction.

A.A. Mendilow, Time and the Novel (London, 1952), p. 72.

36. See note 18 of this chapter.

37. Sterne must have been a regular reader of the London Chronicle, especially between 1758 and 1761 as his letter of 15 June 1760 to the Bishop of Gloucester suggests (see Curtis, pp. 112-14). It is likely that he was introduced to the magazine by Robert Dodsley, who was initially involved with its foundation.
38. Charles Harold Gray, Theatrical Criticism in London to 1795 (New York, 1931), p.p. 135-36.
39. Allardyce Nicoll, The Garrick Stage, edited by Sybil Rosenfeld (Manchester, 1980), p. 141.
40. Traugott, p. 132.
41. Preston, p. 182.
42. Garrick inherited the hoops of candles hung over the forestage and stage to light the scenery. ... The rings of candles hung indiscriminately in front of and over landscapes and gardens as well as palaces and chambers. They could be drawn up when a darkening of the scene was required; or if the opening scene was dark the candles were not lit.

Sybil Rosenfeld, Georgian Scene Painters and Scene Painting (Cambridge, 1981), pp. 60-61.

43. The condemnation of acts of violence or cruelty on the stage was intensified in the eighteenth century. Addison advances the idea of "improbability" as an argument for avoiding battles on the stage. However, it is obvious from the rhetoric of the following quotation that moral impropriety looms prominent in his head:

I have sometimes seen a couple of armies

drawn up together upon the stage, when the poet has been disposed to do honour to his generals. It is impossible for the reader's imagination to multiply twenty men into such prodigious multitudes, or to fancy that two or three hundred thousand soldiers are fighting in a room of forty or fifty yards in compass. Incidents of such nature should be told, not represented.

... I should likewise be glad if we imitated the French in banishing from our stage the noise of drums, trumpets and huzzas; which is sometimes so very great, that when there is a battle in the Haymarket Theatre, one may hear it as far as Charing-Cross.

Critical Essays from the Spectator, edited by Donald F. Bond (Oxford, 1970), pp. 218-19.

The same kind of exaggeration in the number of deaths represented on the stage is parodied in Fielding's play The Tragedy of Tragedies; or The Life and Death of Tom Thumb the Great. Mutinies, mass killings, suicides, ghosts in the above play provide a satirical critique on the lack of verisimilitude in this practice rather than a moral condemnation of the danger lying in accustoming the audience to taking delight in the sight of blood.

One need not look further than Dryden, Otway or Farquhar to identify the recipients of such criticism. At the opening of the third act of All for Love, for instance, we read:

At one door enter Cleopatra, Charmion, Iras, and Alexas, a train of Egyptians; at the other, Anthony and Romans. The entrance on both sides is prepared by

music, the trumpets first sounding on Anthony's part, then answered by timbrels etc., on Cleopatra's.

The presence of such instruments as wheels and scaffolds in Venice Preserved or the use of trumpets and timbrels for sound effects in All for Love qualified as targets of Addison's attack. The tradition of presenting cruel spectacle on stage is continued in sentimental drama. In The Orphan, there is a blatant presentation of three successive suicides -- two of them committed with a sword and the third one, of Monimia's, with poison.

Of course, there is a technical dimension to the theoretical controversies over the presentation or not of cruelty on the stage. The resolution of the problem eventually lay in a middle-of-the-road representation of violence or cruelty. Between the French way of incorporating narratives of acts of violence in characters' speeches and the demands of the British public for the sight of actual bloodshed on the stage, the use of the "traverse" or "discoveries" was adopted on a large scale. For further information on the devices, one can consult: a) William S. Clark, "Corpses, Concealments, and Curtains on the Restoration Stage", RES, 13 (1937), 438-48. b) Lily Campbell, Scenes and Machinery on the English Renaissance (Cambridge, 1923). In spite of the title of the latter

source, there is a whole chapter (XVII) on the Restoration stage, called "Discoveries".

CONCLUSION

Apart from isolated attempts at defining the relationship between the "decline" of drama and the rise of the novel in the eighteenth-century, (1) little has been written up to now on the ways in which this relationship is substantiated in individual novels of the eighteenth century. Even when this relationship is evoked, it is usually limited to theme. (2)

In the present study, I have endeavoured to render the theatrical influence on Sterne more concrete and to relate it to the author's profession and general interests in order that the textual evidence pointing to the stage should not appear fragmentary or casual but systematic and complete.

Sterne lived in an age in which a great many changes took place in the literary world. Of those, the most outstanding one was the decline of standards in drama, in particular, after the introduction of a new dramatic genre: the sentimental comedy. In a sense, the novel had attained its place in the world of literature though still most of the space in journals and magazines was allotted to stage disputes and to new play productions or different interpretations of a part or even of a passion.

As the theory of passions and their appropriate expression were also a matter of concern among the clergy,

it goes without saying that Sterne addressed himself, in part, to the same problems as actors. Sterne's first stylistic exercises were in the form of sermons. The dramatization of Bible stories, the direct addresses to his audience, the questions he asked or the responses he purposely provided were all intended to enliven a text which would otherwise be dull and nondescript. He heightened these effects with the variety of tone and the use of gesture according to the witness of his contemporaries.

Sterne the preacher saw himself as an actor performing in front of his audience. He resumed his posturing in Tristram Shandy, which raised a maelstrom of controversies similar to the one caused by Garrick's "natural" acting. As a preacher, he had found ways of maintaining the attention of his audience with expressive gestures and varied intonations. Accordingly, he met with no difficulties in Tristram Shandy when he assumed his one-man show playing the fool with his readers/spectators and inviting them upon his stage to participate in the action of the unfolding drama.

In addition to being the protagonist, the narrator of Tristram Shandy performed the directorial tasks (3) by manipulating his characters and by providing meticulous accounts of what they looked like and how they spoke on each occasion. Characters in Tristram Shandy, like actors in

eighteenth-century plays, make isolated points through, usually, exaggerated gestures rather than developing as integral personalities. As for the narrator, he has placed himself in the position of scientifically accounting for the physical manifestations of passions in the reactions of his characters. This was a task hardly compatible with that of a novelist -- the latter by convention acting as a commentator on his characters' action. (4) Sterne's preoccupation with physical detail, like Hogarth's, aimed at expressiveness -- the first step in the investigation of character -- rather than plastic beauty, curves, and straight lines. However, Sterne did not complete the process of characterization after the manner of other eighteenth-century novelists; he confined it to the expressive capacities of gesture only.

Notes to Conclusion

1. Laura Schaefer Brown, "English Drama 1660 to 1760: The Development of the Form and its Relation to the Emergence of the Novel" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, 1977).
2. Richard Lee Oden, "Fielding's Drama in Relation to Restoration Comedy and to Tom Jones" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Tulane University, 1968).
3. He (Tristram) is the director, protagonist, and author of the comedy, the actor and the compere; he both tells the story and takes part in it; the inflexion of his voice and his turn of mind are everywhere.

Henri Fluchere, Laurence Sterne: From Tristram to Yorick (Oxford, 1965), p. 339.

4. The only possible way to imagine Tristram Shandy as a play is to imagine Tristram in front of the curtain as a chorus or commentator pointing to the stage action.

John Traugott, Tristram Shandy's World (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1954), p. 133.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. PRIMARY SOURCES

- Adams, John, Elegant Anecdotes and Bon Mots (London, 1794)
- Addison, Joseph, The Miscellaneous Works, ed. by A.C. Guthkelch, 2 vols (London, 1914)
- Addison, Joseph and Steele, Richard, Critical Essays from the Spectator, ed. by Donald F. Bond (Oxford, 1970)
- Ardene, James, Directions Concerning the Matter and Stile of Sermons, Written to W.S. a young Deacon (1671)
- The Art of Preaching (London, 1746)
- Behn, Aphra, The Plays, 4 vols (London, 1871)
- Behn, Aphra, The Plays, Histories and Novels, 6 vols (London, 1871)
- Betterton, Thomas, The History of the English Stage (London, 1741)
- Boileau, Despreaux, The Art of Poetry, transl. by William Soames (Glasgow, 1740)
- Bullock, Christopher, A Woman's Revenge; or, A Match in Newgate (London, 1715)
- Burnet, Gilbert, A Discourse of the Pastoral Care (London, 1692)
- Burnet, Gilbert, A Sermon (London, 1694)
- Burnet, Gilbert, Select Sermons (Glasgow, 1742)
- Burnet, Gilbert, Some Sermons Preached on Several Occasions (London, 1713)
- Butler, John A Sermon (London, 1758)
- Carey, Henry, The Dramatic Works (London, 1743)
- Centlivre, Mrs, The Dramatic Works, 3 vols (London, 1872)

Chetwood, William Rufus, A General History of the Stage (London, 1749)

Chetwood, William Rufus, The Lovers' Opera (London, 1730)

Cheyne, George, The English Malady; or, a Treatise of Nervous Diseases of all kinds (London and Dublin, 1733)

Cibber, Colley, An Apology for the Life of Mr. Colley Cibber (London, 1740)

Cibber, Colley, Three Sentimental Comedies, ed. by Maureen Sullivan (New Haven and London, 1973)

Cibber, Theophilus, The Lives and Characters of the most Eminent Actors and Actresses of Great Britain and Ireland, from Shakespear to the Present Time. Interspersed with a General History of the Stage (London, 1753)

Cibber, Theophilus, To David Garrick, Esq; with Dissertations on Theatrical Subjects (London, 1759)

The Clockmakers Outcry (London, 1760)

Coffey, Charles, The Devil to Pay; or, The Wives Metamorphosed (London, 1830)

Coleridge, Samuel Taylor, Miscellaneous Criticism, ed. by Thomas Raysor (London, 1936)

Collier, Jeremy, A Short View of the Immorality and Profaneness of the English Stage (London, 1698)

Congreve, William, The Complete Plays, ed. by Herbert Davis (Chicago, 1967)

Cooke, William, The Elements of Dramatic Criticism (London, 1775)

Cunningham, John, Love in a Mist (Dublin, 1747)

Davies, Thomas, Dramatic Miscellanies, 3 vols (London, 1785)

Davies, Thomas, Memoirs of the Life of David Garrick, Esq., 2 vols (London, 1781)

Descartes, René, The Philosophical Writings of Descartes, transl. by John Cottingham, Robert Stoothoff and Dugald Murdoch, 2 vols (Cambridge, 1985)

Dennis, John, The Critical Works, ed. by Edward Niles

Hooker, 2 vols (Baltimore, 1939)

Diderot, Denis, Writings on the Theatre, ed. by F.C. Green (Cambridge, 1936)

Drummond, Robert, A Sermon (London, 1759)

Dryden, John, All for Love, ed. by David M. Vieth (London, 1973)

Dryden, John, Essays, ed. by W.P. Ker, 2 vols (Oxford, 1926)

Dunlap, William, Four Plays 1789-1812 (London, 1976)

Dunlop, William, Sermons, 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1722)

D'Urfey, Thomas, Preface to the Campaigners, The Augustan Reprint Society (Los Angeles, 1946-), 12 (March 1948)

D'Urfey, Thomas, The Comical History of Don Quixote, (London, 1729)

Eachard, John The Grounds and Occasions of the Contempt of the Clergy and Religion Enquired into, In a Letter Written to R.L. (London, 1670)

An Essay concerning Preaching (London, 1678)

An Essay on the Action Proper for the Pulpit (London, 1753)

An Essay Upon the Action of an Orator (London, 1680)

Etherege, George, The Plays, ed. by Michael Corder (Cambridge, 1982)

Farquhar, George, The Beaux' Stratagem, ed. by Charles N. Fifer (London, 1978)

Fast Sermons, 1757-62

Ferguson, Robert, The Interest of Reason in Religion; with the Import and Use of Scripture Metaphors; and the nature of the Union betwixt Christ and Believers (with reflections on several late writings, especially Mr. Sherlock's Discourse concerning the knowledge of Jesus Christ etc.)

Fielding, Henry, The Works, ed. by James P. Browne, 10 vols (London, 1871)

Fleetwood, William, "A Sermon preached before the Queen at

White-Hall, on 12 February 1693" (London, 1693)

Foote, Samuel, The Dramatic Works, 2 vols (London, 1794)

Foote, Samuel, A Treatise on the Passions (New York, 1976)

Fordyce, David, The Eloquence of the Pulpit (London, 1755)

Fordyce, David, Theodorus: A dialogue concerning the Art of Preaching (London, 1752)

Four Sermons (London, 1822)

Garrick, David, The Dramatic Works, 3 vols (London, 1798)

Garrick, David, An Essay on Acting (London, 1744)

Garrick, David, The Plays, ed. by Harry William Pedicord and Frederick Louis Bergman, 2 vols (Illinois, 1980)

Gay, John, The Beggar's Opera, ed. by Oswald Doughty (New York, 1973)

Gay, John, The Shepherd's Week (Menston, England, 1969)

Genest, John, Some Account of the English Stage from the Restoration in 1660 to 1830, 10 vols (Bath, 1832)

Gentleman, Francis, The Dramatic Censor; or, Critical Companion, 2 vols (London, 1770)

Gildon Charles, The Life of Mr. Thomas Betterton (London, 1710)

Glanvill, Joseph, An Essay Concerning Preaching (London, 1678)

Goldsmith, Oliver, The Bee and Other Essays (Oxford, 1914)

Goldsmith, Oliver, She Stoops to Conquer (Menston, England, 1970)

Gostelow, Gordon, The Hobby-Horse (typescript at BML, 1953)

Gratiae Theatrales (London, 1662)

Green, John, A Sermon (Chester, 1752)

Henley, John, The Appeal of the Oratory to the First Ages of Christianity (London, 1727)

- Henley, John, Oratory Transactions, I and II (London, 1728)
- Hiffernan, Paul, Dramatic Genius, in Five Books (London, 1770)
- Hill, Aaron, The Art of Acting (London, 1746)
- Hill, Aaron, Merope (London, 1750)
- Hill, Aaron, The Tragedy of Zara (London, 1752)
- Hill, Aaron and Popple, William, The Prompter: A Theatrical Paper (1734-36), ed. by William W. Appleton and Kalman A. Burnim (New York, 1966)
- Hill, Aaron, The Works of the Late Aaron Hill, 4 vols (London, 1753)
- Hill, John, The Actor: or, A Treatise on the Art of Playing (London, 1745)
- Hoadly, Benjamin, The Works, 3 vols (London, 1773)
- Hobbes, Thomas, Leviathan, ed. by C.B. Macpherson (Harmondsworth, 1968)
- Hogarth, William, The Analysis of Beauty, ed. by Joseph Burke (Oxford, 1955)
- Hughes, John, The Siege of Damascus (London, 1735)
- Hume, David, Enquiries Concerning Human Understanding and Concerning the Principles of Morals, ed. by Peter H. Nidditch (Oxford, 1975)
- Hume, David, A Treatise of Human Nature, ed. by Páll S. Ardal, 2 vols (London and Glasgow, 1962)
- Hutcheson, Francis, An Inquiry Concerning Beauty, Order, Harmony, Design, ed. by Peter Kivy (The Hague, 1973)
- Jonson, Ben, Every Man in his Humour, The New Mermaids Edition (New York, 1979)
- Kirkman, James Thomas, Memoirs of the Life of Charles Macklin, 2 vols (London, 1799)
- Lairesse, Gerard De, The Art of Painting, transl. by John Frederick Fritch (London, 1778)
- Lichtenberg, Georg Christoph, Lichtenberg's Visits to

England, transl. by Margaret L. Mare and W.H. Quarrell (Oxford, 1938)

Lillo, George, Fatal Curiosity (London, 1736)

Locke, John, An Essay Concerning Human Understanding, ed. by A.D. Woozley (London and Glasgow, 1964)

Macklin, Charles, The Covent Garden Theatre, or, Pasquin Turned Drawcansir, The Augustan Reprint Society (Los Angeles, 1946-), 116 (1965)

Macklin, Charles, The New Play Criticiz'd, or, The Plague of Envy, The Augustan Reprint Society (Los Angeles, 1946-), 128 (1967)

McNally, Leonard, Critic Upon Critic (London, 1788)

McNally, Leonard, Sentimental Excursions to Windsor and Other Places, (London, 1781)

McNally, Leonard, Tristram Shandy, A Sentimental Shandean Bagatelle (London, 1783)

Mallet, David, Mustapha (London, 1760)

Mason, John, An Essay on Elocution and Pronunciation (Menston, England, 1968)

Moore, Edward, The Foundling (Dublin, 1748)

Murphy, Arthur, The Gray's Inn Journal, 2 vols (Dublin, 1756)

Murphy, Arthur, The Life of David Garrick, 2 vols (London, 1801)

Newton, Benjamin, A Sermon (Gloucester, 1760)

Noverre, Jean Georges, Letters on Dancing and Ballet, 1760, transl. by Cyril Beaumont (London, 1930)

Otway, Thomas, The Orphan, ed. by Aline Mackenzie-Taylor (London, 1977)

Otway, Thomas, Venice Preserved, ed. by Malcolm Kelsall (London, 1969)

Ozel, John, The Cheats of Scapin (London, 1792)

Patrick, Simon, Fifteen Sermons upon Contentment and Resignation (London, 1719)

Patrick, Simon, A Friendly Debate Between a Conformist and a Non-Conformist, third edition (London, 1669)

Pope, Alexander, The Dunciad (Oxford, 1928)

Riccoboni, Lewis, A General History of the Stage, second edition (London, 1754)

Richardson, Jonathan, An Essay on the Theory of Painting (London, 1715)

Richardson, Samuel, The Works, 19 vols (London, 1811)

Rowe, Nicholas, The Fair Penitent, ed. by Malcolm Goldstein (London, 1969)

Select Discourses (Dublin, 1786)

Sermons Collected by Letsome

Sermons (London, 1795)

Shadwell, Thomas, The Virtuoso, ed. by Marjorie Hope Nicolson and David Stuart Rodes (London, 1966)

Shaftesbury, Anthony, Characteristics of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times, ed. by Stanley Grean, 2 vols (Indianapolis and New York, 1964)

Sheridan, Richard Brinsley, The Plays and Poems, ed. by R. Crompton Rhodes, 2 vols (Oxford, 1928)

Sheridan, Richard, Brinsley, The Rivals, ed. by Elizabeth Duthie (London, 1979)

Sheridan, Richard Brinsley, The School for Scandal, ed. by F.W. Bateson (London, 1979)

Some Rules for Speaking and Action (London, 1715)

Some Select Sermons (London, 1750)

Sprat, Thomas, The History of the Royal Society (London, 1734)

Steele, Richard, The Lying Lover (London, 1704)

Steele, Richard, Richard Steele, ed. by G.A. Aitken (London,

1894)

Sterne, Laurence, A Facsimile Reproduction of a Unique Catalogue of Laurence Sterne's Library, with a Preface by Charles Whibley (London, 1930)

Sterne, Laurence, The Letters of Laurence Sterne, ed. by Lewis Perry Curtis (Oxford, 1935)

Sterne, Laurence, The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman, ed. by James Aiken Work (New York, 1940)

Sterne, Laurence, The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman, ed. by Graham Petrie (Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1967)

Sterne, Laurence, A Political Romance (Menston, England, 1971)

Sterne, Laurence, A Sentimental Journey through France and Italy, ed. by Graham Petrie (Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1967)

Sterne, Laurence, The Works, 4 vols (London, 1803)

Tillotson, John, The Works, 3 vols (London, 1752)

Vanbrugh, John and Cibber, Colley The Provoked Husband, ed. by Peter Dixon (London, 1974)

Vanbrugh, John, A Short Vindication of the Relapse and the Provoked Wife from Immorality and Profaneness (London, 1698)

Victor, Benjamin, Original Letters, Dramatic Pieces and Poems, 3 vols (London, 1776)

Warburton, William, A Sermon (London, 1767)

Warburton, William, The Works, 7 vols (London, 1788)

Wesley, John, Sermons on Several Occasions (London, 1944)

Wilkes, Thomas, A General View of the Stage (London, 1759)

Wilkins, John, Ecclesiastes, or, A Discourse concerning the Gift of Preaching (London, 1646)

Wilkinson, Tate, Memoirs of Tate Wilkinson, 4 vols (York, 1790)

Wycherly, William, The Plain Dealer, ed. by James L. Smith

(London, 1979)

B. SECONDARY WORKS

Alter, Robert, Fielding and the Nature of the Novel (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1968)

Anderson and Shea, ed., Studies in Criticism and Aesthetics, 1660-1800 (Saint Paul, Massachusetts, 1967)

Barton, Margaret, Garrick (Westport, Connecticut, 1978)

Bate, Walter Jackson, From Classic to Romantic (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1946)

Bateson, F.N.W., English Comic Drama : 1700-1750 (Cambridge, 1929)

Bergson, Henri, Laughter (London, 1913)

Bernbaum, Ernest, The Drama of Sensibility (Boston and London, 1915)

Bindman, David, Hogarth (Norwich, 1981)

Brissenden, R.F., ed., Studies in the Eighteenth Century (Canberra, Australia, 1973)

Brissenden, R.F., Virtue in Distress (London, 1974)

Brown, Laura Schaefer, "English Drama 1660 to 1760: The Development of the Form and its Relation to the Emergence of the Novel" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, 1977)

Brunskill, Elizabeth, 18th-Century Reading, (York and London, 1950)

Burnim, Kalman A., David Garrick, Director (Carbondale, 1973)

Butt, John, ed., Of Books and Humankind (London, 1964)

Byrd, Max, Tristram Shandy (London, 1985)

Campbell, Lily B., Scenes and Machinery on the English Stage during the Renaissance (Cambridge, 1923)

Capers, Connie, "From Drama to Novel: A study of Fielding's Development" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1970)

Cash, Arthur Hill, Sterne's Comedy of Moral Sentiments : The Ethical Dimension of the Journey (Pittsburgh, 1966)

Cash, Arthur Hill and Stedmond, John M., ed., The Winged Skull : Papers from the Laurence Sterne Bicentenary Conference (London, 1971)

Charney, Maurice, Comedy : High and Low (Oxford, 1978)

Connely, Willard, Laurence Sterne as Yorick (London, 1958)

Conrad, Peter, Shandyism (New York, 1978)

Cross, Wilbur L., The Life and Times of Laurence Sterne (New Haven, 1929)

Curtis, Lewis Perry, The Politicks of Laurence Sterne (Oxford, 1929)

Dilworth, Ernest Nevin, The Unsentimental Journey of Laurence Sterne (New York, 1969)

Dixon, Peter, Rhetoric (London, 1971)

Dobrée, Bonamy, Restoration Comedy 1660-1720 (Oxford, 1929)

Dudden, Homes F., Henry Fielding (Oxford, 1952)

Duerr, Edwin, The Length and Depth of Acting (New York, 1963)

Elioseff, Lee Andrew, The Cultural Milieu of Addison's Literary Criticism (Austin, 1963)

Erämetsä, Erik, A study of the Word "Sentimental" and other Linguistic Characteristics of Eighteenth Century Sentimentalism in England (Helsinki, 1951)

Farley-Hills, David, The Benevolence of Laughter (London, and Basingstoke, 1974)

Ferriar, John, Illustrations of Sterne (London, 1798)

Fitzgerald, Percy, Laurence Sterne : A Biography, 2 vols (London, 1864)

Fitzgerald, Percy, Principles of Comedy and Dramatic Effect

- (London, 1870)
- Fluchère, Henri, Laurence Sterne (Paris, 1961)
- Fluchère, Henri, Laurence Sterne : From Tristram to Yorick (Oxford, 1965)
- Gray, Charles Harold, Theatrical Criticism in London to 1795 (New York, 1931)
- Grean, Stanley, Shaftesbury's Philosophy of Religion and Ethics (Athens, Ohio, 1967)
- Grossvogel, David I., Limits of the Novel (New York, 1968)
- Hagstrum, Jean Howard, Sex and Sensibility (Chicago, 1980)
- Hagstrum, Jean Howard, The Sister Arts (Chicago, 1958)
- Hammond, Lansing Van Der Heyden, Laurence Sterne's Sermons of Mr. Yorick (New Haven, 1948)
- Harvey, W.J., Character and the Novel (London, 1965)
- Hazlitt, William, On the English Novelists, in The Collected Works, ed. by A.R. Waller and Arnold Glover, 13 vols (London, 1903), iii, 106-32
- Hilson, J.C., Jones, M.M.B. and Watson, J.R., ed., Augustan Worlds (Leicester, 1978)
- Holland, Peter, The Ornament of Action: Text and Performance in Restoration Comedy (Cambridge, 1979)
- Holtz, William, Image and Immortality: A Study of Tristram Shandy (Providence, 1970)
- Howes, Alan B., ed., Sterne: The Critical Heritage (London, 1974)
- Howes, Alan B., Yorick and the Critics (New Haven, 1958)
- Hughes, Leo, A Century of English Farce (Princeton, 1956)
- Hume, Robert D., The Development of English Drama in the Late Seventeenth Century (Oxford, 1976)
- Hume, Robert D., "The Multifarious Forms of Eighteenth-Century Comedy", in The Stage and the Page, ed. by George Winchester Stone (Berkeley and London, 1981)

- Ireland, John, Hogarth Illustrated, 3 vols (London, 1804)
- Irvin, Maurice Ray, "Histrionics and Homiletics: The Sermons of Laurence Sterne" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Case Western Reserve University, 1972)
- Irwin, Michael, Henry Fielding: The Tentative Realist (Oxford, 1967)
- Johnson, Maurice, Fielding's Art of Fiction (Philadelphia, 1961)
- Jones, Richard Foster, The Seventeenth Century (Stanford, California, 1951)
- Josipovici, Gabriel, Writing and the Body (Brighton, 1981)
- Kenny, Shirley Strun, British Theatre and the Other Arts: 1660-1800 (Washington and London, 1984)
- Kernodle, George R., From Art to Theatre: Form and Convention in the Renaissance (Chicago, 1944)
- Kinkead-Weekes, Mark, Samuel Richardson: Dramatic Novelist (London, 1973)
- Knight, Joseph, David Garrick (New York, 1978)
- Krutch, Joseph Wood, Comedy and Conscience after the Restoration (New York, 1924)
- Lanham, Richard A., Tristram Shandy: The Games of Pleasure (Berkeley, 1973)
- Lemon, Lee T. and Reis, Marion J., transl. and introd., Russian Formalist Criticism (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1965)
- Loftis, John, Comedy and Society from Congreve to Fielding (Stanford, California, 1959)
- Loftis, John and others, ed., The Revels History of Drama in English, Volume v, (London, 1976)
- Loftis, John, Sheridan and the Drama of Georgian England (Oxford, 1976)
- Loftis, John, Steele at Drury Lane (Westport, Connecticut, 1973)
- Lovejoy, Arthur O, The Great Chain of Being (London, 1960)

- Loveridge, Mark, Laurence Sterne and the Argument about Design (London, 1982)
- Lynch, James J., Box, Pit and Gallery (Berkeley, 1953)
- McGilchrist, Ian, Against Criticism (London, 1982)
- McKillop, Alan Dugald, The Early Masters of English Fiction (Lawrence and London, 1962)
- MacLean, Kenneth, John Locke and English Literature of the Eighteenth Century (New Haven, 1936)
- Mantzius, Karl, A History of Theatrical Art in Ancient and Modern Times, transl. by Louise Von Gossel, 6 vols (London, 1903-21)
- Martin, Robert Bernard, The Triumph of Wit (Oxford, 1974)
- Mayo, Robert, The English Novel in the Magazines 1740-1815 (Oxford, 1962)
- Melville, Lewis, The Life and Letters of Laurence Sterne, 2 vols (London, 1910)
- Mendilow, A.A., Time and the Novel (London, 1952)
- Moore, Cecil, Backgrounds of English Literature: 1700-1760 (Saint Paul, Massachusetts, 1953)
- Muir, Edwin, Essays on Literature and Society (London, 1949)
- Nettleton, George Henry, British Dramatists from Dryden to Sheridan (London, 1939)
- Nettleton, George Henry, English Drama of the Restoration and Eighteenth Century: 1642-1780 (New York, 1914)
- New, Melvyn, Laurence Sterne as Satirist: A Reading of "Tristram Shandy" (Gainesville, 1969)
- Nicholson, Watson, Anthony Weston (South Haven, Michigan, 1920)
- Nicoll, Allardyce, The Garrick Stage, ed. by Sybil Rosenfeld (Manchester, 1980)
- Nicoll, Allardyce, A History of Early Eighteenth-Century Drama, 1700-50 (Cambridge, 1925)
- Noyes, Robert Gale, The Thespian Mirror: Shakespeare in the

- Eighteenth-Century Novel (Providence, 1953)
- Dates, J.C.T., Shandyism and Sentiment, 1760-1800, (Cambridge, 1968)
- Oden, Richard Lee, "Fielding's Drama in Relation to Restoration Comedy and to Tom Jones" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Tulane University, 1968)
- Overton, Philip James, The Relation of Tristram Shandy to the Life of Sterne (New York, 1966)
- Packer, Barbara, The Motley Crew: Audience as Fool in Tristram Shandy (Stanford, 1969)
- Palmer, John, The Comedy of Manners (London, 1913)
- Parry, Edward Abbott, Charles Macklin (London, 1891)
- Patrides, C.A., Aspects of Time (Manchester, 1976)
- Paulson, Ronald, Emblem and Expression: Meaning in English Art of the Eighteenth Century (London, 1975)
- Paulson, Ronald, Hogarth: His Life, Art, and Times (New Haven and London, 1974)
- Pechter, Edward, Dryden's Classical Theory of Literature (London and New York, 1975)
- Pedicord, Harry William, The Theatrical Public in the Time of Garrick (New York, 1954)
- Pickering, Roger, Reflections upon Theatrical Expression in Tragedy (London, 1760)
- Politi, Jina, The Novel and its Presuppositions (Amsterdam, 1976)
- Powell, Jocelyn, Restoration Theatre Production (London, 1984)
- Preston, John, The Created Self (London, 1970)
- Price, Martin, To the Palace of Wisdom (Carbondale and Edwardsville, 1970)
- Priestley, J.B., The English Comic Characters (London, 1925)
- Quinn, Arthur Hobson, A History of the American Drama (London, 1923)

Richards, Kenneth and Thomson, Peter, ed., The Eighteenth Century English Stage (London, 1972)

Roach, Joseph, The Player's Passion (Newark, 1985)

Rogers, Pat, ed., The Eighteenth Century (London, 1978)

Rosenfeld, Sybil, Georgian Scene Painters and Scene Painting (Cambridge, 1981)

Rosenfeld, Sybil, Strolling Players and Drama in the Provinces: 1660-1765 (Cambridge, 1939)

Rosenfeld, Sybil, The Theatre of the London Fairs in the 18th Century (Cambridge, 1960)

Rothstein, Eric, Systems of Order and Inquiry in Later Eighteenth-Century Fiction (Berkeley, 1975)

Schaeffer, Neil, The Art of Laughter (New York, 1976)

Schlegel, Augustus William, Dramatic Art and Literature (London, 1846)

Schroff, Homai J., The Eighteenth-Century Novel: The Idea of the Gentleman (London, 1983)

Shaw, Margaret R.B., Laurence Sterne: The Making of a Humorist, 1713-1762 (New York, 1957)

Sherbo, Arthur, Studies in the Eighteenth Century English Novel (East Lansing, 1969)

Skilton, David, The English Novel (Newton, Abbott, 1977)

Smith, Dane Farnsworth, The Critics in the Audience of the London Theatres from Buckingham to Sheridan (New Mexico, 1953)

Smith, Dane Farnsworth and Lawhon M.L., Plays about the Theatre in England, 1737-1800, or, The Self-Conscious Stage from Foote to Sheridan (London, 1979)

Smith, Helen R., David Garrick : 1717-1779 (London, 1979)

Spingarn, J.E., ed., Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century, 3 vols (Oxford, 1908-09)

Stapfer, Paul, Laurence Sterne (Paris, 1870)

Stedmond, John, The Comic Art of Laurence Sterne (Toronto, 1967)

Stone, George Winchester and Kahrl, George M., David Garrick: A Critical Biography (Carbondale and Edwardsville, 1979)

Swedenberg H.T., ed., Essential Articles for the Study of John Dryden (London, 1966)

Tave, Stuart, The Amiable Humorist (Chicago, 1960)

Thayer, H.W., Laurence Sterne in Germany (New York, 1905)

Thorpe, Clarence Dewitt, The Aesthetic Theory of Thomas Hobbes (Ann Arbor, 1940)

Traill, H.D., Sterne (London, 1909)

Traugott, John, ed., Laurence Sterne: A Collection of Critical Essays (New Jersey, 1968)

Traugott, John, Tristram Shandy's World (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1954)

Tweyman, Stanley, Reason and Conduct in Hume and his Predecessors (The Hague, 1974)

Van Ghent, Dorothy, The English Novel: Form and Function (London, 1953)

Watkins, W.B.C., Perilous Balance (Princeton, 1939)

Weinstein, Arnold, Fictions of the Self, 1550-1800 (Princeton, 1981)

Willey, Basil, The Seventeenth-Century Background (London, 1967)

Williamson, G.C., English Conversation Pictures of the Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries (New York, 1975)

Woods, Leigh, Garrick Claims the Stage (Westport, Connecticut and London, 1984)

C. ARTICLES

Baird, Theodore, "The Time-Scheme of Tristram Shandy and a

Source", MPLA, 51 (1936), 803-20

Barnett, Dene, "The Performance, Practice of Acting: The Eighteenth Century", Theatre Research International, 5 (1979-80), 1-36

Barnett, George L., "Gay, Swift and Tristram Shandy", Notes and Queries, 184-85 (1943), 346-47

Birkhead, Edith, "Sentiment and Sensibility in the Eighteenth-Century Novel", Essays and Studies, 11 (1925)

Booth, Wayne, "Did Sterne complete Tristram Shandy?", MP, 48 (1950-51), 172-83

Booth, Wayne, "The Self-Conscious Narrator in Comic Fiction", PMLA, 67 (1952), 163-85

Bowling, Laurence Edward, "What is the Stream-of-Consciousness Technique?", PMLA, 65, no. 4 (June, 1950), 333-45

Boys, Richard C., "Tristram Shandy and the Conventional Novel", Papers of the Michigan Academy of Science, Arts and Letters, 37 (1951), 423-36

Brewster, Rogerson, "The Art of Painting the Passions", Journal of the History of Ideas, 14 (1953), 68-94

Burnim, Kalman A., "Eighteenth-century Theatrical Illustrations in the light of contemporary documents", Theatre Notebook, 14, no. 2 (winter 1959) 45-55

Campbell, Lily B., "The Rise of a Theory of Stage Presentation in England during the Eighteenth Century", PMLA, 32 (1917), 163-200

Carver, Wayne, "The Worlds of Tom and Tristram", Western Humanities Review, 12 (1958), 67-74

Cash, Arthur Hill, "Psychology of Tristram Shandy", ELH, 22 (1955), 125-35

Cash, Arthur Hill, "The Sermon in Tristram Shandy", ELH, 31 (1964), 395-417

Chatterjee, Ambarnath, "Dramatic Technique in Tristram Shandy", Indian Journal of English Studies, 6 (1965), 33-43

Clark, William S., "Corpses, Concealments, and Curtains on the Restoration Stage", RES, 13 (1937), 438-48

Colby, Elbridge, "A Supplement on Strollers", PMLA, 39 (1924), 642-54

Croissant, De Witt C., "Studies in the work of Colley Cibber", Bulletin of the University of Kansas Humanistic Studies, 1, no. 1 (1 October, 1912)

Downer, Alan S., "Nature to Advantage Dressed: Eighteenth Century Acting", PMLA, 58, (1943), 1002-37

Draper, John W., "Aristotelian "Mimesis" in Eighteenth Century England", PMLA, 36 (1921), 372-400

Duncan, C.S., "The Scientist as a Comic Type", MP, 14 (1916-17), 89-99

Dyson, A.E., "Sterne: The Novelist as Jester", CQ, 4 (1962), 309-20

Edwards, Ralph, "The Dumb Rhetoric of the Scenery", Apollo, 93 (1972), 14-21

Farrell, William J., "Nature Versus Art as a Comic Pattern in Tristram Shandy", ELH, 30 (1963), 16-35

Freedman, William, "Tristram Shandy: The Art of Literary Counterpart", MLQ, 32 (1971), 268-80

Frye, Northrop, "Towards Defining an Age of Sensibility", ELH, 23 (1956), 144-52

Goggin, L.P., "Development of Techniques in Fielding's Comedies", PMLA, 67 (1952), 769-81

Goodin, George, "The Comic as a Critique of Reason: Tristram Shandy", CE, 29 (1967), 206-23.

Griffin, Robert J., "Tristram Shandy and Language", CE, 23 (1961-62), 108-12

Griffiths, Ralph, The Monthly Review, 32 (1765), 120-39

Griffiths, Ralph, The Monthly Review, 36 (February 1767), 93-102

Hafter, Ronald, "Garrick and Tristram Shandy", Studies in English Literature, 7 (1967), 475-89

Harris, Victor, "The Arts of Discourse in England, 1500-1700", PQ, 37 (1958), 484-94

Hartley, Lodwick, "Laurence Sterne and the Eighteenth-Century Stage", Papers on Language and Literature, 4 (1968), 144-57

Hill, Aaron, "On Acting and Painting", London Daily Advertiser (17, 18 and 30 December, 1751)

Holtz, William, "The Journey and the Picture: The Art of Sterne and Hogarth", Bulletin of New York Library, 71 (1967), 25-38

Howell, Wilbur Samuel, "Sources of the Elocutionary Movement in England: 1700-1748", Quarterly Journal of Speech, 50, no. 1 (February 1959), 1-18

Kaufman, Paul, "Mr. Yorick and the Minster Library", Notes and Queries, 205 (1960), 308-10

Kolb, Gwin J., "A Note on Tristram Shandy: Some New Sources", Notes and Queries, 196 (26 May 1951), 226-27

Lamb, Jonathan, "Sterne's System of Imitation", MLR, 76, no. 4 (October 1981), 794-810

Langhorne, John The Monthly Review, 26 (January 1762)

McMaster, Juliet, "Experience to Expression: Thematic Character Contrasts in Tristram Shandy", MLQ, 32 (1971), 42-57

Mayoux, Jean Jacques, "Temps Vécu et Temps Créé dans Tristram Shandy", Poétique, 1 (1970), II, 174-86

New, Melvyn, "The Duncie Revisited: Colley Cibber and Tristram Shandy", South Atlantic Quarterly, 72-74 (August 1973), 547-59

Paulson, Ronald, "The Pictorial Circuit and Related Structures in 18th-Century England", Publications Association for 18th-Century Studies, (MacMaster University) 1 (1971), 165-87

Parnell, Paul E., "The Sentimental Mask", PMLA, 78 (1963), 529-35

Petrie, Graham, "A Note on the Novel and the Film: Flashbacks in Tristram Shandy and the Pawnbroker", Western Humanities Review, 21 (1967), 165-69

Putney, Rufus D.S., "The Evolution of A Sentimental Journey,

PQ, 19 (1940), 349-69

Ross, Julian L., "Dramatist Versus Audience in the Early Eighteenth-Century", PQ, 12 (1933), 73-81

Sallé, Jean-Claude, "A Source of Sterne's Conception of Time", RES, 6 (1955), 180-82

Scouten, Arthur H., "The Increase in Popularity of Shakespeare's Plays in the Eighteenth Century: A Caveat for Interpretors of Stage History", Shakespeare Quarterly, 7 (1956), 189-202

Seidlin, Oskar, "Laurence Sterne's Tristram Shandy, and Thomas Mann's Joseph the Provider", MLQ, 8 (1947), 101-18

Smart, Alastair, "Dramatic Gesture and Expression in the Age of Hogarth", Apollo, 82 (1965), 90-97

Solokyansky, Mark G., "The Rhythmical Pattern of Tristram Shandy", Durham University Journal, 42, no. 1 (December 1980), 23-26

Stedmond, John, "Genre and Tristram Shandy", PQ, 38 (1959), 37-51

Stedmond, John, "Satire and Tristram Shandy", Studies in English Literature, 1, no. 3 (summer 1961), 53-63

Stewart, Jack F., "Romantic Theories of Humor Relating to Sterne", Personalist, 49 (1968), 459-73

Teeter, Louis, "The Dramatic Use of Hobbes's Political Ideas", ELH, 3 (1936), 140-69

Thaler, Alwin, "Strolling Players and Provincial Drama after Shakespeare", PMLA, 37 (1922), 243-80

Towers, A.R., "Sterne's Cock and Bull Story", ELH, 24 (1957), 12-29

Traugott, John, "The Rake's Progress from Court to Comedy: A Study in Comic Form", Studies in English Literature, 6 (1966), 381-407

Warren, Leland E., "The Constant Speaker: Aspects of Conversation in Tristram Shandy", University of Toronto Quarterly, 46 (1976-77), 51-67

Waterhouse, Osborn, "The Development of English Sentimental Comedy in the Eighteenth Century", Anglia, 18 (1907), 137-72

Wood, Frederick T., "The Beginnings and Significance of Sentimental Comedy", Anglia, 43, (1931), 368-92

