The eighteenth-century ‘elocutionary movement’ in Britain

An often retold anecdote in the history of rhetoric concerns Demosthenes, the celebrated Athenian orator, and his response when quizzed about his craft. ‘[W]hen being asked, What was the first point in Oratory? he answered, Delivery; and being asked, What was the second? and afterwards, What was the third? He still answered, Delivery’.[[1]](#footnote-1) Mediated through classical works on rhetoric by Cicero, Quintilian and others, that is Hugh Blair’s retelling of the anecdote in his *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres* from 1783, and, for Blair, Demosthenes was making a sound point. ‘[N]othing is of more importance’ than delivery, he averred. ‘[T]he management of the voice and gesture, in Public Speaking . . . is intimately connected with what is, or ought to be, the end of all Public Speaking, Persuasion; and therefore deserves the study of the most grave and serious Speakers’.[[2]](#footnote-2) Blair, a Scottish Presbyterian preacher and professor of Rhetoric and *Belles Lettres* at Edinburgh University, was among many eighteenth-century writers who sought to provide instruction in how to speak effectively in public and who leant classical authority to their works through citation of Demosthenes’ boldly stated view. Thomas Sheridan, for example, included the anecdote in his *British Education: Or, The Source of the Disorders of Great Britain* (1756), a hefty work in which it is argued that a revival of the art of speaking is the key to curing the woes of the British nation. In this work the story appears within a translation of a long passage from Quintilian’s *Institutio Oratoria*, with Sheridan preferring the term ‘elocution’ where Blair has ‘delivery’.[[3]](#footnote-3) Earlier the anecdote had been used by John Mason in the introduction to his *An Essay on Elocution, or, Pronunciation* (1748), a short treatise offering guidance on how to avoid bad delivery and how to cultivate effective oratorical skills. The term Mason puts into Demosthenes’ mouth is ‘pronunciation’, reflecting his use of Quintilian who uses *pronuntiatio* at this point in *Institutio Oratoria*. There were further retellings of this little tale which, taken together, suggest that, whilst there was no consensus regarding the principal term with which to render Demosthenes’ point in English, this insight into Demosthenes’ priorities as an orator – his emphasis upon the fifth canon of classical rhetoric – had become something of a commonplace in eighteenth-century British culture.[[4]](#footnote-4)

The currency of this anecdote in the eighteenth century is indicative of an important strand of thought and activity within the field of rhetoric in which matters concerning delivery – the use of the voice and body when speaking in public – were prioritised over other aspects of rhetoric. It is indicative of the emergence and growth of what has commonly been termed a British ‘elocutionary movement’, a movement which focussed firstly upon improving the delivery of orators on traditional public platforms (the standard trio being ‘the pulpit, the senate and the bar’), but which evolved so as to embrace, with reformist ambitions, speech practices beyond public oratory *per se*. Other issues addressed included, notably, the pronunciation of English in general, the idea of a standard pronunciation (could the spoken language be ‘stabilised’?), protocols of speech for both men and women in settings less public than that of formal oratory, and also how reading aloud should be conducted. Figures associated with this movement were concerned, then, with language as a medium emerging from living bodies and with how that medium might best be cultivated; they sought to ease communication in the linguistically diverse British nation, and also to imbue spoken English with standards of proper, polite eloquence.

Scholars have often seen this movement as one of four fundamental constituents of the period’s rhetoric, the other three being: a neoclassical movement, exemplified by such works as John Ward’s Ciceronian *A System of Oratory* (1759); a belletristic movement in which notions of taste and polite refinement were developed and honed; and finally a ‘new rhetoric’ which reconsidered classical traditions in the light of modern theories of human psychology, notably Lockean theory. Principal works of this final movement are George Campbell’s *Philosophy of Rhetoric* (1776) and Joseph Priestley’s *A Course of Lectures on Oratory and Criticism* (1777).[[5]](#footnote-5) There are many overlaps between these categories – all, for example, involve a degree of neoclassicism – and in practice few rhetoricians and few rhetorical works can be neatly located within any one of the movements. The categories also *exclude* numerous areas of linguistic practice which many twenty-first century scholars choose to embrace within the broad field of ‘rhetoric’.[[6]](#footnote-6) The four-part division, in other words, is not immediately recognisable when one examines the vibrant and mixed culture of what we might now think of as eighteenth-century rhetorical activity, but it is not entirely redundant as a way into exploring the various matters that preoccupied the period’s thinkers, and, with its identification of an ‘elocutionary movement’, it usefully highlights the serious attention which was being given to the business of delivery, even when this attention commonly appears mixed up among other concerns.

The focus upon delivery in the eighteenth century can also be plotted within a broader, longer-term evolution of rhetoric, whereby issues of style came to dominate rhetoric’s purview while content was increasingly seen to fall within other realms, notably the field of logic (or dialectics). Barbara Warnick is one scholar who has explored the shift away from a classical conception of rhetoric – one which encompasses both the discovery of knowledge through progressive reasoning (*inventio* in the classical schema) and the communication of knowledge – towards a new understanding of rhetoric in which communication was given precedence. An impetus for this shift, as Warnick points out, lay in the work of Peter Ramus, the sixteenth-century French intellectual who ‘removed invention from rhetoric and left to the study and teaching of the art only style and delivery’. Following Ramus (and despite the work of anti-Ramist rhetoricians) invention came to be ‘eclipsed as Enlightenment rhetoricians focused on stylistic management or conduct of a discourse’.[[7]](#footnote-7) But the encouragement of good standards of delivery in the eighteenth century was also fuelled by factors beyond the sphere of rhetorical theory.

There were social and cultural reasons for the growing emphasis upon delivery, and it tended to be these, rather than theoretical concerns, that were cited by elocutionists themselves when they promoted the necessity of their work. Despite the rapid expansion of the print trade – that darling topic for historians of the eighteenth century – oral communication remained vital to the general commerce of Britain. Levels of illiteracy were a factor here – in the middle of the century around half of Britons were non-readers – but those empowered by literacy remained dependent upon the medium of public speech: print did not significantly colonise traditional forums of speech, although it did supplement and modify them. ‘It is by speech’, Thomas Sheridan declared as late as 1780,

that all affairs relative to the nation at large, or particular societies, are carried on. In the conduct of all affairs ecclesiastical and civil, in church, in parliament, courts of justice, county courts, grand and petty juries, vestries in parishes, are the powers of speech essentially requisite.[[8]](#footnote-8)

However, while such institutions depended upon the spoken word, standards of oratory were regarded by many as deplorably low and complaints had long been voiced that British orators lacked eloquence and were too reserved truly to engage their hearers. ‘Our Preachers stand stock-still in the Pulpit’, wrote Joseph Addison in *The* *Spectator*, ‘and will not so much as move a Finger to set off the best Sermons in the World. We meet with the same speaking Statues at our Bars, and in all Publick Places of Debate’. [[9]](#footnote-9) The same point was made by numerous commentators, some merely noting the situation while others attempted its reform. Sheridan began the first of a series of lectures on elocution complaining of the ‘general inability to read, or speak, with propriety and grace in public’ – a failing which he claimed ran ‘thro’ the natives of the British dominions’ and which could be observed ‘in our senates and churches, on the bench and at the bar’.[[10]](#footnote-10) Indeed the figure of the dull orator speaking to a drowsy audience – the type of preacher depicted in Hogarth’s ‘The Sleeping Congregation’ (1736) – became a recurrent topos within eighteenth-century culture.

The bored audience within that topos is an indicator of why effective delivery became a serious issue. It was not only matters of ‘propriety and grace’, as Sheridan put it, which were at stake when standards of delivery were scrutinised and found wanting: ineffective delivery – speech which was not *persuasive* – was seen to endanger the social and political structure of Britain. A just cause in a law court might be lost through its poor presentation, a military officer who lacked eloquence might fail to inspire his men, a sound political principle might be rejected if its proponents could not speak up for it, and an uninspiring preacher might fail to hold on to his congregation. This last possibility became a particular concern for the Anglican majority, not least because of the threat posed by alternative forums for worship – notably Methodism, which, from its beginnings in the 1740s, soon became renowned for the inspirational eloquence of its leaders. Vehement evangelical preachers such as George Whitefield could attract huge crowds with their rousing delivery; many in those crowds would attend simply out of curiosity, but significant numbers converted, and this ability among Methodist preachers to outshine typical Church of England clergy brought into sharp focus what a powerful tool effective public speaking could be. Methodists, like many earlier nonconformists, were regularly condemned as deranged ‘enthusiasts’, but the effectiveness of their oratory was hard to deny. Indeed, Methodist preachers were sometimes held up as exemplars which, if viewed with a critical and selective eye, could help to improve the practice of preachers within the religious mainstream. ‘Even Whitefield may be placed as a model to some of our young divines,’ Oliver Goldsmith suggested in an essay of 1760, if ‘to their own good sense’ they join ‘his earnest manner of delivery’.[[11]](#footnote-11)

The typical reserve of British speakers was seen by many to be a national trait. Addison was contrasting ‘Our Preachers’ with those abroad when he censured the immobility of his countrymen, and it became common in elocutionary writing to draw comparisons between cold British delivery and the more exuberant – more *affective* – speech of other nations, particularly France and Italy. Sheridan worked with a consciousness that superior eloquence could be found on the continent, as did the Scottish philosopher Adam Smith who contrasted the general tendencies of French and English speakers in a lecture of 1763:

Foreigners observe that there is no nation in the world which use so little gesticulation in their conversation as the English. A Frenchman, in telling a story that was not of the least consequence … will use a thousand gestures and contortions of his face, whereas a well-bred Englishman will tell you one in which his life and fortune are concerned, without altering a muscle in his face.[[12]](#footnote-12)

At the same time as this native reserve was noted and criticised, it was seen to be correctable by orators who were willing to recognise and address the problem and to invest time in study and practice in order to improve their skills. ‘It is certain’, wrote Addision, ‘that proper Gestures and vehement Exertions of the Voice cannot be too much studied by a Publick Orator’.[[13]](#footnote-13) And this is where the elocutionists made their intervention, offering guidance on what constituted good oratory and instruction in how to achieve it.

The instruction took different forms. Public lectures were used by some elocutionists as a way of both explaining their ideas of good delivery and demonstrating them in the process of the performance. Thomas Sheridan, probably the most ardent and dedicated elocutionist of the century, toured England and Scotland with his lectures from the 1750s until around 1780 – and he was welcomed north of the border not only for his teaching the methods of public speaking but also for the training he could offer in English pronunciation to those seeking to thrive in the south (albeit that he himself was Irish).[[14]](#footnote-14) Before Sheridan, John ‘Orator’ Henley had, from the 1720s, run a preaching house in London which endured for some thirty years.[[15]](#footnote-15) Henley was an eccentric but staunch devotee of the art of preaching and he regularly included lectures on public speaking in the programme of events at his Oratory. His prime object when setting up the establishment, he declared, was to bring renewed attention to ‘the beautiful, and long neglected science of rhetoric and elocution’,[[16]](#footnote-16) and he pursued this goal with lectures exploring and promoting the eloquent potential of both voice and body. Deeply influenced by classical rhetoric, Henley lectured on such topics as ‘The general Principles of Speaking’, ‘The general Principles of Action’, the ‘Antient History of Action’, ‘The Action of the Eye and Features’, ‘The Action of the Hands’, and Quintilian’s rules for effective speaking.[[17]](#footnote-17) Henley attracted a largely lower-class audience and the Oratory came to be regarded by many as a curiosity within the world of popular entertainment rather than a reputable venue for serious pedagogy. Other public examinations of oratory were found in more securely established educational settings, such as Gresham College, home to the Royal Society, where John Ward delivered the lectures later published as *A System of Oratory*, and the universities, particularly those in Scotland where Adam Smith, Hugh Blair and others lectured on rhetoric. And the subject was furthermore taught in smaller and shorter lived institutions, such as a school devoted to elocution and public speaking set up in London by the Rev. Dr. John Trusler. Having gained a reputation for his own preaching, Trusler, according to his own account of this venture, succeeded in attracting ‘a great many pupils’ even though the school did not endure for long.[[18]](#footnote-18)

Clearly there were commercial as well as reformist motivations behind many of these enterprises – Sheridan and Henley were both concerned with attracting paying crowds for their lectures, and their careers in the field are a testimony to the public interest in oratory at the time. A further opportunity to capitalise on this interest lay in offering private tuition in oratory and elocution (an avenue explored by a number of the period’s actors, such as Charles Macklin and James Love), and, of course, the print market offered a further way of both making money and circulating elocutionary thought. Henley produced numerous publications throughout his career, including many works on linguistic topics and numerous spin-offs from the activities taking place at his Oratory, while Sheridan authored some of the period’s most substantial and influential works on public speaking, notably *British Education* and *Lectures on Elocution* (1762), and later his *Lectures on the Art of Reading* (1775), which sought to institute methods for reading aloud as part of the process of ‘obtaining a just delivery’.[[19]](#footnote-19) In fact, elocutionary writing already constituted a fairly well-established field within the print market by the time Sheridan began making his own contributions in the 1750s.

The most important early intervention in this field was not a native production but rather a translation of a seventeenth-century French treatise on public speaking by Michel Le Faucheur, a Protestant clergyman, originally from Geneva, who made his career in France. Le Faucheur’s *Traitté de l’action de l’orateur, ou de la pronunciation et du geste* first appeared in 1657, shortly after the author’s death, and there were several French editions of this work prior to a translation into Latin in 1690. Thereafter it was translated into English and published in London, probably in 1702, under the title *An Essay upon the Action of an Orator; As to his Pronunciation & Gesture. Useful both for Divines and Lawyers, and necessary for all Young Gentlemen, that study how to Speak well in Publick*.[[20]](#footnote-20) It proved to be an influential work. There were two subsequent editions of the translation, the first appearing in 1727 as *The Art of Speaking in Publick* – this was partly inspired by the interest in oratory created by Henley and includes, in the words of the title, a new *Introduction relating to the Famous Mr. Henly’s present Oratory*. The third edition of the translation appeared in 1750 as *An Essay upon Pronunciation and Gesture*. The translation of the *Traitté* was also used as a source for a number of new works. Le Faucheur’s teachings were condensed and repackaged in the anonymous *Some Rules for Speaking and Action; To be observed at the Bar, in the Pulpit, and the Senate, and by every one that Speaks in Publick*, a popular pamphlet first published in 1715. John Mason similarly drew upon Le Faucheur for his much reprinted *An Essay on Elocution; or Pronunciation* (1748), as did the Methodist leader John Wesley for a concise pamphlet published in 1749 offering *Directions concerning Pronunciation and Gesture* (a work which, along with other sources, shows Wesley to have been a believer in a mode of oratory less manic than that of some of his Methodist colleagues). The *Traitté* was also seen to have a pertinence to stage practice: in 1710 it was plundered to pad out a biography of the actor Thomas Betterton by Charles Gildon, whose *The Life of Mr. Thomas Betterton* includes a consideration of *The Action and Utterance of the Stage, Bar, and Pulpit* which is largely based on Le Faucheur’s work. What type of doctrine was it that was being borrowed and adapted in these various publications?

Le Faucheur’s *Traitté* is grounded in the classical tradition and is based to a large extent upon Cicero’s *De Oratore* and Quintilian’s *Institutio Oratoria.* Importantly, though, it focuses upon only the fifth element of classical rhetoric – delivery – and so is not concerned with the composition of an oration. It is a substantial treatise which addresses how both pronunciation and gesture – ‘*the very Life and Soul of* Rhetorick’[[21]](#footnote-21) – can best be managed in order to reach the primary goal of oratory: persuasion. And that should be achieved, Le Faucheur argues, by appealing to the emotions (or ‘passions’) of the audience: it is because of this belief in the power of the emotions that composition – the building up of a rational argument – is seen to be less important than the art of delivery. The work promotes a form of oratory based around natural sympathy, whereby a speaker should demonstrate his own emotional investment in a topic by means of voice and gesture, following which, according to the theory, comparable feelings will be aroused in the audience. Orators, then, should do more than *perform* the signs of feeling; they should, like Stanislavskian method actors, actually feel the emotions they seek to convey. ‘The *Orator*’, it is argued, ‘ought first of all to form in himself a *strong Idea* of the *Subject* of his *Passion*; and the *Passion* it self will then certainly follow in course; ferment immediately into the *Eyes*, and affect both the *Sense* and the *Understanding* of his *Spectators* with the *same Tenderness*’.[[22]](#footnote-22)

The *Traitté* can be seen as a celebration of the body’s capacity to render emotions contagious: the passions, it is stated,‘are wonderfully convey’d from *one person’s Eyes* to *another’s*’, and the use of tears is particularly recommended as a means of creating ‘a *visible sympathy*’ between a speaker and an audience.[[23]](#footnote-23)At the same time, though, Le Faucheur is keen that orators should maintain a good degree of stateliness; they should impress their audiences ‘not only with their discourse and Style, but in some measure also by the decency of their *Speaking* and the Fineness of their *Action*’.[[24]](#footnote-24) So whilst we might see in Le Faucheur’s emphasis upon the passions an early promotion of the emotionalism which would later be extolled within eighteenth-century sentimentalism, it should be noted that his doctrine also involves placing considerable restraints upon the expression of emotion. A number of rigid rules – mostly derived from the work’s classical sources – are advanced with a view to upholding the dignity of the public speaker. Classical strictures concerning the use of the hands, for example, are reproduced: ‘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*. … to use an *Action* with the *left Hand* alone is a thing you must avoid for its *indecency*’.[[25]](#footnote-25) The general rule is to observe restraint: the voice should be controlled whilst gestures ‘ought to be very moderate and modest; not bold, vast and extensive, nor indeed too frequent neither, which would make such a violent Agitation of the *Arms* and the *Hands* as would not become an *Orator*’.[[26]](#footnote-26) There is, then, some tension within the Le Faucheur’s doctrine – a conflict between the advice to let expression flow as part of a physiological process originating in genuine feeling and the instruction that specific rules be followed in order to maintain somatic decorum. It is a tension which is found in many of the later publications that were indebted to Le Faucheur’s work, but there were also elocutionists who challenged his approach to eloquence and who, whilst upholding the importance of the appeal to the emotions, challenged the imposition of classical rules upon an orator’s performance.

Some later elocutionists followed the practice of delineating how particular passions should be expressed by means of voice and gesture, but they eschewed the classical model of what ‘natural’ eloquence involved. An example here is James Burgh, a Scot who set up an academy in London in 1747, and whose *The Art of Speaking* (1761) became one of the more popular elocutionary tracts of the later eighteenth century, with many editions published in America as well as in Britain.[[27]](#footnote-27) Burgh’s work seeks to explain how numerous passions and states of mind affect the voice and body, and it includes many vignettes of highly dramatic emotional transport. ‘Grief, *sudden* and *violent*’, for example, is expressed, according to Burgh, by ‘*beating* the *head*; *groveling* on the *ground*; *tearing* of *garments*, *hair*, and *flesh*; *screaming* aloud, *weeping*, *stamping* with the feet’ and so on.[[28]](#footnote-28) It seems clear that Burgh took real pleasure in writing such sensational passages and that *The Art of Speaking* explores the language of the emotions at a histrionic level beyond that actually recommended as appropriate to oratorical practice. Nonetheless, it is also clear from such passages that Burgh was operating with an idea of emotional eloquence which was, to a significant degree, liberated from the strictures found in the work of Le Faucheur and his followers.

Other elocutionists took a different approach and refrained altogether from outlining the particular ways in which emotions are communicated, following the logic that if the language of the passions operates according to a natural process then there is no need either to catalogue its signs or to provide instruction in its articulation. This was the attitude of Sheridan. Regarding manufactured language, Sheridan did believe that the codification and prescription of norms and standards were possible and desirable: he was a dedicated advocate of the study of English and was a significant figure in the movement to standardize English pronunciation. His major contribution here, aside from teaching, was his *A General Dictionary of the English Language* (1780), which, unlike Samuel Johnson’s dictionary, included a system of notation to indicate how words should be pronounced. But with regard to the tones and gestures which would augment that language on the occasion of a public oration, Sheridan argued that an orator should ‘speak entirely from his feelings; and they will find much truer signs to manifest themselves by, than he could find for them’.[[29]](#footnote-29) He was unequivocal in his rejection of actual guidelines regarding the language of the passions, insisting that ‘no general practical rules … as would be of any efficacy, can be laid down in this respect’,[[30]](#footnote-30) and as a result his published works contain few actual examples of the emotional language which he regarded as the bedrock of good oratory (‘To move’, he insisted, ‘should be the first great object of every public speaker’).[[31]](#footnote-31) He does regularly point out the need for an orator to be ‘graceful’, ‘refined’ and ‘elegant’ – he employs a range of such adjectives which suggest the presence in his doctrine of some underlying principle of somatic moderation – but, aside from the command to feel and to follow nature, he offers no explicit instruction.

Within the elocutionary movement, then, there were competing notions of what constituted proper delivery and there was a range of approaches to how delivery should be taught. None of these approaches can be said to have been rigorously scientific – something which was regarded as a failing by the last notable elocutionist of the period, the Rev. Gilbert Austin, an Irish clergyman and teacher and the author of *Chironomia; Or A Treatise on Rhetorical Delivery* (1806). For Austin, who is generally seen to represent the ‘culmination of the elocutionary movement’,[[32]](#footnote-32) the first four parts of classical rhetoric had been well served by earlier scholars and educators but they had achieved little regarding delivery. ‘[I]t is a fact’, he lamented,

that we do not possess from the ancients, nor yet from the labours of our own countrymen, any sufficiently detailed and precise precepts for the *fifth* division of the art of rhetoric, namely, *rhetorical delivery*, called by the ancients *actio* and *pronunciation*. [[33]](#footnote-33)

Austin, quite unlike Sheridan, firmly believed that the non-verbal forms of expression used in delivery could be classified, described and taught, and his *Chironomia* is an ambitious attempt to frame the eloquence of the body within a truly scientific system.[[34]](#footnote-34) The work addresses the management of the voice, but Austin was more concerned with gesture, and for the description of this he invented a complicated notation system and included within *Chironomia* numerous illustrations depicting different poses and the directions in which parts of the body should move in order to express different meanings and emotions. (With these illustrations and at around 600 quarto pages, *Chironomia* is one of the more lavish publications on elocution; most eighteenth-century elocutionary tracts are not illustrated.) Austin’s work thus offered a further approach to what had been seen to be a problematic area of British cultural life for at least a century.

Austin’s motivations, in fact, were remarkably similar to those of the earliest contributors to the elocutionary movement: the absence of a system of ‘rules for rhetorical delivery’, he believed, was the ‘chief cause of the reproach of frigid indifference which is charged against our public speakers’.[[35]](#footnote-35) In the time that Austin was working on his system a number of individuals had, of course, become renowned for the extraordinary power of their oratory – in parliament, for example, William Pitt and Charles James Fox – but the bulk of British speakers were apparently still seen to be less than engaging. It appears, then, that whilst the elocutionists had inspired considerable interest in the topic of public speaking, their efforts had not necessarily had a major impact upon the manner in which oratory was actually conducted – the ‘speaking Statues’ described by Addison had not truly been brought to life.
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