

AN  
**ABRIDGMENT**

OF

**Lectures on Rhetorick,**

By **HUGH BLAIR, D. D.**

**GREATLY IMPROVED BY THE ADDITION TO EACH  
CHAPTER OF**

**APPROPRIATE QUESTIONS.**

By **REV. J. L. BLAKE, A. M.**

Principal of the Young Ladies' Literary School, at Concord,  
New-Hampshire.

=====  
THIRD EDITION.  
=====

**CONCORD :**

**PUBLISHED BY HILL AND MOORE.**

1822. -

THE NEW YORK  
PUBLIC LIBRARY

155554

ASTOR, LENOX AND  
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.  
1899.

DISTRICT OF NEW-HAMPSHIRE, TO WIT :

*District Clerk's Office.*

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* L. S. \*  
\* \* \* \* \*  
BE it remembered, that on the sixth day of March,  
A. D. 1832, and in the forty-sixth year of the independence of the United States of America, HILL & MOORE of the said district, have deposited in this office the title of a book, the right whereof they claim as proprietors, in the words following, viz.  
"An Abridgment of Lectures on Rhetorick. By HUGH BLAIR, D. D. greatly improved by the addition to each chapter of appropriate questions. By Rev. J. L. BLAKE, A. M. Principal of the Young Ladies' Literary School, Concord, New-Hampshire." In conformity to the act of the Congress of the United States, entitled "an act for the encouragement of learning, by securing the copies of maps, charts and books to the authors and proprietors of such copies, during the times therein mentioned; and also to an act entitled an act supplementary to an act entitled an act for the encouragement of learning, by securing the copies of maps, charts and books to the authors and proprietors of such copies, during the times therein mentioned, and extending the benefit thereof to the arts of designing, engraving and etching historical and other prints."

WILLIAM CLAGGETT, *Clerk of the District  
of New-Hampshire.*

A true copy of record,

Attest,

WILLIAM CLAGGETT, *Clerk.*

## ADVERTISEMENT.

BLAIR'S Lectures on Rhetorick need no commendation—they are extensively in use, which is sufficient evidence of their merit and the high estimation in which they are held. And to advocate the study of Rhetorick is equally unnecessary, since it has already become an important branch of education in the principal schools of our country. The object of this advertisement is therefore simply to apprise Teachers of the peculiarities of the present edition, and of the editor's views, in regard to the principle of instruction, on which it is prepared.

The design of annexing questions to the the text of elementary school books is to alleviate the labor of teachers, and to present to scholars in a perceptible form, the tasks to which they are appointed. The labor of proposing questions, at the time of recitation, is by no means small to the teacher; and without questions to which the attention can be directed, when learning the lesson, there is no inconsiderable difficulty, with young persons especially, in ascertaining the extent of what is required of them. But while teachers and scholars may be generally aided in their respective duties, it is recommended to the former, at the time of recitation, to propose such other questions as may seem pertinent; and, to the latter, not to be satisfied in becoming able to answer those here given.

It is also suggested to teachers, that their pupils would find great advantage in fixing their minds more upon the ideas and less upon the words than is usual—to answer as much as possible in their own language, instead of committing to memory and repeating *verbatim* from the book. Words being arbitrary, are retained almost altogether by an effort of memory; but in the retention of ideas, the memo-

ry is aided by the understanding. This remark applies in all its force to the method of teaching by "Question and Answer," as it is termed—one of the most erroneous principles in education ever adopted, unless it be for small children not become capable of much reflection. For where the particular form of words is furnished, in which the pupil is to answer the questions given, the attention will not only be directed almost exclusively to this form of words, in learning the lesson; but at the time of reciting it, should one or two of the first words not be recollected, which will very often be the case, there will be an entire failure—a failure against which the diligence and good sense of the pupil will be no invariable security. But let the attention in study be chiefly directed to the ideas or principles to be acquired, and the only difficulty in reciting will be in finding words in which to express these ideas. This difficulty, however, will soon be overcome; for the method of study here recommended will greatly assist the pupil in acquiring a free use of language, which is of itself one of the most important parts of an accomplished education.

It is also proper to apprise teachers who may use this edition of Blair's Lectures on Rhetorick, that the words printed in *italics* in the questions, may be found in the text to which the questions severally refer. For instance, the words, "*next to sublimity*" in the first question annexed to the chapter on Beauty and the other Pleasures of Taste, may be found in the sentence which answers that question. Also, the word "*duration*" in the third question of the same chapter, may be found in the sentence which answers that question. This mode of adapting the questions to the text, where it could be done, pervades the whole work; and it is designed to obviate the difficulty which even teachers may sometimes find in ascertaining, with facility, the precise answers to be given.

J. L. BLAKE,

Concord, 1822.

*Hannah F. Huntington*  
*Sept. 1823.*

## INTRODUCTION.

A PROPER acquaintance with the circle of liberal arts is requisite to the study of Rhetorick and Belles Lettres. To extend the knowledge of them must be the first care of those who wish either to write with reputation, or so to express themselves in public as to command attention. Among the ancients it was an essential principle, that the orator ought to be conversant in every department of learning. No art indeed can be contrived which can stamp merit on a composition, rich or splendid in expression, but barren or erroneous in sentiment. Oratory, it is true, has often been disgraced by attempts to establish a false criterion of its value. Writers have endeavored to supply want of matter by graces of composition; and courted the temporary applause of the ignorant instead of the lasting approbation of the discerning. But such imposture must be short and transitory. The body and substance of any valuable composition must be formed of knowledge and science. Rhetorick completes the structure, and adds the polish; but firm and solid bodies only are able to receive it.

Among the learned it has long been a contested, and remains still an undecided question, whether nature or art contribute most toward excellence in writing and discourse. Various may be the opinions with respect to the manner, in which art can most effectually furnish aid for such a purpose; and it were presumption to assert, that rhetorical rules, how just soever, are sufficient to form an orator. Private application and study, supposing natural genius to be favorable, are certainly superior to any system of public instruction. But, though rules and instructions cannot effect every thing which is requisite, they may be of considerable use. If they cannot inspire genius they can give it direction and as-

sistance. If they cannot make barrenness fruitful, they can correct redundancy. They present proper models for imitation; they point out the principal beauties which ought to be studied, and the chief faults which ought to be avoided; and consequently tend to enlighten taste, and to conduct genius from unnatural deviations into its proper channel. Though they are incapable of producing great excellencies, they may at least serve to prevent considerable mistakes.

In the education of youth, no object has appeared more important to wise men in every age than to excite in them an early relish for the entertainments of taste. From these to the discharge of the higher and more important duties of life, the transition is natural and easy. Of those minds, which have this elegant and liberal turn, the most pleasing hopes may be entertained. On the contrary, entire insensibility to eloquence, poetry or any of the fine arts, may justly be considered as a bad symptom in youth; and supposes them inclined to low gratifications, or capable of being engaged only in the common pursuits of life.

Improvement of taste seems to be more or less connected with every good and virtuous disposition. By giving frequent exercises to the tender and humane passions, a cultivated taste increases sensibility; yet, at the same time, it tends to soften the more violent and angry emotions.

*Ingenias didicisse fideliter artes  
Emollit mores, nec sinit esse feros.*

These polish'd arts have humaniz'd mankind.  
Soften'd the rude, and calm'd the boisterous mind.

Poetry, eloquence, and history continually exhibit to our view those elevated sentiments and high examples, which tend to nourish in our minds public spirit, love of glory, contempt of external fortune and admiration of every thing truly great, noble and illustrious.

# Lectures on Rhetorick,

ABRIDGED.

---

## TASTE.

TASTE is "the power of receiving pleasure or pain from the beauties or deformities of nature and of art." (It is a faculty common in some degree to all men.) Through the circle of human nature, nothing is more general than the relish of beauty of one kind or other; of what is orderly, proportioned, grand, harmonious, new, or sprightly.) Nor does there prevail less generally a disrelish of whatever is gross, disproportioned, disorderly or discordant. (In children, the rudiments of taste appear very early in a thousand instances; in their partiality for regular bodies, their fondness for pictures and statues, and their warm attachment to whatever is new or astonishing.) (The most stupid peasants receive pleasure from tales and ballads, and are delighted with beautiful appearances of nature in the earth and heavens.) Even in the deserts of America, where human nature appears in its most uncultivated state, the savages have their ornaments of dress, their war and their death songs, their harangues and their orators. The principles of taste must therefore be deeply founded in the human mind. To have some discernment of beauty is no less ex-

essential to man, than to possess the attributes of speech and reason.

Though no human being can be entirely devoid of this faculty, yet it is possessed in very different degrees. In some men only faint glimmerings of taste are visible; the beauties which they relish are of the coarsest kind; and of these they have only a weak and confused impression; while in others, taste rises to an acute discernment, and a lively enjoyment of the most refined beauties.

This inequality of taste among men is to be ascribed undoubtedly in part to the different frame of their natures; to nicer organs, and more delicate internal powers, with which some are endued beyond others; yet it is owing still more to culture and education. Taste is certainly one of the most improvable faculties of our nature. We may easily be convinced of the truth of this assertion by only reflecting on that immense superiority which education and improvement give to civilized, above barbarous nations, in refinement of taste; and on the advantage which they give, in the same nation, to those who have studied the liberal arts, above the rude and illiterate vulgar.

Reason and good sense have so extensive an influence on all the operations and decisions of taste, that a completely good taste may well be considered as a power compounded of natural sensibility to beauty, and of improved understanding. To be satisfied of this, we may observe, that the greater part of the productions of genius are no other than imitations of nature; representations of the characters, actions



or manners of men.) Now the pleasure we experience from such imitations or representations is founded (on mere taste); but to judge whether they be properly executed, belongs to (the understanding,) which compares the copy with the original.

In reading, for instance, the *Æneid* of Virgil, a great part of our pleasure arises (from the proper conduct of the plan or story; from all the parts being joined together with probability and due connection; from the adoption of the characters from nature, the correspondence of the sentiments to the characters, and of the style to the sentiments.) The pleasure which is derived from a poem so conducted, is felt or enjoyed by taste, as an internal sense; but the discovery of this conduct in the poem is owing to reason; and the more reason enables us to discover such propriety in the conduct, the greater will be our pleasure.

The constituents of taste, when brought to its most perfect state, are two, DELICACY and CORRECTNESS.)

Delicacy of taste refers principally (to the perfection of that natural sensibility, on which taste is founded.) It implies those finer organs or powers, which enable us to discover beauties, that are concealed from a vulgar eye. It is judged of by the same marks, that we employ in judging of the delicacy of an external sense. As the goodness of the palate is not tried by strong flavors, but by a mixture of ingredients, where, notwithstanding the confusion, we remain sensible of each; so delicacy of internal taste appears, by a quick and lively seq-

sibility to its finest, most compounded, or most latent objects.

Correctness of taste respects the improvement this faculty receives through its connection with the understanding. (A man of correct taste is one who is never imposed upon by counterfeit beauties; who carries always, in his own mind, that standard of good sense, which he employs in judging of every thing. He estimates with propriety the relative merit of the several beauties which he meets in any work of genius; refers them to their proper classes; assigns the principles, as far as they can be traced, whence their power of pleasing is derived; and is pleased himself precisely in that degree in which he ought, and no more.

Taste is certainly not an arbitrary principle, which is subject to the fancy of every individual, and which admits no criterion for determining whether it be true or false. Its foundation is the same in every human mind. It is built upon sentiments and perceptions, which are inseparable from our nature; and which generally operate with the same uniformity as our other intellectual principles. When these sentiments are perverted by ignorance or prejudice, they may be rectified by reason. Their sound and natural state is finally determined by comparing them with the general taste of mankind. Let men declaim as much as they please concerning the caprice and uncertainty of taste; it is found, by experience, that there are beauties, which, if displayed in a proper light, have power to command lasting and universal admiration. In every composition, what interests the imagin-

ation, and touches the heart, gives pleasure to all ages and nations. There is a certain string, which being properly struck, the human heart is so made as to accord to it.

Hence the universal testimony, which the most improved nations of the earth, through a long series of ages, have concurred to bestow on some few works of genius; such as, the Iliad of Homer, and the Æneid of Virgil. Hence the authority which such works have obtained, as standards of poetical composition; since by them we are enabled to collect what the sense of mankind is, with respect to those beauties, which give them the highest pleasure, and which, therefore, poetry ought to exhibit. Authority or prejudice may, in one age or country, give a short lived reputation to an indifferent poet or a bad artist; but when foreigners, or posterity, examine his works, his faults are discovered, and the genuine taste of human nature is seen. Time overthrows the illusions of opinion, but establishes the decisions of nature.

### QUESTIONS.

1. What is *taste*?
2. Do all men possess the faculty of taste?
3. How does it appear, that all do possess it?
4. How is it discovered in *children*?
5. How is it discovered in *peasants*?
6. How is it discovered in the natives of *America*?
7. Do all possess this faculty in *equal degrees*?
8. To what is the *inequality* of taste among men to be ascribed?
9. How does it appear that taste is an *improvable* faculty of nature?
10. How may a completely *good taste* be defined?
11. What are the greater part of the *productions* of genius?
12. On what is the *pleasure* founded which we *experience* from such imitations and representations?
13. To what faculty

does it belong to *judge* whether they be properly executed? 14. From what does the greater part of our *pleasure arise* in reading the *Æneid* of Virgil? 15. What are the *constituents of taste*, when brought to its most perfect state? 16. To what does *delicacy* of taste principally refer? 17. What does *correctness* of taste respect? 18. Who may be said to possess a *correct taste*? 19. Is taste an *arbitrary principle*? 20. Is the *foundation* of taste the same in every individual? 21. On what is it *built*? 22. How is it known, that taste is built upon *sentiments and perceptions*, which are inseparable from our nature? 23. What works have obtained the *authority* of standard poetical compositions according to the principles of correct taste?

---

## CRITICISM. GENIUS. PLEASURES OF TASTE. SUBLIMITY IN OBJECTS.

TRUE criticism is the application of taste and of good sense to the several fine arts. Its design is to distinguish what is beautiful, and what is faulty, in every performance. From particular instances it ascends to general principles, and gradually forms rules or conclusions concerning the several kinds of beauty in works of genius.

Criticism is an art, founded entirely on experience; on the observation of such beauties as have been found to please mankind most generally. For example, Aristotle's rules concerning the unity of action in dramatic and epic composition, were not first discovered by logical reasoning and then applied to poetry; but they

were deduced from the practice of Homer and Sophocles. They were founded upon observing the superior pleasure which we derive from the relation of an action, which is one and entire, beyond what we receive from the relation of scattered and unconnected facts.

A superior genius, indeed, will of himself, uninstructed, compose in such manner as is agreeable to the most important rules of criticism; for, (as these rules are founded in nature, nature will frequently suggest them in practice.) Homer was acquainted, with no system of the art of poetry. (Guided by genius alone, he composed in verse a regular story, which all succeeding ages have admired.) This, however, is no argument against the usefulness of criticism.—For (since no human genius is perfect, there is no writer who may not receive assistance from critical observations upon the beauties and faults of those who have gone before him.) No rules indeed can supply the defects of genius, or inspire it, where it is wanting; but they may often guide it into its proper channel; they may correct its extravagances, and teach it the most just and proper imitation of nature.) Critical rules are intended chiefly to point out the faults which ought to be avoided. We must be indebted to nature for the production of eminent beauties.

GENIUS is a word which in common acceptation extends much further than to objects of taste. It signifies that talent or aptitude which we receive from nature, in order to excel in any one thing whatever. A man is said to have

a genius for mathematics, as well as a genius for poetry; a genius for war, for politics, or for any mechanical employment.

Genius may be greatly improved by art and study; but by them alone it cannot be acquired. As it is a higher faculty than taste, it is ever, according to the common frugality of nature, more limited in the sphere of its operations. There are persons, not unfrequently to be met, who have an excellent taste in several of the polite arts; such as, music, poetry, painting, and eloquence; but an excellent performer in all these arts is very seldom found; or rather is not to be looked for. A universal genius, or one who is equally and indifferently inclined towards several different professions and arts, is not likely to excel in any. Although there may be some few exceptions, yet in general it is true, that, when the mind is wholly directed towards some one object exclusively of others, there is the fairest prospect of eminence in that, whatever it may be. Extreme heat can be produced only when the rays converge to a single point. Young persons are highly interested in this remark; since it may teach them to examine with care, and to pursue with ardor, that path which nature has marked out for their peculiar exertions.

The nature of taste, the nature and importance of criticism, and the distinction between taste and genius, being thus explained, the sources of the pleasures of taste shall next be considered. Here a very extensive field is opened; no less, than all the pleasures of the imagination, as they are generally called, whether afforded us by natural objects, or by imita-

fions and descriptions of them.) (It is not, however, necessary to the purpose of the present work, that all these be examined fully;) the pleasure which we receive from discourse or writing being the principal object of them. Our design is to give some opening into the pleasures of taste in general, and to insist more particularly upon (sublimity and beauty.)

(We are far from having yet attained any system concerning this subject.) A regular inquiry into it was first attempted by (Mr. Addison, in his essay on the Pleasures of the Imagination.) By him these pleasures are ranged (under three heads, beauty, grandeur and novelty.) His speculations on this subject, if not remarkably profound, are very beautiful and entertaining; and he has the merit of having discovered a track, which was before untrodden. Since his time, the advances made in this part of philosophical criticism are considerable; which is owing, doubtless, to that thinness and subtilty, which are discovered to be properties of all the feelings of taste. (It is difficult to enumerate the several objects which give pleasure to taste; it is more difficult to define all those which have been discovered, and to range them in proper classes; and, when we would proceed further, and investigate the efficient causes of the pleasure which we receive from such objects, here we find ourselves at the greatest loss.) For example, we all learn by experience that some figures of bodies appear more beautiful than others; on further inquiry, we discover that the regularity of some figures, and the graceful variety of others, are the foundation of the

consequently been ever considered as one of the most striking and magnificent spectacles, which can be either presented to the eye, or exhibited to the imagination in description.)

All ideas of the solemn and awful kind, and even bordering on the terrible, tend greatly to assist the sublime, such as darkness, solitude and silence. The firmament, when filled with stars, scattered in infinite numbers and with splendid profusion, strikes the imagination with more awful grandeur than when we behold it enlightened by all the splendor of the sun. The deep sound of a great bell, or the striking of a great clock, is at any time grand and awful; but when heard amid the silence and stillness of night, they become doubly so. Darkness is very generally applied for adding sublimity to all our ideas of the Deity. "He maketh darkness his pavilion; he dwelleth in the thick cloud." Thus Milton——

———How oft amid  
Thick clouds and dark does heaven's all-ruling Sire  
Choose to reside, his glory unobscured;  
And with the majesty of darkness round  
Circles his throne———

Obscurity is favorable to the sublime. The descriptions given us of appearances of supernatural beings carry some sublimity; though the conception, which they afford us, be confused and indistinct. Their sublimity arises from the ideas which they always convey of superior power and might connected with awful obscurity. No ideas, it is evident, are so sublime, as those derived from the Supreme Being, the most unknown, yet the greatest of all objects; the infinity of whose nature and the eternity of



whose duration, added to the omnipotence of his power, though they surpass our conceptions, yet exalt them to the highest.)

Disorder is also very compatible with grandeur; nay, frequently heightens it. Few things which are exactly regular and methodical, appear sublime. We see the limits on every side; we feel ourselves confined; there is no room for any considerable exertion of the mind. Though exact proportion of parts enters often into the beautiful, it is much disregarded in the sublime. (A great mass of rocks thrown together by the hand of nature with wildness and confusion, strikes the mind with more grandeur, than if they had been adjusted to each other with the most accurate symmetry.)

There yet remains one class of sublime objects to be mentioned, which may be termed the moral or sentimental sublime, arising from certain exertions of the mind; from affections and actions of our fellow creatures. These will be found to be chiefly of that class which comes under the name of magnanimity or heroism; and they produce an effect very similar to what is produced by a view of grand objects in nature, filling the mind with admiration and raising it above itself. Whenever, in some critical and dangerous situation, we behold a man uncommonly intrepid, and resting solely upon himself; superior to passion and to fear; animated by some great principle to contempt of popular opinion, of selfish interest, of dangers, or of death; we are there struck with a sense of the sublime. Thus Porus, when taken by Alexander, after a gallant defence, being asked in what manner he would

be treated, answered—"Like a King;" and Cesar, chiding the pilot, who was afraid to set out with him in a storm, "Quid times? Cæsarem vehis," are good instances of the sentimental sublime.

The sublime in natural, and in moral objects, is presented to us in one view, and compared together in the following beautiful passage of Akenside's Pleasures of the Imagination :

Look then abroad through nature to the range  
Of planets, suns, and adamantinè spheres,  
Wheeling, unshaken, through the void immense !  
And speak, O Man ; does this capacious scene,  
With half that kindling majesty, dilate  
Thy strong conception, as when Brutus rose  
Refulgent from the stroke of Cæsar's fate  
Amid the crowd of patriots ; and his arm  
Aloft extending, like eternal Jove,  
When guilt brings down the thunder, call'd aloud  
On Tully's name, and shook his crimson steel,  
And bade the father of his country hail !  
For lo ! the tyrant prostrate on the dust ;  
And Rome again is free.

It has been imagined by an ingenious author, that terror is the source of the sublime ; and that no objects have this character, but such as produce impressions of pain and danger. Many terrible objects are indeed highly sublime ; nor does grandeur refuse alliance with the idea of danger. But the sublime does not consist wholly in modes of danger and pain. In many grand objects there is not the least coincidence with terror ; as in the magnificent prospect of widely extended plains, and of the starry firmament ; or in the moral dispositions and sentiments which we contemplate with high admiration. In many painful and terrible objects, also, it is evident, there is no sort of grandeur. The amputation of a limb, or the bite of a snake, is in the highest degree terrible ; but they are

destitute of all claim whatever to sublimity. It seems just to allow that mighty force or power, whether attended by terror or not, whether employed in protecting or alarming us, has a better title, than any thing yet mentioned, to be the fundamental quality of the sublime. There appears to be no sublime object, into the idea of which strength and force either enter not directly or are not at least intimately associated, by conducting our thoughts to some astonishing power, as concerned in the production of the object.

### QUESTIONS.

1. What is *criticism*? 2. What is the *design* of criticism? 3. On what is the art of criticism *founded*? 4. Why can a *superior genius*, un instructed, compose agreeably to the most important rules of criticism? 5. Was Homer *acquainted* with any system of the art of poetry? 6. How then was he *guided* in writing his *Iliad*? 7. Is this any *argument* against the usefulness of criticism? 8. Why is it not? 9. Can rules supply the *defects* of genius, or inspire it where it is wanting? 10. What, then, is their *use*?

11. What is *genius*? 12. Can genius be *improved* by study and art? 13. Can it be acquired? 14. How does genius compare with taste? 15. How will you illustrate this comparison? 16. Is what is called an *universal genius* likely to excel in any thing? 17. Are there many *sources* of pleasure to taste? 18. Will they all be *examined* in this work? 19. Which *two* will be particularly considered? 20. Has any *system* on this subject been attained? 21. By *whom* was the *first attempt* made on this subject? 22. Under what *head* did he arrange these pleasures? 23. Have many *advances* been made in this part of *philosophical criticism* since Addison's time? 24. Is it difficult to *enumerate* the several objects which give

pleasure to taste? 25. And is it difficult to *define* those which have been discovered, and to arrange them in proper classes? 26. Is the *efficient* cause of pleasure arising from beautiful objects *obscure*? 27. How are the *powers* of taste and imagination *calculated* to impress us with the benevolence of our Creator?

28. How does the pleasure arising from *sublimity* or *grandeur* compare with the *other* pleasures of the imagination? 29. Where is the *simplest* form of external grandeur seen? 30. What effect does vastness always produce? 31. Which makes the strongest impression, *space* extended, in length, or height and depth? 32. What are some instances in confirmation of this? 33. Whence arises the *grandeur* of the *firmament*? 34. Of the ocean? 35. What is *essentially* necessary to grandeur where *space* is concerned? 36. What will invariably *render* an object sublime? 37. What are instances of it? 38. What is the *most copious* source of sublime ideas? 39. What are some instances of this? 40. When is a *stream* of water a *beautiful* object and when a *sublime* one? 41. How is a *race horse* considered? 42. And how a *war horse*? 43. How are two powerful contending *armies* viewed in relation to this subject? 44. How do ideas of the *solemn* and *awful kind* affect sublimity? 45. What are instances of this? 46. How does *obscurity* affect the sublime? 47. What are instances of this? 48. From what are the *most sublime* ideas derived? 49. How does *disorder* affect grandeur? 50. How does *regularity* and *order* affect it? 51. What is a striking instance of the different effects produced by order and irregularity as it regards sublimity?

52. What other class of sublime objects is there? 53. What is an instance of *moral* or *sentimental* sublimity? 54. Does *terror* ever exist in connection with sublime ideas? 55. Has it ever been supposed that terror is necessary to the existence of the sublime? 56. Is this correct? 57. What are instan-

des of the sublime disconnected with terror? 56.  
 What are instances of the *terrible* without any thing  
 of the sublime?



### SUBLIMITY IN WRITING.

THE foundation of the sublime in composition must always be laid (in the nature of the object described.) Unless it be such an object, as, if presented to our sight, if exhibited to us in reality, would excite ideas of that elevating, that awful, and magnificent kind, which we call sublime; the description, however finely drawn, is not entitled to be placed under this class. This excludes (all objects, which are merely beautiful, gay, or elegant.) Besides, the object must not only in itself be sublime, but it must be placed before us in such a light, as is best calculated to give us a clear and full impression of it; it must be described with strength, conciseness, and simplicity. (This depends chiefly upon the lively impression, which the poet or orator has of the object, which he exhibits; and upon his being deeply affected and animated by the sublime idea, which he would convey.) If his own feeling be languid, he can never inspire his reader with any strong emotion. Instances, which on this subject, are extremely necessary, will clearly show the importance of all these requisites.

It is chiefly among ancient authors, that we are to look for the most striking instances of the sublime. The early ages of the world, and the uncultivated state of society, were peculiar-

ly favorable to the emotions of sublimity. The genius of men was then very prone to admiration and astonishment. Meeting continually new and strange objects, their imagination was kept glowing, and their passions were often raised to the utmost. They thought and expressed themselves boldly without restraint. In the progress of society the genius and manners of men have undergone a change more favorable to accuracy, than to strength or sublimity.)

Of all writings, ancient or modern, (the Sacred Scriptures) afford the most striking instance of the sublime. In them the descriptions of the Supreme Being are wonderfully noble, both from the grandeur of the object, and the manner of representing it. What an assemblage of awful and sublime ideas is presented to us in that passage of the eighteenth Psalm, where an appearance of the Almighty is described! "In my distress I called upon the Lord; he heard my voice out of his temple, and my cry came before him. Then the earth shook and trembled; the foundations of the hills were moved; because he was wroth. He bowed the heavens and came down, and darkness was under his feet; and he did ride upon a cherub, and did fly; yea, he did fly upon the wings of the wind. He made darkness his secret place; his pavilion round about him were dark waters and thick clouds of the sky.) The circumstances of darkness and terror are here applied with propriety and success for heightening the sublime.

The celebrated instance, given by Longinus, from Moses, "God said, let there be light; and

there was light,) belongs to the true sublime; and its sublimity arises from the strong conception, it conveys, of an effort of power producing its effect with the utmost speed and facility. A similar thought is magnificently expanded in the following passage (of Isaiah) Chap. xxiv. 24, 27, 28. "Thus saith the Lord, thy Redeemer, and he, that formed thee from the womb; I am the Lord, that maketh all things; that stretcheth forth the heavens alone; that spreadeth abroad the earth by himself; that saith to the deep, be dry, and I will dry up thy rivers; that saith of Cyrus, he is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure; even saying to Jerusalem, thou shalt be built; and to the temple, thy foundation shall be laid."

(Homer has in all ages been universally admired for sublimity; and he is indebted for much of his grandeur to that native and unaffected simplicity which characterizes his manner.) His descriptions of conflicting armies; the spirit, the fire, the rapidity, which he throws into his battles, present to every reader of the Iliad frequent instances of sublime writing. The majesty of his warlike scenes is often heightened in a high degree by the introduction of the gods. (In the twentieth book, where all the gods take part in the engagement, according as they severally favor either the Grecians or the Trojans, the poet appears to put forth one of his highest efforts, and the description rises into the most awful magnificence. All nature appears in commotion. Jupiter thunders in the heavens; Neptune strikes the earth with his trident; the ships, the

city, and the mountains shake; the earth trembles to its centre; Pluto starts from his throne, fearing, lest the secrets of the infernal regions should be laid open to the view of mortals. We shall transcribe Mr. Pope's translation of this passage; which, though inferior to the original, is highly animated and sublime.

But when the powers descending swell'd the flight,  
 Then tumult rose, fierce rage, and pale affright.  
 Now through the trembling shores Minerva calls,  
 And now she thunders from the Grecian walls:  
 Mars, nor'ring o'er his Troy, his terror sends  
 In gloomy tempests, and a night of clouds;  
 Now through each Trojan heart he fury pours  
 With voice divine from Ilion's topmost towers;  
 Above the Sire of gods his thunder rolls,  
 And peals on peals redoubled rend the poles.  
 Beneath, stern Neptune shakes the solid ground,  
 The forests wave, the mountains nod around;  
 Through all her summits tremble Ida's woods,  
 And from their sources boil her hundred floods:  
 Troy's turrets totter on the rocking plain,  
 And the toss'd waves beat the heaving main;  
 Deep in the dismal region of the dead  
 The infernal monarch rear'd his horrid head,  
 Leap't from his throne, lest Neptune's arm should lay  
 His dark dominions open to the day,  
 And pour in light on Pluto's drear abodes,  
 Abhor'd by men, and dreadful e'en to gods.  
 Such was the immortals' wage; such horrors rend  
 The world's vast concave, when the gods contend.

Conciseness and simplicity will ever be found essential to sublime writing. (Simplicity is properly opposed to studied and profuse ornament; and conciseness to superfluous expression.) It will easily appear, why a defect either in conciseness or simplicity is peculiarly hurtful to the sublime. The emotion, excited in the mind by some great or noble object, raises it considerably above its common pitch. A species of enthusiasm is produced, extremely pleasing, while it lasts; but the mind is tending every moment to sink into its ordinary state.



When an author has brought us, or is endeavoring to bring us into this state, if he multiply words unnecessarily; if he deck the sublime object on all sides with glittering ornaments; nay, if he throw in any one decoration which falls in the least below the principal image; that moment he changes the key; he relaxes the tension of the mind; the strength of the feeling is emasculated; the beautiful may remain; but the sublime is extinguished. (Homer's description of the nod of Jupiter, as shaking the heavens, has been admired in all ages, as wonderfully sublime. Literally translated, it runs thus; "He spoke, and bending his sable brows, gave the awful nod; while he shook the celestial locks of his immortal head, all Olympus was shaken." Mr. Pope translates it thus;

He spoke; and awful bends his sable brows,  
Shakes his ambrosial curls, and gives the nod;  
The stamp of fate, and sanction of a God;  
High heaven with trembling the dread signal took,  
And all Olympus to its centre shook,

The image is expanded, and attempted to be beautified; but in reality it is weakened.) The third line, "The stamp of fate, and sanction of a God," is entirely expletive, and introduced only to fill up the rhyme; for it interrupts the description, and clogs the image. For the same reason Jupiter is represented, as shaking his locks, before he gave the nod; "Shakes his ambrosial curls, and gives the nod;" which is trifling and insignificant; whereas in the original the shaking of his hair is the consequence of his nod, and makes a happy picturesque circumstance in the description.

The boldness, freedom, and variety of our

(blank verse) are infinitely more propitious than rhyme, to all kinds of sublime poetry. The fullest proof of this is afforded by (Milton) an author, whose genius led him peculiarly to the sublime. The first and second books of Paradise Lost are continued examples of it. Take, for instance, the following noted description of Satan, after his fall, appearing at the head of his infernal host.

—He above the rest,  
 In shape and gestures proudly eminent,  
 Stood, like a tower; his form had not yet lost,  
 All her original brightness, nor appear'd  
 Less, than Archangel ruin'd and the excess  
 Of glory obscur'd: as when the sun, new risen,  
 Looks through the horizontal misty air,  
 Shorn of his beams; or, from behind the moon,  
 In dim eclipse, disastrous twilight sheds  
 On half the nations, and with fear of change,  
 Perplexes monarchs. Darken'd so, yet shone  
 Above them all, the Archangel.

Here various sources of the sublime are joined together; the principal object superlatively great; a high, superior nature, fallen indeed, but raising itself against distress; the grandeur of the principal object heightened by connecting it with so noble an idea, as that of the sun suffering an eclipse; this picture, shaded with all those images of change and trouble, of darkness and terror, which coincide so exquisitely with the sublime emotion; and the whole expressed in a style and versification easy, natural, and simple, but magnificent.

Besides simplicity and conciseness, strength is essentially necessary to sublime writing. Strength of description proceeds in a great measure, from conciseness; but it implies something more, namely, a judicious choice of circumstances in the description; such as will

exhibit the object in its full and most striking point of view. For, every object has several faces, by which it may be presented to us, according to the circumstances with which we surround it; and it will appear superlatively sublime, or not, in proportion as these circumstances are happily chosen, and of the sublime kind. In this, the great art of the writer consists; and indeed the principal difficulty of sublime description. (If the description be too general, and divested of circumstances; the object is shown in a faint light, and makes a feeble impression, or no impression, on the reader.) At the same time, if any trivial or improper circumstances be mingled, (the whole is degraded.)

The nature of that emotion, which is aimed at by sublime description, admits no mediocrity, and cannot subsist in a middle state; but must either highly transport us; or, if unsuccessful in the execution, leave us exceedingly disgusted. We attempt to rise with the writer; the imagination is awakened, and put upon the stretch; but it ought to be supported; and, if in the midst of its effort it be deserted unexpectedly, it falls with a painful shock. (When Milton, in his battle of the angels, describes them, as tearing up mountains, and throwing them at one another; there are in his description, as Mr. Addison has remarked, no circumstances, but what are truly sublime;

From their foundations loosning to and fro,  
They pluck'd the seated hills with all their load,  
Rocks, waters, woods; and by the shaggy tops  
Uplifting bore them with their hands.—

This idea of giants throwing the mountains, which is in itself so grand, Claudian renders bur-

lesque and ridiculous, by the single circumstance of one of his giants with the mountain *Ida* upon his shoulders, and a river, which flowed from the mountain, running down the giant's back, as he held it up in that posture. (Virgil, in his description of mount *Ætna*, is guilty of a slight inaccuracy of this kind. After several magnificent images, the poet concludes with personifying the mountain under this figure,

—“*Eruetans viscera cum gemitu*—”

“belching up its bowels with a groan;” which, by making the mountain resemble a sick or drunken person, degrades the majesty of the description. The debasing effect of this idea will appear in a stronger light, from observing what figure it makes in a poem of Sir Richard Blackmore; who, through an extravagant perversity of taste, selected it for the principal circumstance in his description; and thereby, as Dr. Arbuthnot humorously observes, represented the mountain, as in a fit of the cholic.

*Ætna and all the burning mountains find  
Their kindled stores, with imbred storms of wind,  
Blown up to rage, and roaring out complain,  
As torn with inward gripes and torturing pain;  
Laboring, they cast their dreadful vomit round,  
And with their melted bowels spread the ground.*

Such instances show how much the sublime depends upon a proper selection of circumstances; and with how great care every circumstance must be avoided, which, by approaching in the smallest degree to the mean, or even to the gay or trifling, changes the tone of the emotion.

What is commonly called the sublime style, is for the most part a very bad one, and has no

relation whatever to the true sublime.) Writers are apt to imagine, that splendid words, accumulated epithets, and a certain swelling kind of expression, by rising above what is customary or vulgar, constitutes the sublime; yet nothing is, in reality more false. In genuine instances of sublime writing, nothing of this kind appears. "God said, let there be light; and there was light." This is striking and sublime; but put it into what is commonly called the sublime style; "The sovereign Arbiter of nature, by the potent energy of a single word, commanded the light to exist;" and, as Boileau justly observed, the style is indeed raised, but the thought is degraded. In general it may be observed, that the sublime lies in the thought, not in the expression; and, when the thought is really noble, it will generally clothe itself in a native majesty of language.

The faults, opposite to the sublime, are principally (two, the frigid and the bombast.) The frigid consists in degrading an object or sentiment, which is sublime in itself, by a mean conception of it; or by a weak, low, or puerile description of it. This betrays entire absence, or, at least, extreme poverty of genius. The bombast lies in forcing a common or trivial object out of its rank, and in laboring to raise it into the sublime; or in attempting to exalt a sublime object beyond all natural bounds.)

### QUESTIONS.

1. In what must the *foundation* of the sublime in composition always be laid? 2. What objects does this *exclude*? 3. What is necessary besides a proper object, to produce the sublime in composition? 4.

On what do *strength, conciseness, and simplicity* of all description chiefly depend? 5. Among what *authors* are we to look for the most striking instance of the sublime? 6. What *ages* of the world and what *state* of society have been favorable to this kind of composition? 7. How does this appear? 8. What *change* have the genius and manners of mankind undergone with progress in society? 9. In what *writings* do we find instances of the most truly sublime? 10. What particular *descriptions* in the sacred scriptures are of this class? 11. What *circumstances* are applied by David, with propriety and success, to *heighten* the sublime, in his description of the manifestation of the Almighty? 12. What *celebrated instance* is given by Longinus from Moses of the sublime? 13. From what does the sublime in this passage *arise*? 14. Which of the other inspired writers has a *similar* thought magnificently *expanded*? 15. What is it? 16. Who in all ages has been *universally admired* for sublimity? 17. To what is Homer *indebted* for much of his grandeur? 18. In what way is the *majesty* of his *warlike scenes* often heightened? 19. Which is considered one of his most *happy efforts*, where the description rises into the most *awful magnificence*? 20. To what are conciseness and simplicity *opposed*? 21. What instance do Homer and Pope's translation of him afford of this? 22. Which is most favorable to the sublime, *blank verse* or *rhyme poetry*? 23. What *author* furnishes proof of this? 24. From what does *strength*, necessary to sublime writing, proceed? 25. What is the *effect*, if the description is too *general*? 26. What is the *effect*, if *trivial* and *improper* circumstances are introduced? 27. What is the effect upon the mind, of attempts at sublime description—is there any *mediocrity* of emotion? 28. What illustration do Milton and Claudian afford of this, in describing a similar subject? 29. How does Virgil fail of producing the true sublime in his description of Mount *Ætna*? 30. Is what is for the *most part* called the

sublime style, a good one? 31. What are the principal faults opposite to the sublime? 32. In what does the *frigid* consist? 33. In what does the *bombast* consist?

## BEAUTY AND OTHER PLEASURES OF TASTE.

(BEAUTY,) next to sublimity, affords the highest pleasure to the imagination. The emotion which it raises, is easily distinguished from that of sublimity. (It is of a calmer kind; more gentle and soothing; does not elevate the mind so much, but produces a pleasing serenity.) Sublimity excites a feeling, too violent to be lasting; the pleasure, proceeding from beauty, admits longer duration.) (It extends also to a much greater variety of objects than sublimity; to a variety indeed so great, that the sensations which beautiful objects excite, differ exceedingly, not in degree only, but also in kind, from each other. Hence no word is used in a more undetermined signification than beauty. It is applied to almost every external object, which pleases the eye or the ear; to many of the graces of writing; to several dispositions of the mind; nay, to some objects of abstract science. We speak frequently of a beautiful tree or flower; a beautiful poem; a beautiful character; and a beautiful theorem in mathematics.)

(Color) seems to afford the simplest instance of beauty. Association of ideas, it is probable, has some influence on the pleasure, which we receive from colors. Green, for example, may

appear more beautiful, from being connected in our ideas with rural scenes and prospects; white with innocence; blue, with the serenity of the sky. Independently of associations of this sort, all that we can farther observe respecting colors is, that those, chosen for beauty, are commonly delicate, rather than glaring. Such are the feathers of several kinds of birds, the leaves of flowers, and the fine variation of colors, shown by the sky, at the rising and setting of the sun.

Figure opens to us forms of beauty more complex and diversified. Regularity first offers itself as a source of beauty. By a regular figure is meant one, which we perceive to be formed according to some certain rule, and not left arbitrary or loose in the construction of its parts. Thus a circle, a square, a triangle, or a hexagon, gives pleasure to the eye by its regularity, as a beautiful figure; yet a certain graceful variety is found to be a much more powerful principle of beauty. Regularity seems to appear beautiful to us chiefly, if not entirely, on account of its suggesting the ideas of fitness, propriety, and use, which have always a more intimate connection with orderly and proportioned forms, than with those, which appear not constructed according to any certain rule. Nature, who is the most graceful artist, hath, in all her ornamental works, pursued variety with an apparent neglect of regularity. Cabinets, doors and windows are made after a regular form, in cubes and parallelograms, with exact proportion of parts; and thus formed, they please the eye, for this just reason, that, being



works of use, they are by such figures better adapted to the ends for which they were designed. But plants, flowers, and leaves, are full of variety and diversity. (A straight canal is an insipid figure, when compared with the meanders of a river.) Cones and pyramids have their degree of beauty; but trees, growing in their natural wildness, have infinitely more beauty, than when trimmed into pyramids and cones. The apartments of a house must be disposed (with regularity for the convenience of its inhabitants) but a garden, which is intended merely for beauty, would be extremely disgusting, if it had as much uniformity and order as a dwelling house.)

Motion affords another source of beauty, distinct from figure. (Motion of itself is pleasing; and bodies in motion are, "cæteris paribus," universally preferred to those at rest.) Only gentle motion, however, belongs to the beautiful; for, (when it is swift, or very powerful, such as that of a torrent, it partakes of the sublime.) (The motion of a bird gliding through the air, is exquisitely beautiful; but the swiftness with which lightning darts through the sky, is magnificent and astonishing.) Here it is necessary to observe, that the sensations of sublime and beautiful are not always distinguished by very distant boundaries; but are capable in many instances of approaching toward each other. Thus a gentle running stream is one of the most beautiful objects in nature; but, as it swells gradually into a great river, the beautiful by degrees is lost in the sublime. A young tree is a beautiful object; a spreading ancient

oak is a venerable and sublime one.) To return, however, to the beauty of motion, it will be found to hold very generally, that motion in a straight line is not so beautiful, as in a waving direction; and motion upward is commonly more pleasing than motion downward. The easy, curling motion of flame and smoke is an object singularly agreeable. (Hogarth observes very ingeniously, that all the common and necessary motions for the business of life are performed in straight or plain lines; but that all the graceful and ornamental movements are made in curve lines;) an observation, worthy the attention of those, who study the grace of gesture and action.

Color, figure and motion, though separate principles of beauty, yet in many beautiful objects meet together, and thereby render the beauty greater and more complex.) Thus in flowers, trees, and animals, we are entertained at once with the delicacy of the color, with the gracefulness of the figure, and sometimes also with the motion of the object. The most complete assemblage of beautiful objects, which can be found, (is presented by a rich natural landscape, where there is a sufficient variety of objects; fields in verdure, scattered trees and flowers, running water, and animals grazing. If to these be added some of the productions of art, suitable to such a scene; as, a bridge with arches over a river, smoke rising from cottages in the midst of trees, and a distant view of a fine building, seen by the rising sun; we then enjoy, in the highest perfection, that gay, cheerful, and placid sensation, which characterizes beauty.

The beauty of the human countenance is more complex than any we have yet examined. It comprehends the beauty of color, arising from the delicate shades of the complexion; and the beauty of figure, arising from the lines, which constitute different features of the face. But the principal beauty of the countenance depends upon a mysterious expression, which it conveys, of the qualities of the mind; of good sense, or good humor; of candor, benevolence, sensibility, or other amiable dispositions. It may be observed, that there are certain qualities of the mind, which, whether expressed in the countenance, or by words, or by actions, always raise in us a feeling similar to that of beauty. There are two great classes of moral qualities; one is of the high and the great virtues, which require extraordinary efforts, and is founded on dangers and sufferings; as heroism, magnanimity, contempt of pleasures, and contempt of death. These produce in the spectator an emotion of sublimity and grandeur. The other class is chiefly of the social virtues; and such, as are of a softer and gentler kind; as compassion, mildness, and generosity. These excite in the beholder a sensation of pleasure, so nearly allied to that excited by beautiful external objects, that, though of a more exalted nature, it may with propriety be classed under the same head.)

Beauty of writing, in its more definite sense, characterizes a particular manner; signifying a certain grace and amenity in the turn either of style or sentiment, by which some authors are particularly distinguished. In this sense it denotes a manner neither remarkably sublime, nor

vehemently passionate, nor uncommonly sparkling ; but such, as excites in the reader an emotion of the placid kind, resembling that, which is raised by the contemplation of beautiful objects in nature ; which neither lifts the mind very high, nor agitates it to excess ; but spreads over the imagination a pleasing serenity.) (Addison) is a writer of this character, and one of the most proper examples of it. (Fenelon, the author of Telemachus,) is another example. (Virgil, also, though very capable of rising occasionally into the sublime, yet generally is distinguished by the character of beauty and grace, rather than sublimity. (Among orators, Cicero) has more of the beautiful than Demosthenes, whose genius led him wholly toward vehemence and strength.

So much it is necessary to have said upon the subject of beauty ; since next to sublimity it is the most copious source of the pleasures of taste. But objects delight the imagination not only by appearing under the forms of sublime or beautiful ; they likewise derive their power of giving it pleasure from several other principles.

Novelty, for example, has been mentioned by Addison, and by every writer on this subject. An object which has no other merit, than that of being new, by this quality alone raises in the mind a vivid and an agreeable emotion. Hence that passion of curiosity, which prevails so generally in mankind. Objects and ideas which have been long familiar, make too faint an impression to give an agreeable exercise to our faculties. New and strange objects rouse the mind from its dormant state, by giving it a sudden and pleasing impulse. Hence, in a great

measure, the entertainment, we receive fiction and romance. (The emotion raised by novelty, is of a more lively and awakening nature, than that produced by beauty; and shorter in its duration.) For, if the object in itself no charms to hold our attention, soon wears gloss, spread over it by novelty, soon wears

Imitation is another source of pleasure to taste. This gives rise to what Addison calls the secondary pleasures of imagination, which form a very extensive class. For all imitation affords some pleasure to the mind; not only imitation of beautiful or sublime objects, but calling the original ideas of beauty or grandeur, which such objects themselves exhibited; even objects, which have neither beauty nor grandeur; nay, some, which are terrible or deformed, give us pleasure, in a secondary or represented view.

The pleasures of melody and harmony belong also to taste. There is no delightful sensation, we receive either from beauty or grandeur, which is not capable of being heightened by the power of musical sound. Hence the charm of poetical numbers; and even of the concealed and looser measures of prose. Satire, humor, and ridicule, open likewise a variety of pleasures to taste, altogether different from those that have yet been considered.

At present it is not necessary to pursue further the subject of the pleasures of taste. We have opened some of the general principles; it is time now to apply them to our present object. If it be asked, to what class of pleasures of taste, which have been enumerated, that pleasure is to be referred, which

receive from poetry, eloquence or fine writing? The answer is, not to any one, but to them all. This peculiar advantage writing and discourse possess, they encompass a large and fruitful field on all sides, and have power to exhibit in great perfection, not a single set of objects only, but almost the whole of those, which give pleasure to taste and imagination; whether that pleasure arise from sublimity, from beauty in its various forms, from design and art, from moral sentiment, from novelty, from harmony, from wit, humor, or ridicule. To whichever of these a person's taste is directed, from some writer or other he has it always in his power to receive the gratification of it.

It has been usual among critical writers to treat of discourse, as the chief of all the imitative arts. They compare it with painting and with sculpture, and in many respects prefer it justly before them. But we must distinguish between imitation and description. (Words have no natural resemblance of the ideas or objects which they signify; but a statue or picture has a natural likeness of the original.)

As far, however, as a poet or historian introduces into his work persons really speaking, and by words, which he puts into their mouths, represents the conversation, which they might be supposed to hold; so far his art may be called imitative; and this is the case in all dramatic composition. (But in narrative or descriptive works it cannot with propriety be so called. Who, for example, would call Virgil's description of a tempest in the first Æneid an imitation of a storm? If we heard of the imitation of a battle, we might naturally think of some mock

fight, or representation of a battle on the stage ; but should never imagine it meant one of Homer's descriptions in the Iliad. It must be allowed at the same time, that imitation and description agree in their principal effect, that of recalling by external signs the ideas of things, which we do not see. But, though in this they coincide, yet it should be remembered, that the terms themselves are not synonymous ; that they import different means of producing the same end ; and consequently make different impressions on the mind.

### QUESTIONS.

1. What, *next to sublimity*, affords the highest pleasure to the imagination ?
2. How is the emotion raised by beauty *distinguished* from that of sublimity ?
3. How do the pleasures arising from sublimity and beauty compare with each other, as to *duration* ?
4. How does it compare with sublimity as to *variety* of objects ?
5. What may be said generally of beauty as to its *signification* ?
6. What affords the *simplest instance* of beauty ?
7. Why does *green* appear peculiarly beautiful ? Why does *blue* ?
8. What colors are *chosen* for beauty *independently* of the associations, which cause green and blue to appear peculiarly beautiful ?
9. Does *figure* contribute to beautify ?
10. What is meant by a *regular figure* ? And what are instances of it ?
11. On what account does *regularity* appear *chiefly* beautiful ?
12. How does a *straight canal* compare with a *meandering river* for beauty ?
13. How do *cones* and *pyramids* compare with *trees*, growing in their *natural wildness*, for beauty ?
14. Why should the *apartments of a house* be disposed with regularity ?
15. Why may a *garden* have less *uniformity* than a house ?
16. How do *bodies in motion* compare with those at rest ?
17. Why does *gentle motion* only belong to the beautiful ?
18. How does the *motion of a bird* compare with the

*darting of lightning?* 19. How does a young tree compare with the ancient oak for beauty? 20. What observation does *Hogarth* make concerning motion as it tends to beautify?

21. How do *color, figure, and motion*, when united, affect beauty? 22. In what objects are they united? 23. Where is the *most complete assemblage* of beautiful objects to be found? 24. What description of beauty is *more complex* than any we have yet examined? 25. On what does the *principal* beauty of the countenance depend? 26. What *two great classes* of moral qualities always raise in us a feeling similar to that of beauty? 27. What description of *writing* is called beautiful? 28. What authors are *distinguished* for this kind of style? 29. What other pleasure of taste has been mentioned by Addison? 30. How does the *emotion* raised by novelty compare with that produced by beauty? 31. To what description of pleasure does *imitation* give rise? 32. What effect does *melody* have upon the sensations produced by beauty and sublimity? 33. What *advantage* do writing and discourse possess? 34. What is considered among critical writers as the *chief* of the *imitative arts*? 35. What is the difference between *imitation* and *description*? 36. When and how far may the work of a poet or historian be called *imitative*? 37. Can what is *narrative* and *descriptive* be called imitative? 38. In what do imitation and description agree?



## ORIGIN AND PROGRESS OF LANGUAGE.

TO form an adequate idea of the origin of language, we must contemplate the circumstances of mankind in their earliest and rudest state. They were then a wandering, scattered race;



no society among them except families ; and family society also very imperfect, as their mode of living, by hunting or pasturage, must have separated them frequently from each other.

In such a condition, how could any one set of sounds or words be universally agreed on, as the signs of their ideas ? Supposing that a few whom chance or necessity threw together, agreed by some means upon certain signs ; yet, by what authority could these be so propagated among other tribes or families, as to grow up into a language ? One would imagine that men must have been previously gathered together in considerable numbers, before language could be fixed and extended ; and yet on the other hand there seems to have been an absolute necessity of speech previous to the formation of society. (For by what bond could a multitude of men be kept together, or be connected in the prosecution of any common interest, before, by the assistance of speech, they could communicate their wants and intentions to each other ? So that, how society could subsist previously to language, and how words could rise into language before the formation of society, seem to be points attended with equal difficulty. When we consider farther that curious analogy, which prevails in the construction of almost all languages, and that deep and subtile logic, on which they are founded ; difficulties increase so much upon us on all sides, that there seems to be no small reason for referring the origin of all language to divine inspiration.)

But, supposing language to have a divine original, we cannot imagine that a perfect system of it was at once given to man. It is much

more natural to suppose that God taught our first parents only such language as suited their present occasions; leaving them, as he did in other respects, to enlarge and improve it as their future necessities should require.) Consequently, those rudiments of speech must have been poor and narrow; and we are at liberty to inquire, in what manner, and by what steps, language advanced to the state, in which we now find it.

Should we suppose a period existed, before words were invented or known; (it is evident, that men could have no other method of communicating their feelings, than by the cries of passion, accompanied by such motions and gestures, as were farther expressive of emotion.) These indeed are the only signs, which nature teaches all men, and which are understood by all. One, who saw another going into some place, where he himself had been frightened, or exposed to danger, and who wished to warn his neighbor of the danger, could contrive no other method of doing it, than by uttering those cries and making those gestures, which are the signs of fear; as two men at this day would endeavor to make themselves understood by each other, if thrown together on a desolate island, ignorant of each other's language. (Those exclamations, therefore, by grammarians called interjections, uttered in a strong and passionate manner, were undoubtedly the elements of speech.)

When more enlarged communication became requisite, and names began to be applied to objects; how can we suppose men proceeded in this application of names, or invention of words?

Certainly by imitating as much as they could, the nature of the object named by the sound of the name given to it. As a painter, who would represent grass, must employ a green color ; so, in the infancy of language, one giving a name to any thing harsh or boisterous, would of course employ a harsh or boisterous sound. He could not do otherwise, if he desired to excite in the hearer the idea of that object, which he wished to name. To imagine words invented, or names given to things, without any ground or reason, is to suppose an effect without a cause. There must always have been some motive, which led to one name, rather than another ; and we can suppose no motive, which would more generally operate upon men in their first efforts toward language, than a desire to paint by speech the objects, which they named, in a manner more or less complete, according as it was in the power of the human voice to effect this imitation.

Wherever objects were to be named, in which sound, noise, or motion was concerned, the imitation by words was sufficiently obvious. Nothing was more natural, than to imitate by the sound of the voice, the quality of the sound or noise, which any external object produced ; and to form its name accordingly. Thus in all languages we discover a multitude of words, which are evidently constructed on this princi-

A certain bird is called the Cuckoo, from sounds which it emits. When one sort of d is said to *whistle*, and another to *roar* ; when serpent is said to *hiss* ; a fly to *buzz* ; and fall-timber to *crash* ; when a stream is said to *run*, and hail to *rattle* ; the resemblance be-

tween the word and the thing signified is plainly discernible. But in the names of objects which address the sight only, where neither noise nor motion is concerned; and still more in terms, appropriated to moral ideas, this analogy appears to fail. Yet many learned men have imagined that, though in such cases it becomes more obscure, it is not altogether lost; and that in the radical words of all languages there may be traced some degree of correspondence with the objects signified.

This principle however of a natural relation between words and objects, can be applied to language only in its most simple and early state. Though in every tongue some remains of it may be traced, it were utterly in vain to search for it through the whole construction of any modern language. As terms increase in every nation, and the vast field of language is filled up, words, by a thousand fanciful and irregular methods of derivation and composition, deviate widely from the primitive character of their roots, and lose all resemblance in sound of the things signified. This is the present state of language. Words, as we now use them, taken in general, may be considered, as symbols, not imitations; as arbitrary or instituted, not natural signs of ideas. But there can be no doubt, that language, the nearer we approach to its rise among men, will be found to partake more of a natural expression.

Interjections, it has been shown, or passionate exclamations, were the elements of speech. Men labored to communicate their feelings to each other by those expressive cries and gestures, which nature taught them. After words,

or names of objects, began to be invented, this mode of speaking by natural signs could not be all at once disused. For language in its infancy must have been extremely barren; and there certainly was a period among all rude nations, when conversation was carried on by a very few words, intermixed with many exclamations and earnest gestures. The small stock of words which men then possessed, rendered those helps entirely necessary for explaining their conceptions; and rude uncultivated individuals, not having always ready even the few words, which they knew, would naturally labor to make themselves understood by varying their tones of voice, and by accompanying their tone with the most expressive gesticulations.

To this mode of speaking, necessity gave rise. But we must observe that, after this necessity had in a great degree ceased, by language becoming in process of time more extensive and copious, the ancient manner of speech still subsisted among many nations; and, what had arisen from necessity, continued to be used for ornament. In the Greek and Roman languages, a musical and gesticulating pronunciation was retained in a very high degree. Without attending to this, we shall be at a loss in understanding several passages of the classics, which relate to the public speaking and theatrical entertainments of the ancients. Our modern pronunciation would have seemed to them a lifeless monotony. The declamation of their orators and the pronunciation of their actors upon the stage approached to the nature of recitative in music; was capable of being marked by notes,

and supported by instruments ; as several learned men have proved.

With regard to gesture, the case was parallel; for strong tones and animated gestures always go together. (The action both of orators and players in Greece and Rome was far more vehement than that to which we are accustomed. To us, Roscius would appear a madman. Gesture was of such consequence on the ancient stage, that there is reason for believing that on some occasions the speaking and the acting were divided ; which, according to our ideas, would form a strange exhibition. One player spoke the words in the proper tones, while another expressed the corresponding motions and gestures. Cicero tells us, it was a contest between him and Roscius, whether he could express a sentiment in a greater variety of phrases; or Roscius in a greater variety of intelligible significant gestures.) At last, gesture engrossed the stage entirely; for under the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius, the favorite entertainment of the public was the pantomime, which was carried on by gesticulation only. The people were moved, and wept at it as much as at tragedies ; and the passion for it became so violent, that laws were made for restraining the senators from studying the pantomime art. Now, though in declamations and theatrical exhibitions both tone and gesture were carried much farther than in common discourse ; yet public speaking of any kind must in every country bear some proportion to the manner which is used in conversation ; and such public entertainments could never be established by a nation whose tones

The early language of men, being entirely composed of words descriptive of sensible objects, became of necessity extremely metaphorical. For, to signify any desire or passion, or any act of feeling of the mind, they had no fixed expression which was appropriated to that purpose; but were obliged to paint the emotion or passion, which they felt, by alluding to those sensible objects, which had most connection with it, and which could render it in some degree visible to others.)

But it was not necessity alone, that gave rise to this pictured style. In the infancy of all societies, fear and surprise, wonder and astonishment, are the most frequent passions of men. Their language will necessarily be affected by this character of their minds. They will be disposed to paint every thing in the strongest colors. Even the manner, in which the first tribes of men uttered their words, had considerable influence on their style. Wherever strong exclamations, tones, and gestures are connected with conversation, the imagination is always more exercised; a greater effort of fancy and passion is excited. Thus the fancy, being kept awake and rendered more sprightly by this mode of utterance, operates upon the style, and gives it additional life and spirit.

As one proof, among many which might be produced of the truth of these observations, we shall transcribe a speech from Colden's History of the Five Indian Nations, which was delivered by their chiefs, when entering on a treaty of peace with us, in the following language. "We are happy in having buried under ground the red axe, that has so often been dyed in the blood

of our brethren. Now in this fort we inter the axe, and plant the tree of peace. We plant a tree, whose top will reach the sun; and its branches spread abroad so, that it shall be seen afar off. May its growth never be stifled and choaked; but may it shade both your country and ours with its leaves! Let us make fast its roots, and extend them to the utmost of your colonies. If the French should come to shake this tree, we should know it by the motion of its roots reaching into our country. May the Great Spirit allow us to rest in tranquillity upon our mats, and never again dig up the axe, to cut down the tree of peace! Let the earth be trodden hard over it, where it lies buried. Let a strong stream run under the pit, to wash the evil away out of our sight and remembrance. The fire, that had long burned in Albany, is extinguished. The bloody bed is washed clean, and the tears are wiped from our eyes. We now renew the covenant chain of friendship. Let it be kept bright and clean as silver, and not suffered to contract any rust. Let not any one pull away his arm from it."

As language in its progress grew more copious, it gradually lost that figurative style, which was its early character. The vehement manner of speaking by tones and gestures became less common. Instead of poets, philosophers became the instructors of men; and in their reasoning on all subjects introduced that plainer and more simple style of composition which we now call prose. Thus the ancient metaphorical and poetical dress of language was at length laid aside in the intercourse of men, and reserved for those occasions only, on which ornament was professedly studied.



## QUESTIONS.

1. How can we form an *adequate idea* of the origin of language?
2. What were the circumstances of mankind in their *earliest* and *rudest* state?
3. What is the difficulty in supposing that language was formed before men united in society?
4. What difficulty is there in supposing that men united in society before they had the use of language?
5. What *further* difficulty is there in determining the origin of language, unless we refer it to *divine inspiration*?
6. Supposing language had a *divine original*, can we suppose that a *perfect system* was *at once* given to man?
7. What way is to be supposed more *natural* for God to have communicated language to men?
8. If we suppose a period existed before words were *invented* or *known*, what method would men have had to express their feelings?
9. What then may be considered the *elements of speech*?
10. When *names* began to be applied to *objects*, how did men probably proceed in the *application* of them, or in the *invention* of words?
11. What are instances of this?
12. In what description of *objects* is the *imitation* by words most easy?
13. In what *state* of language is there a *natural relation* between words and objects?
14. How are words in general to be considered, *as we now use them*?
15. Did the mode of speaking by *natural signs* or exclamations go out of use *at once*?
16. What rendered *those helps*, exclamations, necessary in the infancy of language?
17. Was this mode of speaking continued, after the *necessity* which gave rise to it had passed away?
18. In what *languages* was it retained in a high degree?
19. How would our *modern* pronunciation have appeared to the Greeks and Romans?
20. How would the gesticulation of the Greek and Roman orators and players compare with that of modern times?
21. How would it probably *appear to us*?
22. What was the *distinction* between Cicero and Roscius?
23. What is *gesticulation*, as practised upon the stage, called?
24. What gave rise to *metaphorical language*?
25. How

does this appear? 26. What besides *necessity* contributed to the use of metaphorical language? 27. What proof is adduced in confirmation of the *observations* made on this subject? 29. When did language become less *figurative*?

## RISE AND PROGRESS OF LANGUAGE AND OF WRITING.

WHEN we examine the order in which words are arranged in a sentence, we find a very remarkable difference between ancient and modern tongues. The consideration of this will serve to unfold farther the genius of language, and to shew the causes of those alterations, it has undergone in the progress of society.

To conceive distinctly the nature of this alteration, we must go back, as before, to the earliest period of language. Let us figure to ourselves a savage beholding some fruit which he earnestly desires, and requests another to give him. Suppose him unacquainted with words, he would strive to make himself understood by pointing eagerly at the object desired, and uttering at the same time a passionate cry. Supposing him to have acquired words, the first word which he would utter would be the name of that object. He would not express himself according to our order of construction, "Give me fruit;" but according to the Latin order, "Fruit give me," "*Fructum da mihi*," for this plain reason, that his attention was wholly directed toward fruit, the object desired. Hence we might conclude *a priori*, that this was the

order in which words were most commonly arranged in the infancy of language; and accordingly we find in reality that in this order words are arranged in most of the ancient tongues, as in the Greek and Latin; and it is said likewise in the Russian, Slavonic, Gaelic and several American tongues.)

The modern languages of Europe have adopted a different arrangement from the ancient. In their prose compositions very little variety is admitted in the collocation of words; they are chiefly fixed to one order, which may be called the order of understanding. They place first in the sentence the person or thing, which speaks or acts; next, its action; and lastly, the object of its action. Thus an English writer, paying a compliment to a great man, would say, "It is impossible for me to pass over in silence so distinguished mildness, so singular and unheard of clemency, and so uncommon moderation, in the exercise of supreme power." Here is first presented to us the person who speaks, "It is impossible for me;" next, what the same person is to do, "*to pass over in silence;*" and lastly, the object which excites him to action, "the mildness, clemency, and moderation of his patron." Cicero, from whom these words are translated, reverses this order. He begins with the object; places that first, which was the exciting idea in the speaker's mind, and ends with the speaker and his action. "*Tantum mansuetudinem, tam inusitatum inauditamque clementiam, tantumque in summa potestate rerum omnium modum, tacitus nullo modo præterire possum.*" Here, it must be observed, the Latin or-

der is more animated ; the English more clear and distinct.

Our language naturally allows greater liberty for transposition and inversion in poetry, than in prose. Even there, however, this liberty is confined within narrow limits, in comparison with the ancient languages. In this respect, modern tongues vary from each other. The Italian approaches the nearest in its character to the ancient transposition ; the English has more inversion than the rest ; and the French has the least of all.

Writing is an improvement upon speech, and consequently was posterior to it in order of time. Its characters are of two kinds, signs of things, and signs of words. Thus the pictures, hieroglyphics, and symbols, employed by the ancients, were of the former sort ; the alphabetical characters, now employed by Europeans, of the latter.

Pictures were certainly the first attempt toward writing. Mankind in all ages and in all nations have been prone to imitation. This would soon be employed for describing and recording events. Thus, to signify that one man had killed another, they painted the figure of one man lying on the ground, and of another standing by him with a hostile weapon in his hand. When America was first discovered, this was the only kind of writing with which the Mexicans were acquainted. It was however a very imperfect mode of recording facts ; since by pictures external events only could be delineated.

Hieroglyphical characters may be considered as the second stage of the art of writing. They

consist of certain symbols, which are made to stand for invisible objects on account of their supposed resemblance to the objects themselves. Thus (an eye) represented knowledge; and (a circle, having neither beginning nor end) was the symbol of eternity. Egypt was the country where this kind of writing was most studied, and brought into a regular art. By these characters all the boasted wisdom of their priests was conveyed. They pitched upon animals, to be the emblems of moral objects, according to the qualities with which they supposed them to be endued.) Thus imprudence was denominated by (a fly; (wisdom, by an ant) and (victory, by a hawk.) But this sort of writing was in the highest degree enigmatical and confused; and consequently a very imperfect vehicle of knowledge.

From hieroglyphics some nations gradually advanced to simple arbitrary marks, which stood for objects, though without any resemblance of the objects signified.) Of this nature was the writing of the Peruvians. They used small cords of different colors; and by knots upon these, of different sizes and variously ranged, they invented signs for communicating their thoughts to one another. The Chinese at this day use written characters of this nature.— They have no alphabet of letters or simple sounds of which their words are composed; but every single character, which they use, is expressive of an idea; it is a mark, which signifies no one thing or object. The number of such characters must consequently be immense. They are said indeed to amount to (seventy thousand.) To be perfectly acquainted with

them is the business of a whole life; which must have greatly retarded among them the progress of every kind of science.

It is evident that the Chinese characters, like hieroglyphics, are signs of things and not of words. For we are told, that the Japanese, the Tonquinese, and the Corceans, who speak different languages from each other, and from the inhabitants of China, use, however, the same written characters with them, and thus correspond intelligibly with one another in writing, though mutually ignorant of each other's language. Our arithmetical figures, 1, 2, 3, 4, &c. are an example of this sort of writing.— They have no dependance on words; each figure represents the number for which it stands; and consequently is equally understood by all nations, who have agreed in the use of these figures.

The first step to remedy the imperfection, the ambiguity, and the tediousness of each of the methods of communication, which have been mentioned, was the invention of signs, which should stand not directly for things, but for words by which things were named and distinguished. An alphabet of syllables seems to have been invented previously to an alphabet of letters. Such an one is said to be retained at this day in Ethiopia and some countries in India. But at best it must have been imperfect and ineffectual; since the number of characters, being very considerable, must have rendered both reading and writing very complex and laborious.

To whom we are indebted for the sublime and refined discovery of letters, is not determined. They were brought into Greece by Cadmus,

the Phenician, who, according to Sir Isaac Newton's Chronology, was cotemporary with king David.) His alphabet contained only (sixteen letters.) The rest were afterwards added, according as signs for proper sounds were found to be wanting. The Phenician, Hebrew, Greek, and Roman alphabets agree so much in the figure, names and arrangement of the letters, as amounts to demonstration, that they were derived originally from the same source.

The ancient order of writing was from the right hand to the left. This method, as appears from some very old inscriptions, prevailed even among the Greeks. They afterwards used to write their lines alternately from the right to the left, and from the left to the right. The inscription on the famous Sigean monument is a specimen of this mode of writing, which continued till the days of Solon, the celebrated legislator of Athens. At length the motion from the left hand to the right, being found more natural and convenient, this order of writing was adopted by all the nations of Europe.

Writing was first exhibited on pillars and tables of stone; afterwards on plates of the softer metals. As it became more common, the leaves and bark of certain trees were used in some countries; and in others, tablets of wood, covered with a thin coat of soft wax, on which the impression was made with a stylus of iron. Parchment, made of the hides of animals, was an invention of later times. Paper was not invented before the fourteenth century.

## QUESTIONS.

1. How can the *genius* of *language* be further unfolded? 2. What order of words would a savage but little acquainted with language adopt in asking for fruit? 3. Why would he say "*fruit give me,*" instead of saying, give me fruit? 4. In what languages is this *order of words* preserved? 5. What is the order of words in *prose compositions* adopted in the modern languages of Europe? 6. Which admits of the *greater transposition* in the English language, poetry or prose? 7. What modern language *approaches* nearest to the ancient languages in transposition and inversion? 8. What one has the least of them? 9. What are the *characters* of writing? 10. What are the *signs* of things? 11. What the *signs* of words? 12. What was the *first attempt* toward writing? 13. Has this been *employed* for describing and recording events? 14. How would one man killing another be represented by pictures? 15. Was this an *imperfect* mode of recording facts? 16. What was the *second stage* in the art of writing? 17. What are hieroglyphical characters? 18. What would represent *knowledge*? 19. What would represent *eternity*? 20. In what country was this *kind* of writing brought to a regular art? 21. How did the Egyptians represent *moral qualities*? 22. How was *imprudence* represented? 23. How was wisdom? 24. How was victory? 25. What kind of writing succeeded hieroglyphics? 26. What was the manner of writing by *simple arbitrary marks*, as used by the Peruvians? 27. What nation still has a language of *this nature*? 28. How many of these marks or characters is the *Chinese* language said to contain? 29. What evidence is there, that the characters in the Chinese and some other eastern languages are *signs of things* and not of words? 30. What is there in our own language of the nature of the Chinese language? 31. What was the *first step* to remedy the evils in the modes of communication named? 32. What nation is now said to have a language of *syllables*? 33.



How many letters did the alphabet of Cadmus contain? 34. What proof is there that the Phenician, Hebrew, Greek, and Roman alphabets were derived from the same source? 35. What was the *ancient order* of writing? 36. What method was there adopted previous to that now used, from left to right? 37. When was paper invented? 38. What was used for writing before the invention of paper?

### STRUCTURE OF LANGUAGE.

THE common division of speech into eight parts, nouns, pronouns, verbs, participles, adverbs, prepositions, interjections, and conjunctions, (is not very accurate;) since under the general term of nouns it comprehends both substantives and adjectives, which are parts of speech essentially distinct. Yet, as we are most accustomed to this division, and, as logical exactness is not necessary to our present design, we shall adopt these terms, which habit has made familiar to us.

Substantive nouns are the foundation of Grammar, and the most ancient part of speech.—When men had advanced beyond simple interjections or exclamations of passion, and had begun to communicate their ideas to each other, they would be obliged to assign names to objects, by which they were surrounded. Whether a savage looked, he beheld forests and trees. To distinguish each by a separate name would have been endless. Their common qualities, such as springing from a root, and bearing branches and leaves, would suggest a general idea and a general name. The genius,

*tree*. was afterward subdivided into its several species of oak, elm, ash, &c. upon experience and observation.)

Still however only general terms were used in speech. For oak, elm, and ash, were names of whole classes of objects, each of which comprehended an immense number of undistinguished individuals. Thus, when the nouns, man, lion, or tree, were mentioned in conversation, it could not be known, which man, lion, or tree was meant among the multitude comprehended under one name. Hence arose a very useful contrivance for determining the individual object intended, by means of that part of speech called the article. In English, we have two articles, *a* and *the*; *a* is more general, *the* more definite. The Greeks had but one, which agrees with our definite article *the*. They supplied the place of our article *a* by the absence of their article; thus, ANTHROPOS signifies *a* man, ο ANTHROPOS. *the* man. The Latins had no article; but in the room of it used the pronouns, *hic*, *ille*, *iste*. This, however, seems a defect in their language; since articles certainly contribute much to perspicuity and precision.

To perceive the truth of this remark, observe the different imports of the following expressions: "The son of a King, the son of the king, a son of the king's." Each of these three phrases has a separate meaning, too obvious to be misunderstood. But, in Latin, "*filius regis*" is entirely undetermined; it may bear either of the three senses mentioned.

Besides this quality of being defined by the article, three affections belong to nouns; number, gender and case, which deserve to be considered.

**NUMBER**, as it makes a noun significant of one or more, is singular or plural; a distinction found in all tongues, which must have been coeval with the origin of language, since there were few things, which men had more frequent necessity of expressing, than the distinction between one and more. (In the Hebrew, Greek, and some other ancient languages, we find not only a plural, but a dual number; the origin of which may very naturally be accounted for, as separate terms of numbering were yet undiscovered, and one, two, and many, were all; or at least the principal numeral distinctions, which men at first had any occasion to make.)

**GENDER**, which is founded on the distinction of the two sexes, can with propriety be applied to the names of living creatures only. All other nouns ought to be of the neuter gender. Yet in most languages the same distinction is applied to a great number of inanimate objects. Thus, in the Latin tongue, *ensis*, a sword, is masculine; *sagitta*, an arrow, is feminine; and this assignation of sex to inanimate objects often appears entirely capricious. In the Greek and Latin, however, all inanimate objects are not distributed into masculine and feminine; but many of them are classed, where all ought to be, under the neuter gender; as *saxum*, a rock; *mare*, the sea. But in the French and Italian tongues, the neuter gender is wholly unknown, all their names of inanimate objects being put upon the same footing with those of living creatures, and

distributed without reserve into masculine and feminine. In the English language, all nouns, literally used, that are not names of living creatures, are neuter; and ours is, perhaps, the only tongue, except the Chinese, which is said to resemble it in this particular, in which the distinction of gender is philosophically applied.)

CASE denotes the state or relation, which one object bears to another, by some variation of the name of that object; generally in the final letters, and by some languages in the initial. All tongues, however, do not agree in this mode of expression. Declension is used by the Greek and Latin; but in the English, French, and Italian, it is not found; or, at most, it exists in a very imperfect state. These languages express the relations of objects by prepositions, which are the names of those relations prefixed to the names of objects. English nouns have no case, except a sort of genitive, commonly formed by adding the letter *s* to the noun; as when we say "Pope's Dunciad," meaning the Dunciad of Pope.)

Whether the moderns have given beauty or utility to language, by the abolition of cases, may perhaps be doubted. They have, however, certainly rendered it more simple, by removing that intricacy which arose from different forms of declension, and from the irregularities of the several declensions. But in obtaining this simplicity, it must be confessed, we have filled language with a multitude of those little words, called prepositions, which, by perpetually occurring in every sentence, encumber speech; and by rendering it more prolix, enervate its force. The sound of modern language is also less agreeable to the ear, being deprived of that

variety and sweetness, which arose from the length of words and the change of terminations, occasioned by cases in the Greek and Latin. But perhaps the greatest disadvantage we sustain by the abolition of cases is the loss of that liberty of transposition in the arrangement of words, which the ancient languages enjoyed.

**PRONOUNS** are the representatives of nouns, and are subject to the same modifications of number, gender and case. We may observe, however, that the pronouns of the first and second person, *I* and *thou*, have no distinction of gender in any language; for as they always refer to persons present, their sex must be known, and therefore need not to be marked by their pronouns. But, as the third person may be absent, or unknown, the distinction of gender there becomes requisite; and accordingly in English it hath all the three genders, *he, she, it*.

**ADJECTIVES**, as *strong, weak, handsome, ugly*, are the plainest and most simple in that class of words, which are termed attributive. They are common to all languages, and must have been very early invented: since objects could neither be distinguished nor treated of in discourse, before names were assigned to their different qualities.

### QUESTIONS.

1. Is the *common division* of speech into eight parts accurate? 2. Why is this division retained, if inaccurate? 3. What are the *foundations* of grammar? 4. Is it probable, when names were first given to objects, that *each* one had a particular name? 5. What method was then adopted? 6. What *useful contrivance*, as it is called, grew out of this method of naming objects? 7. How many *articles* has the English

uage? 8. How many had the Greek? 9. Was the place of our article *a* supplied in that uage? 10. Had the *Latin* language any article? 11. How was the defect supplied? 12. Was a real defect? 13. How will you evince the truth of the remark that it was a defect in the *Latin* uage not having any article? 14. What else belongs to nouns besides the article? 15. What is the distinction of number? 16. What languages had more than two numbers? 17. What was the name of the third? 18. What was the origin of it? 19. What is *gender*? 20. Is the distinction of gender applied, in any cases, differently from what it ought to be? 21. How is *gender* applied in the *Latin* and *Greek* languages? 22. How in the *French* and *Italian*? 23. How in the *English*? 24. How in the *Hebrew*? 25. What is *case*? 26. Do all languages use this mode of expression? 27. In what languages is *declension* used? 28. In what languages not used? 29. What cases have *English nouns*? What advantage has been had in the abolition of *cases* and *declensions* in modern languages? 30. What are the disadvantages? 31. What are *pronouns*? 32. What are *adjectives*?



## STRUCTURE OF LANGUAGE. ENGLISH TONGUE.

OF all the parts of speech, **VERBS** are by far the most complex and useful. From their importance we may justly conclude, that they are coeval with the origin of language; though a long time must have been requisite to bring them up to that accuracy which they now possess.

The tenses were contrived to mark the several distinctions of time. We commonly think of no more than its three great divisions, the past, the present, and the future; and we might suppose that if verbs had been so contrived as merely to express these, no more was necessary. But language proceeds with much greater subtilty. (It divides time into its several moments; it regards it as never standing still, but always flowing; things past, as more or less distant; and things future, as more or less remote by different gradations.) Hence the variety of tenses in almost every language.

The present may indeed be always regarded as one indivisible point, which admits no variety; "I am," "*sunt.*" But it is not so with the past. Even the poorest language has two or three tenses to express its varieties. Ours has four. 1. A past action may be represented as unfinished, by the imperfect tense; "I was walking, *ambulabam.*" 2. As finished by the perfect tense; "I have walked." 3. As finished some time since, the particular time being left undetermined; "I walked, *ambulavi;*" that is what grammarians call an aorist or indefinite past. 4. As finished before something else, which is also past. This is the plusquamperfect; "I had walked, *ambulaveram.* I had walked before you called upon me." Our language, we must perceive with pleasure, has an advantage over the Latin, which has only three variations of past time.

The varieties in future time are two; a simple or indefinite future; "I shall walk, *ambulabo;*" and a future, having reference to something else, which is likewise future; "I shall"

have walked, *ambulavero* ; I shall have walked, before he will pay me a visit."

Besides tenses, verbs admit the distinction of voices; viz. the active and passive ; as, "I love, or I am loved." They admit also the distinction of modes, which are intended to express the perceptions and volitions of the mind under different forms. The indicative mode simply declares a proposition ; "I write ; I have written." The imperative requires, commands, or threatens ; "Write thou ; let him write." The subjunctive expresses a proposition under the form of a condition, or as subordinate to something, to which reference is made ; "I might write ; I could write ; I should write, if the matter were so." This expression of the perceptions and volitions of the mind in so many various forms, together with the distinction of the three persons, *I, thou, and he*, constitutes the conjugation of verbs, which makes so great a part of the grammar of all languages.

Conjugation is reckoned most perfect in those languages, which, by varying the termination or the initial syllable of the verb, expresses the greatest number of important circumstances without the help of auxiliary verbs. In the oriental tongues verbs have few tenses ; but their modes are so contrived, as to express a great variety of circumstances and relations. In the Hebrew, they say in one word, without the aid of an auxiliary, not only, "I taught," but, "I was taught ; I caused to teach ; I was caused to teach ; I taught myself." The Greek, which is commonly thought to be the most perfect of all languages, is very regular and complete in the modes and tenses. The Latin,



though formed on the same model, is not so perfect; particularly in the passive voice, which forms most of the tenses by the aid of the auxiliary "*sum*." (In modern European tongues, conjugation is very defective.) The two great auxiliary verbs, *to have*, and *to be*, with those other auxiliaries, which we use in English, *do*, *shall*, *will*, *may*, and *can*, prefixed to a participle, or to another verb in the infinitive mode, supersede in a great measure the different terminations of modes and tenses which formed the ancient conjugations.

The other parts of speech, as they admit no variation, will require only a short discussion.

Adverbs are for the most part an abridged mode of speech, expressing by one word, what might by a circumlocution be resolved into two or more words, belonging to other parts of speech. "Here," for instance, is the same with "in this place." Hence adverbs seem to be less necessary, and of later introduction into speech, than several other classes of words; and accordingly most of them are derived from other words, formerly established in the language.

Prepositions and conjunctions serve to express the relations which things bear to one another, their mutual influence, dependence, and coherence; and so to join words together, as to form intelligible propositions. Conjunctions are commonly employed for connecting sentences, or members of sentences; as, *and* *because*, and the like. Prepositions are used for connecting words; as, *of*, *from*, *to*, &c. The beauty and strength of every language depend in a great measure on a proper use of conjunc-

tions, prepositions, and those relative pronouns, which serve the same purpose of connecting different parts of discourse.

Having thus briefly considered the structure of language in general, we will now enter more particularly into an examination of our own language.

The English, which was spoken after the Norman conquest, and continues to be spoken now, is a mixture of the ancient Saxon and the Norman French, together with such new and foreign words, as commerce and learning have, in a succession of ages, gradually introduced. From the influx of so many streams, from a junction of so many dissimilar parts, it naturally follows, that the English, like every compounded language, must be somewhat irregular. We cannot expect from it that complete analogy in structure, which may be found in those simpler languages, which were formed within themselves, and on built one foundation. Hence our syntax is short, since there are few marks in the words themselves which show their relation to each other, or point out either their concordance or their government in a sentence. But, if these be disadvantages in a compound language, they are balanced by the advantages which attend it, particularly by the number and variety of words by which such a language is commonly enriched. Few languages are more copious than the English. In all, grave subjects especially, historical, critical, political, and moral, no complaint can justly be made of the barrenness of our tongue. We are rich too in the language of poetry; our poetical style differs widely from prose, not with respect to num-

bers only, but in the very words themselves; which proves what a compass and variety of words we can select and employ, suited to different occasions. Herein (we are infinitely superior to the French,) whose poetical language, if it were not distinguished by rhyme, would not be known to differ from their ordinary prose. Their language, however, surpasses ours in expressing whatever is delicate, gay, and amusing. It is perhaps, the happiest language for conversation in the known world; but for the higher subjects of composition, the English is justly considered as far superior to it.)

The flexibility of a language, or its power of becoming either grave and strong, or easy and flowing, or tender and gentle, or pompous and magnificent, as occasions require, is a quality of great importance in speaking and writing. This depends on the copiousness of a language; the different arrangements of which its words are susceptible; and the variety and beauty of the sounds of its words. The Greek possessed these requisites in a higher degree than any other language. It superadded the graceful variety of its different dialects; and thereby readily assumed every kind of character, an author could wish, from the most simple and familiar, to the most majestic. The Latin, though very beautiful, is inferior in this respect to the Greek. It has more of a fixed character of stateliness and gravity; and is supported by a certain senatorial dignity, of which it is difficult for a writer to divest it.) Among modern tongues the Italian possesses much more flexibility than the French; and seems to be on the whole the most perfect of the modern dialects which have arisen out

of the ruins of the ancient. (Our language, though unequal to the Italian in flexibility, is not destitute of a considerable degree of this quality.) Whoever considers the diversity of style in some of our best writers, will discover in our tongue such a circle of expression, such a power of accommodation to the various tastes of men, as redounds much to its honor.

Our language has been thought to be very deficient in harmony of sound; yet the melody of its versification, its power of supporting poetical numbers, without the assistance of rhyme, is a sufficient proof, that it is far from being unharmonious. Even the hissing sound, of which it has been accused, occurs less frequently than has been suspected. For in many words, and in the final syllables especially, the letter *s* has the sound of *z*, which is one of the sounds on which the ear rests with pleasure; as in *has*, *these*, *loaves*, *hears*, &c.

It must however be admitted, that smoothness is not the distinguishing property of the English tongue. Strength and expressiveness, rather than grace and melody, constitute its character. It possesses also the property of being the most simple of all the European dialects in its form and construction. It is free from the intricacy of cases, declensions, modes and tenses. Its words are subject to fewer variations from their original form, than those of any other language. Its nouns have no distinction of gender, except what is made by nature; and but one variation in case. Its adjectives admit no change, except what expresses the degree of comparison. Its verbs, instead of the varieties of ancient conjugation, admit only of four or five

changes in termination. A few prepositions and auxiliary verbs effect all the purposes of signifi-  
cantly; while the principal words for the most  
part preserve their form unaltered. Hence  
our language acquires a simplicity and facility,  
which are the cause of its being frequently writ-  
ten and spoken with inaccuracy. (We imagine  
that a competent skill in it may be acquired  
without any study; and that in a syntax so nar-  
row and limited as ours, there is nothing which  
requires attention.) But the fundamental rules  
of syntax are common to the English and to the  
ancient tongues; and regard to them is abso-  
lutely requisite for writing or speaking with  
propriety.

Whatever be the advantages or defects of our  
language, it certainly deserves, in the highest  
degree, our study and attention. The Greeks  
and Romans, in the meridian of their glory, be-  
stowed the highest cultivation on their respect-  
ive languages. The French and Italians have  
employed much study upon theirs; and their  
example is worthy of imitation. For whatever  
knowledge may be gained by the study of other  
languages, it can never be communicated with  
advantage, unless by those, who can write and  
speak their own language with propriety. Let  
the matter of an author be ever so good and  
useful, his compositions will always suffer in the  
public esteem, if his expression be deficient in  
purity or propriety. At the same time, the at-  
tainment of a correct and elegant style is an ob-  
ject which demands application and labor. If  
any one suppose he can catch it merely by the  
ear, or acquire it by a hasty perusal of some of  
our good authors, he will be much disappointed.

The many grammatical errors, the many impure expressions, which are found in authors who are far from being contemptible, demonstrate that a careful study of our language is previously requisite for writing it with propriety, purity and elegance.

### QUESTIONS.

1. What parts of speech are the most complex? 2. From what may we conclude, that they were *coeval* with language in their existence? 3. For what were the tenses designed? 4. What are the *great*, the natural *divisions* of time? 5. What more particular distinctions have been introduced? 6. Of what other *distinction* do verbs admit besides tenses? 7. In what languages is conjugation reckoned most perfect? 8. What language is thought *most perfect* as to modes and tenses? 9. How does the Latin compare with the Greek in this respect? 10. What is the state of *conjugation* in modern European tongues? 11. What in modern languages has *superseded*, in a great measure, the different terminations of modes and tenses in the *ancient conjugations*? 12. What are *adverbs*? 13. What is the use of *prepositions* and *conjunctions*? 14. What is the composition of the *English* language? 15. What *naturally follows*, from the great number of languages from which the English is *compounded*? 16. Why is the English syntax *short*? 17. What are the *advantages* of a *compound* language? 18. How does the English language compare with the French for *poetry*? 19. How does it compare for *prose*? 20. On what does the flexibility of a language depend? 21. What language is pre-eminent in flexibility? 22. How does the Latin compare with the Greek in *this respect*? 23. How do the French and Italian compare in *flexibility*? 24. How do the Italian and English? 25. In what has our language been thought *deficient*? 26. But can it justly be considered *unharmonious*? 27. What may be considered the *distinguishing prop-*

erty of the English tongue? 28. What evil arises from the *simplicity* and *facility* of our language? 29. Can our language be well understood and used without study?



### STYLE, PERSPICUITY AND PRECISION.

**STYLE** is the peculiar manner in which a man expresses his thoughts by words. It is a picture of the ideas in his mind, and of the order in which they there exist.

The qualities of a good style may be ranged under two heads, *perspicuity* and *ornament*. It will readily be admitted, that *perspicuity* is the fundamental quality of a good style. Without this the brightest ornaments only glimmer through the dark, and perplex instead of pleasing the reader. If we be forced to follow a writer with much care; to pause, and to read over his sentences a second time, in order to understand them fully, he will not please us long. Men are too indolent to relish so much labor. Though they may pretend to admire an author's depth, after they have discovered his meaning, they will seldom be inclined to look a second time into his book.

*Perspicuity* requires attention, first to single words and phrases, and then to the construction of sentences. When considered with respect to words and phrases, it requires these three qualities, *purity*, *propriety* and *precision*.

*Purity* and *propriety* of language are often used indiscriminately for each other; and in-

deed they are very nearly allied. A distinction, however, obtains between them. (Purity is the use of such words and constructions as belong to the idiom of a particular language, in opposition to words and phrases, which are imported from other languages, or which are obsolete, or newly coined, or employed without proper authority. Propriety is the choice of such words, as the best and most established usage has appropriated to those ideas, which we intend to express by them.) It implies a correct and happy application of them, in opposition to vulgar or low expressions, and to words and phrases, less significant of the ideas we intend to convey. Style may be pure, that is, it may be strictly English without Scotticisms, or Gallicisms, or ungrammatical expressions of any kind, and yet be deficient in propriety. The words may be illy selected; not adapted to the subject, nor fully expressive of the author's meaning. He took them indeed from the general mass of English words; but his choice was made without skill. But style cannot be proper without being pure; it is the union of purity and propriety, which renders it graceful and perspicuous.

The exact meaning of precision may be learnt from the etymology of the word. It is derived from *præcidere*, to cut off; and signifies retrenching all superfluities, and pruning the expression in such a manner, as to exhibit neither more nor less than the ideas intended to be conveyed. Words, employed to express ideas, may be faulty in three respects. They may either not express the ideas which the au-



flour means, but some others which are only related; or they may express those ideas, but not completely; or they may express them together with something more than he intends. Precision is opposed to these three faults; but particularly to the last, into which feeble writers are very apt to fall. They employ a multitude of words, to make themselves understood, as they think, more distinctly; but they only confound the reader. The image, as they place it before you, is always seen double. When an author tells us of his hero's *courage*, in the day of battle; the expression is precise, and we understand it fully. But if, from a desire of multiplying words, he praise his *courage* and *fortitude*; at the moment he joins these words together, our idea begins to waver. He intends to express one quality more strongly; but he is in fact expressing two. (*Courage* resists danger, *fortitude* supports pain. The occasions of exerting these qualities are different; and, being led to think of both together, when only one of them should engage attention, our view is rendered unsteady, and our conception of the object indistinct.

The great source of a loose style, the opposite of precision, is the injudicious use of words called synonymous. Scarcely in any language are there two words that convey precisely the same idea; and a person perfectly acquainted with the propriety of the language, will always be able to observe something, by which they are distinguished. In our language many instances may be given of difference in meaning among words, reputed synonymous; and, as

the subject is important, we shall point out a few of them.

*Surprised, astonished, amazed, confounded.* We are surprised at what is new or unexpected; we are astonished at what is vast or great; we are amazed at what is incomprehensible; we are confounded by what is shocking or terrible.)

*Pride, vanity.* Pride makes us esteem ourselves; vanity makes us desire the esteem of others.)

*Haughtiness, disdain.* Haughtiness is founded on a high opinion of ourselves; disdain, on a low opinion of others.)

*To weary, to fatigue.* Continuance of the same thing wearies us; labour fatigues us. A man is wearied by standing; he is fatigued by walking.)

*To abhor, to detest.* (To abhor imports simply strong dislike; to detest imports likewise strong disapprobation. We abhor being debt; we detest treachery.)

*To invent, to discover.* (We invent things which are new; we discover what is hidden. Galilæo invented the telescope; Harvey discovered the circulation of the blood.)

*Entire, complete.* A thing is entire, when it wants none of its parts; complete, when it wants none of the appendages which belong to it. A man may occupy an entire house; though he may not have one complete apartment.

*Enough, sufficient.* Enough relates to the quantity, which we wish to have of a thing. Sufficient, relates to the use that is to be made of it. Hence enough commonly signifies a

greater quantity than sufficient does. The covetous man never has enough; though he has what is sufficient for nature.

These are a few among many instances of words in our language, which by careless writers are apt to be mistaken for synonymous. The more the distinction in the meaning of such words is regarded, the more accurately and forcibly shall we speak and write.

### QUESTIONS.

1. What is *style*?
2. What are the qualities of a good *style*?
3. What qualities does perspicuity require, when considered with respect to *words and phrases*?
4. What is the *distinction* between purity and propriety of language?
5. Can style be pure and *not proper*?
6. Can it be proper and *not pure*?
7. What is *precision*?
8. To what is it *opposed*?
9. What is the difference between *courage* and *fortitude*?
10. What is the great *source* of a loose style?
11. What is the difference between *surprised*, *astonished*, *amazed*, and *confounded*?
12. What is the difference between *pride* and *vanity*?
13. Between *haughtiness* and *disdain*?
14. Between *to weary* and *to fatigue*?
15. Between *to abhor* and *to detest*?
16. Between *to invent* and *to discover*?
17. Between *entire* and *complete*?
18. Between *enough* and *sufficient*?



### STRUCTURE OF SENTENCES.

A PROPER construction of sentences is of such importance in every species of composition, that we cannot be too strict or minute in

our attention to it. For, whatever be the subject, if the sentences be constructed in a clumsy, perplexed, or feeble manner, the work cannot be read with pleasure, nor even with profit. But by attention to the rules which relate to this part of style, we acquire the habit of expressing ourselves with perspicuity and elegance; and if a disorder happen to arise in some of our sentences, we immediately see where it lies, and are able to rectify it.

The properties most essential to a perfect sentence are the four following. 1. Clearness. 2. Unity. 3. Strength. 4. Harmony.)

Ambiguity is opposed to clearness, and arises from two causes; either from a wrong choice of words, or a wrong collocation of them. Of the choice of words, as far as regards perspicuity, we have already spoken. Of the collocation of them, we are now to treat. From the nature of our language, a capital rule in the arrangement of our sentences is, that words or members most nearly related should be placed as near to each other as possible, that their mutual relation may clearly appear. This rule is frequently neglected even by good writers. A few instances will show both its importance and application.

In the position of adverbs, which are used to qualify the signification of something which either precedes or follows them, a good deal of nicety is to be observed. "By greatness," says Addison, "I do not only mean the bulk of any single object, but the largeness of a whole view." Here the place of the adverb *only* makes it limit the verb *mean*. "I do not only

mean." The question may then be asked, What does he more than mean? Had it been placed after *bulk*, still it would have been wrong; for it might then be asked, What is meant beside the *bulk*? Is it the color, or any other property? Its proper place is after the word *object*: "By greatness, I do not mean the bulk of any single object only;" for then, when it is asked, What does he mean more than the bulk of a single object? the answer comes out precisely as the author intends, "the largeness of a whole view." "Theism," says Lord Shaftesbury, "can only be opposed to polytheism or atheism." It may be asked then, Is theism capable of nothing else, except being opposed to polytheism or atheism? This is what the words literally mean, through the improper collocation of *only*. He ought to have said, "Theism can be opposed only to polytheism or atheism." Inaccuracies of this kind occasion little ambiguity in common discourse, because the tone and emphasis used by the speaker generally make the meaning perspicuous. But in writing, where a person speaks to the eye, he ought to be more accurate, and so to connect adverbs with the words they qualify, that his meaning cannot be mistaken on the first inspection.

When a circumstance is interposed in the middle of a sentence, it sometimes requires attention to place it in such manner as to divest it of all ambiguity. For instance, "Are these designs," says Lord Bolingbroke, "which any man who is born a Briton, in any circumstances, in any situation, ought to be ashamed or afraid

to avow?" Here we are in doubt whether the phrases, "*in any circumstances, in any situation,*" be connected with "a man born a Briton," or with that man's "avowing his designs." If the latter, as seems most likely was intended to be the meaning, the arrangement ought to be this; "Are these designs which any man who is born a Briton ought to be ashamed or afraid, in any circumstances, in any situation, to avow?"

Still more attention is requisite to a proper disposition of the relative pronouns *who, which, what, whose*; and of all those particles which express the connexion of the parts of speech. As all reasoning depends upon this connexion, we cannot be too accurate with regard to it. A small error may obscure the meaning of a whole sentence; and even where the meaning is apparent, yet if these relatives be misplaced, we always find something awkward and disjointed in the structure of the period. The following passage in Bishop Sherlock's Sermons will exemplify these observations; "It is folly to pretend to arm ourselves against the accidents of life, by heaping up treasures which nothing can protect us against, but the good providence of our heavenly Father."—*Which* grammatically refers to the immediately preceding noun, which here is "treasures;" and this would convert the whole period into nonsense. The sentence should have been thus constructed: "It is folly to pretend, by heaping up treasures, to arm ourselves against the accidents of life, against which nothing can protect us, but the good providence of our heavenly Father."

We now proceed to the second quality of a

well arranged sentence, which we termed its Unity. This is a capital property. The very nature of a sentence implies one proposition to be expressed. It may consist of parts; but these parts must be so closely bound together, as to make an impression of one object only upon the mind.

To preserve this unity, we must first observe, that during the course of the sentence the subject should be changed as little as possible. There is generally in every sentence some person or thing which is the governing word. This should be continued so, if possible, from the beginning to the end of it. Should a man express himself in this manner—"After we came to anchor, they put me on shore, where I was saluted by all my friends, who received me with the greatest kindness"—though the objects in this sentence are sufficiently connected, yet by shifting so often the subject and person, *we*, *they*, *I*, and *who*, they appear in so disunited a view, that the sense and connexion are nearly lost. The sentence is restored to its proper unity by constructing it thus: "Having come to anchor, I was put on shore, where I was saluted by all my friends, who received me with the greatest kindness."

The second rule is, never crowd into one sentence ideas which have so little connexion, that they might well be divided into two or more sentences. Violation of this rule, never fails to displease a reader. Its effect, indeed, is so disgusting, that of the two, it is the safest extreme to err rather by too many short sentences, than by one that is overloaded and con-

fused. The following sentence from a translation of Plutarch will justify this opinion: "Their march," says the author, speaking of the Greeks, "was through an uncultivated country, whose savage inhabitants fared hardly, having no other riches than a breed of lean sheep, whose flesh was rank and unsavory, by reason of their continual feeding upon sea fish." Here the subject is repeatedly changed. The march of the Greeks, the description of the inhabitants through whose country they passed, the account of their sheep, and the reason of their sheep being disagreeable food, make a jumble of objects, slightly related to each other, which the reader cannot without considerable difficulty comprehend in one view.

The third rule for preserving the unity of a sentence is, keep clear of parentheses in the middle of it. These may on some occasions have a spirited appearance, as prompted by a certain vivacity of thought, which can glance happily aside, as it is going along. But in general their effect is extremely bad; being a perplexed method of disposing of some thought, which a writer has not art enough to introduce in its proper place. It is needless to produce any instances, as they occur so frequently among incorrect writers.

The fourth rule for the unity of a sentence is, bring it to a full and perfect close. It needs not to be observed, that an unfinished sentence is no sentence as it respects grammar. But sentences often occur, which are more than finished. When we have arrived at what we expected to be the conclusion; when we are



come to the word on which the mind is naturally led to rest; unexpectedly some circumstance is added, which ought to have been omitted, or disposed of elsewhere. Thus, for instance, in the following sentence from Sir William Temple, the adjection to the sentence is entirely foreign to it. Speaking of Burnet's Theory of the Earth, and Fontenelle's Plurality of Worlds; "The first," says he, "could not end his learned treatise without a panegyric of modern learning in comparison of the ancient; and the other falls so grossly into the censure of the old poetry, and preference of the new, that I could not read either of these strains without some indignation; which no quality among men is so apt to raise in me as self-sufficiency." The word "indignation" concludes the sentence; for the last member is added after the proper close.

### QUESTIONS.

1. What are the *properties* most essential to a *perfect sentence*?
2. What is opposed to *clearness*?
3. What may be considered a *capital rule* in the arrangement of our sentences?—(Let the Instructor read the examples given of ambiguity, and the pupil correct them.)
4. What is *unity*?
5. What is the *first rule* to preserve the unity of a sentence?
6. What is the *second rule* for preserving the unity of a sentence?
7. What is the *third rule* for it?
8. What is the *fourth rule*?

## STRUCTURE OF SENTENCES.

WE now proceed to the third quality of a correct sentence, which we termed strength. By this is meant such a disposition of the several words and members, as will exhibit the sense to the best advantage; as will render the impression, which the period is intended to make, most full and complete; and give every word and member its due weight and force. To the production of this effect, perspicuity and unity are absolutely necessary; but more is requisite. For a sentence may be clear; it may also be compact, or have the requisite unity; and yet, by some unfavorable circumstance in the structure, it may fail in that strength or liveliness of impression, which a more happy collocation would produce.

The first rule for promoting the strength of a sentence is, take from it all redundant words. Whatever can be easily supplied in the mind, is better omitted in the expression; thus, "content with deserving a triumph, he refused the honor of it," is better than "being content with deserving a triumph, he refused the honor of it." It is one of the most useful exercises on reviewing what we have written, to contract that circuitous mode of expression, and to cut off those useless excrescences, which are usually found in a first draught. But we must be cautious of pruning so closely as to give a hardness and dryness to the style. Some leaves must be left to shelter and adorn the fruit.

As sentences should be cleared of superfluous words, so also of superfluous members.—Opposed to this, is the fault Gwe frequently

meet, the last member of a period being only a repetition of the former in a different dress. For example, speaking of beauty, "the very first discovery of it," says Addison, "strikes the mind with inward joy, and spreads delight through all its faculties." In this instance, scarcely any thing is added by the second member of the sentence to what was expressed in the first. Though the flowing style of Addison may palliate such negligence; yet it is generally true, that language, divested of this prolixity, is more strong and beautiful.

The second rule for promoting the strength of a sentence is, pay particular attention to the use of copulatives, relatives, and particles, employed for transition and connection. Some observations on this subject, which appear useful, shall be mentioned.

What is termed splitting of particles, or separating a preposition from the noun, which it governs, is ever to be avoided. For example, "though virtue borrows no assistance from, yet it may often be accompanied by, the advantages of fortune." In such instances we suffer pain from the violent separation of two things, which by nature are closely united.

The strength of a sentence is much injured by an unnecessary multiplication of relative and demonstrative particles. If a writer say, "there is nothing which disgusts me sooner, than the empty pomp of language;" he expresses himself less forcibly, than if he had said, nothing disgusts me sooner, than the empty pomp of language." The former mode of expression in the introduction of a subject, or

in laying down a proposition, to which particular attention is demanded, is very proper; but in ordinary discourses the latter is far preferable.

With regard to the relative, we shall only observe, that in conversation and epistolary writing it may be omitted; but in compositions of a serious or dignified kind, it should constantly be inserted.

On the copulative particle *and*, which occurs so often, several observations are to be made. It is evident, that an unnecessary repetition of it enfeebles style. By omitting it we often make a closer connection, a quicker succession of objects, than when it is inserted between them. "*Veni, vidi, vici*," expresses with more spirit the rapidity of conquest, than if connecting particles had been used. When, however, we wish to prevent a quick transition from one object to another; and when enumerating objects which we wish to appear as distinct from each other as possible; copulatives may be multiplied with peculiar advantage. Thus Lord Bolingbroke says with propriety, "such a man might fall a victim to power; but truth, and reason, and liberty, would fall with him."

The third rule for promoting the strength of a sentence is, dispose of the principal word or words in that part of the sentence, where they will make the most striking impression. Perspicuity ought first to be studied; and the nature of our language allows no great liberty of collocation. In general, the important words are placed at the beginning of a sentence. Thus Mr. Addison; "the pleasures of the im-

agination, taken in their full extent, are not so gross as those of sense; nor so refined as those of the understanding." This order seems to be the most plain and natural. Sometimes, however, when we propose giving weight to a sentence, it is useful to suspend the meaning a little, and then to bring it out fully at the close. "Thus," says Pope, "on whatever side we contemplate Homer, what principally strikes us, is his wonderful invention."

The fourth rule for promoting the strength of sentences is, make the members of them go on rising in their importance one above another. This kind of arrangement is called a climax, and is ever regarded, as a beauty in composition. Why it pleases is sufficiently evident. In all things we love to advance to what is more and more beautiful, rather than to follow a retrograde order. Having viewed some considerable object, we cannot without pain descend to an inferior circumstance. "*Cavendum est,*" says Quintilian, "*ne decrescat oratio, et fortior subjungatur aliquid infirmius.*" A weaker assertion should never follow a stronger one; and, when a sentence consists of two members, the longest should in general be the concluding one. Periods, thus divided, are pronounced more easily; and the shortest member being placed first, we carry it more readily in our memory, as we proceed to the second, and see the connection of the two more clearly. Thus to say, "When our passions have forsaken us, we flatter ourselves with the belief that we have forsaken them," is both more graceful and more perspicuous, than to begin with the lon-

gest part of the proposition; "We flatter ourselves with the belief that we have forsaken our passions, when they have forsaken us."

The fifth rule for constructing sentences with strength is, avoid concluding them with an adverb, a preposition, or any insignificant word. By such conclusions, style is always weakened and degraded. Sometimes, indeed, where the stress and significancy rest chiefly upon words of this kind, they ought to have the principal place allotted them. No fault, for example, can be found with this sentence of Bolingbroke; "In their prosperity my friends shall never hear of me; in their adversity, always;" where *never* and *always*, being emphatical words, are so placed, as to make a strong impression. But, when these inferior parts of speech are introduced, as circumstances, or as qualifications of more important words, they should always be disposed of in the least conspicuous parts of the period.

We should always avoid concluding a sentence or member with any of those particles, which distinguish the cases of nouns; as *of*, *to*, *from*, *with*, *by*. Thus it is much better to say, "avarice is a crime, of which wise men are often guilty," than to say, "avarice is a crime, which wise men are often guilty of." This is a phraseology which all correct writers shun.

A complex verb, compounded of a simple verb and a subsequent preposition, is also an ungraceful conclusion of a period; as, *bring about*, *clear up*, *give over*, and many others of the same kind; instead of which, if a simple verb be employed, it will terminate the sentence with

more strength. Even the pronoun *it*, especially when joined with some of the prepositions, as *with it*, *in it*, *to it*, cannot without violation of grace be the conclusion of a sentence. Any phrase, which expresses a circumstance only, cannot conclude a sentence without great inelegance. Circumstances, indeed, are like unshapely stones in a building, which try the skill of an artist, where to place them with the least offence. We should not crowd too many of them together; but rather intersperse them in different parts of the sentence, joined with the principal words on which they depend. Thus, for instance, when Dean Swift says, "what I had the honor of mentioning to your lordship some time ago in conversation, was not a new thought;" these two circumstances, *some time ago*, and *in conversation*, which are joined, would have been better separated thus; "what I had the honor some time ago of mentioning to your lordship in conversation."

The sixth and last rule, concerning the strength of a sentence is this, (in the members of it, where two things are compared or contrasted; where either resemblance or opposition is to be expressed; some resemblance in the language and construction ought to be observed.) The following passage from Pope's preface to his *Homer*, beautifully exemplifies this rule. "Homer was the greater genius; Virgil the better artist: in the one we admire the man; in the other, the work. Homer hurries us with a commanding impetuosity; Virgil leads us with an attractive majesty. Homer scatters with a generous profusion; Virgil bestows with a careful magnificence. Homer, like

the Nile, pours out his riches with a sudden overflow ; Virgil, like a river in its banks, with a constant stream. When we look upon their machines, Homer seems like his own Jupiter in his terrors, shaking Olympus, scattering lightnings, and firing the heavens. Virgil like the same power in his benevolence, counselling with the gods, laying plans for empires, and ordering his whole creation." Periods, thus constructed, when introduced with propriety, and not too frequently repeated, have a sensible beauty. But, if such a construction be aimed at in every sentence, it betrays into a disagreeable uniformity, and produces a regular jingle in the period, which tires the ear, and plainly discovers affectation.

### QUESTIONS.

1. What is the *strength* of a sentence ?
2. What is the *first rule* for promoting the strength of a sentence ?
3. What is necessary besides avoiding all *superfluous words* ?
4. What is the *second rule* for promoting the strength of a sentence ?
5. How should *prepositions* and the words which they govern be placed in regard to each other ?
6. What may be observed in relation to the use of *relative* and *demonstrative particles* ?
7. What may be observed relative to the *copulative particle* AND ?
8. What is the *third rule* for promoting the strength of a sentence ?
9. What is the *fourth rule* for it ?
10. What is *this kind* of arrangement called ?
11. What is the *fifth rule* for promoting the strength of a sentence ?
12. What is the *sixth rule* ?



## STRUCTURE OF SENTENCES...HARMONY.

HAVING considered sentences with regard to their meaning, under the heads of Perspicuity, Unity, and Strength, we shall now consider them with respect to their sound.

In the harmony of periods, two things are to be considered. First, agreeable sound or modulation in general, without any particular expression. Next, the sound so ordered as to become expressive of the sense. The first is the more common; the second the superior beauty.

The beauty of musical construction depends upon the choice and arrangement of words. Those words are most pleasing to the ear, which are composed of smooth and liquid sounds, in which there is a proper intermixture of vowels and consonants, without too many harsh consonants, or too many open vowels in succession. Long words are generally more pleasing to the ear than monosyllables; and those are the most musical, which are not wholly composed of long or short syllables, but of an intermixture of them, such as *delight, amuse, velocity, celerity, beautiful, impetuosity*. If the words, however, which compose a sentence, be ever so well chosen and harmonious, yet, if they be unskillfully arranged, its music is entirely lost. As an instance of a musical sentence, we may take the following, from Milton: "We shall conduct you to a hill side, laborious, indeed, at the first ascent; but else, so smooth, so

green, so full of goodly prospects and melodious sounds on every side, that the harp of Orpheus was not more charming." Every thing in this sentence conspires to render it harmonious. The words are well chosen; *laborious, smooth, green, goodly, melodious, charming*; and so happily arranged, that no alteration can be made without injuring the melody.

There are two things on which the music of a sentence principally depends; these are, the proper distribution of the several members of it, and the close or cadence of the whole.

First, the distribution of the several members should be carefully regarded. Whatever is easy to the organs of speech is always grateful to the ear. While a period advances, the termination of each member forms a pause in the pronunciation; and these pauses should be so distributed, as to bear a certain musical proportion to each other. This will be best illustrated by examples. "This discourse concerning the easiness of God's commands does all along suppose and acknowledge the difficulties of the first entrance upon a religious course; except only in those persons who have had the happiness to be trained up to religion by the easy and insensible degrees of a pious and virtuous education." This sentence is far from being harmonious; owing chiefly to this, that there is but one pause in it, by which it is divided into two members, each of which is so long as to require a considerable stretch of breath in pronouncing it. On the contrary, let us observe the grace of the following passage from Sir William Temple, in which he speaks ear-

castically of man. "But, God be thanked, his pride is greater than his ignorance; and, what he wants in knowledge, he supplies by sufficiency. When he has looked about him as far as he can, he concludes there is no more to be seen; when he is at the end of his line, he is at the bottom of the ocean; when he has shot his best, he is sure none ever did, or ever can shoot better, or beyond it. His own reason he holds to be the certain measure of truth; and his own knowledge, of what is possible in nature." Here every thing is at once easy to the breath, and grateful to the ear. We must however observe, that if composition abound with sentences which have too many rests, and these placed at intervals apparently measured and regular, it is apt to savour of affectation.

The next thing which demands attention, is the close or cadence of the period. The only important rule, which can here be given, is this, when we aim at dignity or elevation, the sound should increase to the last; the longest members of the period, and the fullest and most sonorous words, should be reserved for the conclusion. As an instance of this, the following sentence of Addison may be given. "It fills the mind with the largest variety of ideas; converses with its objects at the greatest distance; and continues the longest in action without being tired or satiated with its proper enjoyments." Here every reader must be sensible of beauty in the just distribution of the pauses, and in the manner of rounding the period, and of bringing it to a full and harmonious close.

It may be remarked, that (little words) in the conclusion of a sentence are as injurious to melody, as they are inconsistent with strength of expression. A musical close in our language seems in general to require either the last syllable, or the last but one, to be a long syllable. Words which consist chiefly of short syllables, as *contrary, particular, retrospect*, seldom terminate a sentence harmoniously, unless a previous run of long syllables have rendered them pleasing to the ear.

Sentences, however, which are so constructed, as to make the sound always swell toward the end, and rest either on the last or penult syllable, give a discourse the tone of declamation. If melody be not varied, the ear is soon cloyed with it. Sentences constructed in the same manner, with the pauses at equal intervals, should never succeed each other. Short sentences must be blended with long and swelling ones, to render discourse sprightly as well as magnificent.

We now proceed to treat of a higher species of harmony; the sound adapted to the sense. Of this we may remark two degrees. First, the current of sound suited to the tenor of a discourse. Next, a peculiar resemblance effected between some object, and the sounds that are employed in describing it.

Sounds have in many respects an intimate correspondence with our ideas; partly natural, partly produced by artificial associations. Hence, any one modulation of sound continued, stamps on style a certain character and expression. Sentences, constructed with Ciceronian

fullness, excite an idea of what is important, magnificent, and sedate. But they suit no violent passion, no eager reasoning, no familiar address. These require measures brisker, easier, and often more abrupt. It were as absurd to write a panegyric and an invective in a style of the same cadence, as to set the words of a tender love song to the tune of a warlike march. Beside, the general correspondence of the current of sound with the current of thought, a more particular expression of certain objects by resembling sounds may be attempted. In poetry this resemblance is chiefly to be sought. It obtains sometimes, indeed, in prose composition; but there in an inferior degree.

The sounds of words may be employed for representing chiefly three classes of objects; first, other sounds; secondly, motions; and thirdly, the emotions and passions of the mind.

In most languages, the names of many particular sounds are so formed, as to bear some resemblance of the sound which they signify; as with us the *whistling* of winds, the *buzz* and *hum* of insects, the *hiss* of serpents, and the *crash* of falling timber; and many other instances, where the name is plainly adapted to the sound it represents. A remarkable example of this beauty may be taken from two passages in Milton's *Paradise Lost*; in one of which he describes the sound, made by the opening of the gates of hell; in the other, that made by the opening of the gates of heaven. The contrast between the two, exhibits to great advan-

tage the art of the poet. The first is the opening of hell's gates ;

— On a sudden open fly  
With impetuous recoil and jarring sound  
The infernal doors ; and on their hinges grate  
Harsh thunder.

Observe the smoothness of the other ;

— Heaven open'd wide  
Ever during gates, harmonious sound !  
On golden hinges turning.

In the second place, the sound of words is frequently employed to imitate motion ; as it is swift or slow, violent or gentle, uniform or interrupted, easy or accompanied with effort. Between sound and motion there is no natural affinity ; yet in the imagination there is a strong one ; as is evident from the connexion between music and dancing. The poet can therefore give us a lively idea of the kind of motion he would describe, by the help of sounds which in our imagination correspond with that motion. Long syllables naturally excite an idea of slow motion ; as in this line of Virgil,

*Olli inter sese magna vi brachia tollunt.*

A succession of short syllables gives the impression of quick motion ; as ;

*Sed fugit interea, fugit irreparabile tempus.*

The works of Homer and Virgil abound with instances of this beauty ; which are so often quoted, and so well known, that it is unnecessary to produce them.

The third set of objects, which the sound of words is capable of representing, consists of emotions and passions of the mind. Between sense and sound there appears to be no natural resemblance. But if the arrangement of syllables by their sound alone recalls one set of ideas more readily than another, and disposes the

mind for entering into that affection which the poet intends to raise) such arrangement may with propriety be said to resemble the sense. Thus when pleasure, joy, and agreeable objects, are described by one who feels his subject, the language naturally runs in smooth, liquid, and flowing numbers.

———*Namque ipsa decoram  
Cæsariem nato genetrix, lumenque juventæ  
Purpureum, et lætos oculis afflarat honores.*

Brisk and lively sensations exact quicker and more animated numbers.

———*Juvenum manus emicat ardens  
Littus in Hesperium.*

Melancholy and gloomy subjects are naturally connected with slow measures and long words.

*In those deep solitudes and awful cells,  
Where heavenly pensive contemplation dwells.*

Abundant instances of this kind are suggested by a moderate acquaintance with good poets, either ancient or modern.

### QUESTIONS.

1. What is necessary in producing what is called *harmony* of periods? 2. On what does the beauty of *musical construction* depend? 3. What words are *most pleasing* to the ear? 4. On what does the *music* of a sentence *principally* depend? 5. What *important-rule* may be given concerning cadence? 6. What words, *in the conclusion* of a sentence are *injurious* to melody? 7. How must the *short* and *long* sentences of a discourse be disposed? 8. What does Dr. Blair consider the *higher species* of harmony? 9. In what description of composition is the *resemblance* between *thought* and *sound* chiefly to be *observed*? 10. For what may the *sounds of words* be *admired*? 11. What are instances in our language *names of sounds* bearing resemblance to the *things themselves*? 12. What *example* of this beau-

ty does Milton furnish? 13. Is there a natural affinity between *sound* and *motion*? 14. What kind of *syllables* excites an idea of *slow motion*? 15. What of *quick motion*? 16. In what does the *third set* of objects, which the sound of words is capable of representing, consist? 17. What *arrangement* of syllables, although there is no *natural* resemblance between sense and sound, may with propriety be said to *resemble* the sense.



## ORIGIN AND NATURE OF FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE.

FIGURES may be described to be that language, which is prompted either by the imagination or passions. They are commonly divided by rhetoricians into two great classes, figures of words, and figures of thought. The former are commonly called tropes, and consist in a word's being used to signify something different from its original meaning. Hence, if the word be changed, the figure is destroyed. Thus, for instance, "light ariseth to the upright in darkness." Here the trope consists in "light and darkness" not being taken literally, but substituted for comfort in adversity; to which conditions of life they are supposed to bear some resemblance. The other class, termed figures of thought, supposes the figure to consist in the sentiment only, while the words are used in their literal sense; as in exclamations, interrogations, apostrophes, and comparisons; where, though the words be varied the



translated from one language into another, the same figure is still preserved. This distinction however, is of small importance; as practice cannot be assisted by it; nor is it always very perspicuous.

Tropes are derived in part from the barrenness of language; but principally from the influence, which the imagination has over all language. (The imagination never contemplates any one idea or object as single and alone; but as accompanied by others, which may be considered as its accessories.) These accessories often operate more forcibly upon the mind, than the principal idea itself. They are, perhaps, in their nature more agreeable, or more familiar to our conceptions; or remind us of a greater variety of important circumstances. Hence the name of the accessory or correspondent idea is substituted; although the principal has a proper and well known name of its own. Thus, for example, when we design to point out the period, in which a state enjoyed most reputation or glory, we might easily employ the proper words for expressing this; but, as this, in our imagination, is readily connected with the flourishing period of a plant or tree, we prefer this correspondent idea and say, "The Roman empire flourished most under Augustus." The leader of a faction is a plain expression; but, because the head is the principal part of the human body, and is supposed to direct all the animal operations, resting on this resemblance, we say, "Cataline was the head of his party."

We shall now examine, why tropes and fig-

ures contribute to the beauty and grace of style. By them language is enriched, and made more copious. Hence words and phrases are multiplied for expressing all sorts of ideas; for describing even the smallest differences; the nicest shades and colors of thought; which by proper words alone cannot possibly be expressed. They also give dignity to style, which is degraded by the familiarity of common words. Figures have the same effect on language, that a rich and splendid apparel has on a person of rank and dignity. In prose compositions, assistance of this kind is often requisite; to poetry it is essential. To say, "the sun rises," is common and trite; but it becomes a magnificent image, as expressed by Thomson:

But yonder comes the powerful king of day;  
Rejoicing in the east. \_\_\_\_\_

Figures furnish the pleasure of enjoying two objects, presented at the same time to our view, without confusion; the principal idea together with its accessory, which gives it the figurative appearance. When, for example, instead of "youth," we say "the morning of life;" the fancy is instantly entertained with all the corresponding circumstances between these two objects. At the same instant we behold a certain period of human life, and a certain time of the day so connected, that the imagination plays between them with delight, and views at once two similar objects without embarrassment.

Figures are also attended with the additional advantage of giving us a more clear and stri-

king view of the principal object, than if it were expressed in simple terms, and freed from its accessory idea. (They exhibit the object, on which they are employed, in a picturesque form; they render an abstract conception in some degree an object of sense; they surround it with circumstances, which enable the mind to lay hold of it steadily, and to contemplate it fully.) By a well adapted figure, even conviction is assisted, and a truth is impressed upon the mind with additional liveliness and force. (Thus in the following passage of Dr. Young; "When we dip too deep in pleasure, we always stir a sediment, that renders it impure and noxious." When an image presents such a resemblance between a moral and a sensible idea, it serves, like an argument from analogy, to enforce what the author advances, and to induce belief.

All tropes being founded on the relation which one object bears to another; the name of the one may be substituted for that of the other; and by this the vivacity of the idea is generally increased. The relation between a cause and its effect, is one of the first and most obvious. Hence the cause is sometimes figuratively put for the effect. Thus Mr. Addison, writing of Italy, says.

Blossoms, and fruits, and flowers together rise,  
And the whole year in gay confusion lies.

Here the "whole year" is plainly meant to signify the productions of the year. The effect is also often put for the cause; as "grey hairs;" for "old age," which produces grey hairs; and "shade," for the "trees," which

cause the shade.) The relation between the container and the thing contained is so intimate and apparent, as naturally to give rise to tropes.

Ille inspiger hausit  
Spumantem pateram, et pleno se proloit auro:

Where it is obvious, that the cup and gold are put for the liquor, contained in the golden cup. The name of a country is often used to signify its inhabitants. To pray for the assistance of Heaven is the same with praying for the assistance of God, who is in heaven. The relation between a sign and the thing signified is another source of tropes. Thus,

Cedant arma togæ, concedat laurea linguæ :

Here the "togæ," which is the badge of the civil professions, and the "laurel," that of military honors, are each of them put for the civil and military characters themselves. Tropes, founded on these several relations of cause and effect, container and contained, sign and thing signified, are called by the name of metonymy.

When a trope is founded on the relation between an antecedent and its consequent, it is called a metalepsis; as in the Roman phrase, "fuit," or "vixit," to signify that one was dead. "Fuit Ilium et ingens gloria Teucrum," expresses that the glory of Troy is no more.

When the whole is put for a part, or a part for the whole; a genus for a species, or a species for a genus; the singular number for the plural, or the plural for the singular; in general, when any thing less, or any thing more, is put for the precise object meant; the figure is then termed a synecdoche. We say, for instance, "A fleet of so many sail," instead of so

many "ships;" we frequently use the "head" for the "person," the "pole" for the "earth," the "waves" for the "sea." An attribute is often used for its subject; as, "youth and beauty," for the "young and beautiful;" and sometimes a subject for its attribute. But the relation by far the most fruitful of tropes, is similitude, which is the sole foundation of metaphor.

### QUESTIONS.

1. How may figures be described?
2. Into how many classes may figures be divided?
3. What are figures of words called?
4. In what does a trope consist?
5. What are figures of thought?
6. From what are tropes derived?
7. How does the imagination contemplate objects?
8. Whence are we led to say a country flourishes, in time of prosperity, instead of finding words to express it literally?
9. Why do tropes and figures contribute to the beauty and grace of style?
10. To what is the effect on language produced by figures, compared?
11. To what kind of composition is this figurative language essential?
12. What are the two objects, the pleasure of which is furnished by figures without confusion and at the same time?
13. Between what two objects is the fancy entertained, in the expression—"Morning of youth?"
14. Why do figures give us a more clear and striking view of an object than we could have without them?
15. What example is there of this from Dr. Young?
16. Upon what are tropes founded?
17. Why is the cause frequently put for the effect and the effect for the cause?
18. What is an instance of the cause put for the effect?
19. What is an instance of the effect put for the cause?
20. What is another source of tropes?
21. On what are tropes, called metonymy, founded?
22. On what are tropes called metalepsis, founded?
23. When is a figure called synecdoche?

## METAPHOR.

**METAPHOR** is founded entirely on the resemblance which one object bears to another. It is therefore nearly allied to simile or comparison; and is, indeed, a comparison in an abridged form. When we say of a great minister, "He upholds the state, like a pillar, which supports the weight of an edifice," we evidently make a comparison; but, when we say of him, he is the "pillar of the state," it becomes a metaphor.

Of all the figures of speech, none approaches so near to painting as metaphor. It gives light and strength to description; makes intellectual ideas in some degree visible, by giving them color, substance and sensible qualities. To produce this effect, however, a delicate hand is requisite; for by a little inaccuracy we may introduce confusion, instead of promoting perspicuity. Several rules, therefore, must be given for the proper management of metaphors.

The first rule respecting metaphors is, they must be suited to the nature of the subject; neither too numerous, nor too gay, nor too elevated for it; we must neither attempt to force the subject by the use of them into a degree of elevation not congruous to it; nor on the contrary, suffer it to fall below its proper dignity. Some metaphors are beautiful in poetry, which would be unnatural in prose; some are graceful in orations, which would be highly improper in historical or philosophical composition. Figures are the dress of sentiment.

They should consequently be adapted to the ideas which they are intended to adorn.)

The second rule respects the choice of objects whence metaphors are to be drawn. The field for figurative language is very wide. All nature opens her stores, and allows us to collect them without restraint. But we must beware of using such allusions as raise in the mind disagreeable, mean, low, or dirty ideas. To render a metaphor perfect, it must not only be apt, but pleasing; it must entertain as well as enlighten. Dryden, therefore, can hardly escape the imputation of a very unpardonable breach of delicacy, when he observes to the Earl of Dorset, that "some bad poems carry their owner's marks about them; some brand or other on this *buttock*, or that *ear*; that it is notorious who are the owners of the cattle." The most pleasing metaphors are derived from the frequent occurrences of art and nature, or from the civil transactions and customs of mankind. Thus, how expressive, yet at the same time how familiar, is the image which Otway has put into the mouth of Metellus, in his play of Caius Marius, where he calls Sulpicius

That mad wild bull, whom Marius lets loose  
On each occasion; when he'd make Rome feel him,  
To toss our laws and liberties in the air.

In the third place, a metaphor should be founded on a resemblance which is clear and striking, not far fetched, nor difficult to be discovered. Harsh or forced metaphors are always displeasing, because they perplex the reader, and, instead of illustrating the thought, render it intricate and confused. Thus, for in-

stance, Cowley, speaking of his mistress, expresses himself in the following forced and obscure verses :

Wo to her stubborn heart ; if once mine come  
 Into the self same room,  
 'Twill tear and blow up all within,  
 Like a grenada shot into a magazine-  
 Then shall Love keep the ashes and torn parts  
 Of both our broken hearts ;  
 Shall out of both one new one make ;  
 From her's the alloy, from mine the metal take ;  
 For of her heart be from the flames will find  
 But little left behind ;  
 Mine only will remain entire ;  
 No dross was there to perish in the fire.

Metaphors borrowed from any of the sciences, especially from particular professions, are almost always faulty by their obscurity.

In the fourth place, we must never jumble metaphorical and plain language together; never construct a period so, that part of it must be understood metaphorically, part literally; which always produces confusion. The works of Ossian afford an instance of the fault we are now censuring. "Trothal went forth with the stream of his people; but they met a rock; for Fingal stood unmoved; broken, they rolled back from his side. Nor did they roll in safety; the spear of the king pursued their flight." The metaphor at the beginning is beautiful; the "stream," the "unmoved rock," the waves "rolling back broken," are expressions in the proper and consistent language of figure. But in the end, when we are told, "they did not roll in safety, because the spear of the king pursued their flight," the literal meaning is injudiciously mixed with the metaphor; they are at the same moment presented to us as waves that



roll, and as men that may be pursued and wounded by a spear.

In the fifth place, (take care not to make two different metaphors meet on the same object.) This, which is called mixed metaphor, is one of the grossest abuses of this figure. Shakspeare's expression, for example, "to take arms against a sea of troubles," makes a most unnatural medley, and entirely confounds the imagination. More correct writers than Shakspeare are sometimes guilty of this error. Mr. Addison says, "There is not a single view of human nature which is not sufficient to extinguish the seeds of pride." Here a *view* is made to *extinguish*, and to *extinguish seeds*.

In examining the propriety of metaphors, it is a good rule to form a picture of them, and to consider how the parts agree, and what kind of figure the whole presents, when delineated with a pencil.

Metaphors, in the sixth place, should not be crowded together on the same object. Though each of them be distinct, yet, if they be heaped on one another, they produce confusion. The following passage from Horace will exemplify this observation :

Morum ex Metello consule civicum,  
 Belique causas, et vitia, et modos,  
 Ludumque fortunæ, gravesque  
 Principum amicitias, et arma  
 Nondum expiatis uncta cruoribus,  
 Periculosæ plenum opus alexæ,  
 Tractas, et incedis per ignes  
 Suppositos cineri doloso.

This passage, though very poetical, is rendered harsh and obscure by three distinct metaphors crowded together. First, "*arma uncta cruoribus nondum expiatis*;" next "*opus plenum*

*periculosa alee;*" and then, "*incedis per ignes-  
suppositos cineri doloso.*"

The last rule concerning metaphors is, (they should not be too far pursued.) For, when the resemblance which is the foundation of the figure is long dwelt upon, and carried into all its minute circumstances, an allegory is produced; instead of a metaphor; the reader is wearied, and the discourse becomes obscure. This is termed straining a metaphor. Dr. Young, whose imagination was more distinguished by strength than delicacy, is often guilty of running down his metaphors. Speaking of old age, he says, it should

Walk thoughtful on the silent, solemn shore  
Of that vast ocean, it must sail so soon;  
And put good works on board; and wait the wind  
That shortly blows us into worlds unknown.

The two first lines are uncommonly beautiful; but when he continues the metaphor by "putting good works on board, and waiting the wind," it is strained, and sinks in dignity.

Having treated of metaphor, we shall conclude this chapter with a few words concerning Allegory.

An Allegory is a continued metaphor; as it is the representation of one thing by another that resembles it. Thus, Prior makes Emma describe her constancy to Henry in the following allegorical manner:

Did I but purpose to embark with thee  
On the smooth surface of a summer's sea,  
While gentle zephyrs play with prosperous gales,  
And fortune's favor fills the swelling sails;  
But would forsake the ship and make the shore,  
When the winds whistle, and the tempest roar?

The same rules that were given for metaphors may be applied to allegories, on account

of the affinity between them.) The only material difference beside the one being short and the other prolonged is, that a metaphor always explains itself by the words that are connected with it in their proper and literal meaning; as when we say, "Achilles was a lion;" "An able minister is the pillar of the state." Lion and pillar are here sufficiently interpreted by the mention of Achilles and the minister, which are joined to them. But an allegory may be allowed to stand less connected with the literal meaning; the interpretation not being so plainly pointed out, but left to our own reflection.

### QUESTIONS.

1. On what is metaphor founded?
2. What description of figures approaches nearest to painting?
3. What is the first rule respecting metaphors?
4. To what should figures be adapted?
5. What is the second rule respecting metaphors?
6. How may a metaphor be rendered perfect?
7. From what are the most pleasing metaphors derived?
8. What is the third rule respecting metaphors?
9. What is the fourth rule?
10. What is the fifth rule?
11. What is the sixth rule?
12. What is the seventh rule?
13. What is an allegory?
14. What rules may be given for the use of allegories?
15. What is the difference between a metaphor and an allegory?

### HYPERBOLE.

HYPERBOLE consists in magnifying an object beyond its natural bounds. This figure occurs very frequently in all languages, even in common conversation; "as swift as the wind," "as white as snow;" and our usual forms of

compliment are in general extravagant hyperboles. From habit, however, these exaggerated expressions are seldom considered as hyperbolic.

Hyperboles are of two kinds; (such as are employed in description, or such as are suggested by passion.) Those are far best which are (the effect of passion;) since it not only gives rise to the most daring figures, but often renders them just and natural. Hence the following passage in Milton, though extremely hyperbolic, contains nothing but what is natural and proper. It exhibits the mind of Satan agitated by rage and despair.

Me miserable ! which way shall I fly  
 Infinite wrath and infinite despair ?  
 Which way I fly is hell ; myself am hell ;  
 And in the lowest depth, a lower deep,  
 Still threat'ning to devour me, opens wide,  
 To which the hell I suffer seems a heaven.

(In simple description) hyperboles must be employed with more caution. (When an earthquake or storm is described, or when our imagination is carried into the midst of a battle) we can bear strong hyperboles without displeasure. But when only a woman in grief is presented to our view, it is impossible not to be disgusted with such exaggeration as the following, in one of our dramatic poets :

——— I found her on the floor  
 In all the storm of grief, yet beautiful ;  
 Pouring forth tears at such a lavish rate,  
 That, were the world on fire, they might have drown'd  
 The wrath of Heav'n, and quench'd the mighty ruin.

This is mere bombast. The person herself who labored under the distracting agitations of grief, might be permitted to express herself in strong hyperbole ; but the spectator who de-

scribes her, cannot be allowed equal liberty. The just boundary of this figure cannot be ascertained by any precise rule. Good sense and an accurate taste must ascertain the limit, beyond which, if it pass, it becomes extravagant.

### QUESTIONS.

1. Of what does hyperbole consist ?
2. How many kinds of hyperbole are there ?
3. What are they ?
4. Which is best ?
5. In what kind of description must hyperbole be used with great caution ?
6. When may strong hyperboles be used without displeasure ?
7. Can the just boundary of this figure be ascertained by any rule ?

## PERSONIFICATION AND APOSTRO- PHE.

WE proceed now to those figures which lie altogether in the thought, the words being taken in their common and literal sense. We shall begin with Personification, by which life and action are attributed to inanimate objects. All poetry, even in its most humble form, abounds in this figure. From prose it is far from being excluded; nay, even in common conversation frequent approaches are made to it. When we say, the earth *thirsts* for rain, or the fields *smile* with plenty; when ambition is said to be *restless*, or a disease to be *deceitful*; such expressions show the facility with which the mind can accommodate the properties of living creatures to things inanimate, or abstract conceptions.

There are three different degrees of this fig-

ore, which it is requisite to distinguish in order to determine the propriety of its use. (The first is when some of the properties of living creatures are ascribed to inanimate objects,) the second, (when these inanimate objects are described as acting like such as have life,) and the third, (when they are exhibited either as speaking to us, or as listening to what we say to them.)

The first and lowest degree of this figure, which consists in ascribing to inanimate objects some of the qualities of living creatures, raises the style so little, that (the humblest discourse) admits it without any force. Thus "a raging storm, a deceitful disease, a cruel disaster," are familiar expressions. This, indeed, is so obscure a degree of personification, that it might, perhaps, be properly classed with simple metaphors, which almost escape our observation.

The second degree of this figure is, when we represent inanimate objects acting like those that have life. Here we rise a step higher, and the personification becomes sensible. According to the nature of the action which we ascribe to those inanimate objects, and to the particularity with which we describe it, is the strength of the figure. When pursued to a considerable length, it belongs only to studied harangues; when slightly touched, it may be admitted into less elevated compositions. Cicero, for example, speaking of the cases where killing a man is lawful in self-defence, uses the following expressions: "*Aliquando nobis gladius ad occidendum hominem ab ipsis porrigitur legibus.*" Here the laws are beautifully person-

ified, as reaching forth their hand to give us a sword for putting a man to death.

In poetry personifications of this kind are extremely frequent, and are indeed the life and soul of it. In the descriptions of a poet who has a lively fancy, every thing is animated. Homer, the father of poetry, is remarkable for the use of this figure. War, peace, darts, rivers, every thing, in short, is alive in his writings. The same is true of Milton and Shakspeare. No personification is more striking, or introduced on a more proper occasion, than the following of Milton upon Eve's eating the forbidden fruit :

So saying, her rash hand in evil hour  
Forth reaching to the fruit, she pluck'd, she ate!  
Earth felt the wound ; and nature, from her seat,  
Sighing through all her works, gave signs of wo,  
That all was lost.

The third and highest degree of this figure is yet to be mentioned ; when inanimate objects are represented, not only as feeling and acting, but as speaking to us, or listening while we address them. This is the boldest of all rhetorical figures ; it is the style of strong passion only, and therefore should never be attempted, except when the mind is considerably heated and agitated. Milton affords a very beautiful example of this figure, in that moving and tender address which Eve makes to Paradise, immediately before she is compelled to leave it.

Oh, unexpected stroke, worse than of death !  
Must I thus leave thee, Paradise ? Thus leave  
Thee, native soil ; these happy walks and shades,  
Fit haunt of gods ! where I had hope to spend,  
Quiet though sad, the respite of that day  
Which must be mortal to us both ? O flowers !  
That never will in other climate grow ;  
My early visitation, and my last

At even; which I bred up with tender hand  
 From your first opening buds, and gave you names!  
 Who now shall rear you to the sun, or rank  
 Your tribes, and water from the ambrosial fount?

This is the real language of nature and of female passion.

In the management of this sort of personification (two rules) are to be observed. First, never attempt it unless prompted by strong passion, and never continue it when the passion begins to subside. The second rule is, never personify an object which has not some dignity in itself, and which is incapable of making a proper figure in the elevation to which we raise it. To address the body of a deceased friend is natural; but to address the clothes which he wore, introduces low and degrading ideas. So, likewise, addressing the several parts of the body, as if they were animated, is not agreeable to the dignity of passion. For this reason the following passage in Pope's *Eloisa to Abelard* is liable to censure:

Dear, fatal name! rest ever unreveal'd,  
 Nor pass these lips, in holy silence seal'd.  
 Hide it my heart, within that close disguise,  
 Where mix'd with God's his lov'd idea lies!  
 O write it not, my hand!—his name appears  
 Already written—blot it out, my tears.

Here the name of *Abelard* is first personified; which, as the name of a person often stands for the person himself, is exposed to no objection. Next, *Eloisa* personifies her own heart; and, as the heart is a dignified part of the human frame, and is often put for the mind, this also may pass without censure. But when she addresses her hand, and tells it not to write his name, this is forced and unnatural. Yet the figure becomes still worse when she exhorts



her tears to blot out what her hand had written. The two last lines are indeed altogether unsuitable to the tenderness which breathes through the rest of that inimitable poem.

APOSTROPHE is (an address to a real person, but one who is either absent or dead, as if he were present and listening to us.) This figure is in boldness a degree lower than (personification) since (it requires less effort of imagination to suppose persons present who are dead or absent, than to animate insensible beings, and direct our discourse to them.) The poems of Ossian abound in beautiful instances of this figure.—“Weep on the rocks of roaring winds, O maid of Inistore. Bend thy fair head over the waves, thou fairer than the ghost of the hills, when it moves in a sunbeam at noon over the silence of Morven. He is fallen! Thy youth is low; pale beneath the sword of Cuchullin.”

### QUESTIONS.

1. What is personification?
2. What kind of composition abounds in this figure?
3. What are instances of personification?
4. How many different degrees of hyperbole are there?
5. What is the first?
6. What is the second?
7. What is the third?
8. In what kind of discourse is the first degree of this figure used?
9. In what kind of composition may the second degree be used to advantage?
10. When may the third and highest of personification be attempted?
11. For the management of the third degree of personification, how many rules are there?
12. What is the first?
13. What is the second?
14. What is an apostrophe?
15. Which is the most bold, personification or apostrophe?
16. Why is apostrophe less bold?
17. What author abounds in apostrophe?

## COMPARISON, ANTITHESIS, INTERROGATION, EXCLAMATION, AND OTHER FIGURES OF SPEECH.

A COMPARISON or simile is, (when the resemblance between two objects is expressed in form, and usually pursued more fully than the nature of a metaphor admits.) As when we say, "The actions of princes are like those great rivers, the course of which every one beholds, but their springs have been seen by few." This short instance will show that a happy comparison is a sort of sparkling ornament, which adds lustre and beauty to discourse.

All comparisons may be reduced under (two heads, *explaining* and *embellishing*) comparisons. For when a writer compares an object with any other thing, it always is, or ought to be, with a view to make us understand that object more clearly, or to render it more pleasing. Even abstract reasoning admits explaining comparisons. For instance, the distinction between the powers of sense and imagination is in Mr. Harris's *Hermes*, illustrated by a simile: "As wax," says he, "would not be adequate to the purpose of signature, if it had not the power to retain as well as to receive the impression, the same holds of the soul with respect to sense and imagination. Sense is its receptive power, and imagination its retentive. Had it sense without imagination, it would not be as wax, but as water; where, though all impressions be instantly made, yet, as soon as they are made, they are lost." In comparisons of this kind,

perspicuity and usefulness are chiefly to be studied.

But *embellishing comparisons* are those which most frequently occur. Resemblance, it has been observed, is the foundation of this figure. Yet resemblance must not be taken in too strict a sense for actual similitude. Two objects may raise a train of concordant ideas in the mind, though they resemble each other, strictly speaking, in nothing. For example, to describe the nature of soft and melancholy music, Ossian says, "The music of Carryl was, like the memory of joys that are past, pleasant and mournful to the soul." This is happy and delicate; yet no kind of music bears any resemblance to the memory of past joys.

We shall now consider when comparisons may be introduced with propriety. Since they are the language of imagination rather than of passion, an author can hardly commit a greater fault, than in the midst of passion to introduce a simile. Our writers of tragedies often err in this respect. Thus, Addison in his *Cato* makes Portius, just after Lucia had bid him farewell forever, express himself in a studied comparison.

Thus o'er the dying lamp th' unsteady flame  
Hangs quiv'ring on a point, leaps off by fits,  
And falls again, as loth to quit its hold.  
Thou must not go; my soul still hovers o'er thee,  
And can't get loose.

As comparison is not the style of strong passion, so, when designed for embellishment, it is not the language of a mind totally unmoved. Being a figure of dignity, it always requires some elevation in the subject, to make it proper. It supposes the imagination to be enliven-

ed, though the heart is not agitated by passion. The language of simile lies in the middle region, between the highly pathetic and the very humble style. It is however, a sparkling ornament, and must consequently dazzle and fatigue, if it recur too often. (Similes, even in poetry, should be employed with moderation; but in prose much more so) otherwise the style will become disgustingly luscious, and the ornament lose its beauty and effect.

We shall now consider the nature of those objects from which comparisons should be drawn.

In the first place, (they must not be drawn from things which have too near and obvious a resemblance of the object with which they are compared.) The pleasure we receive from the act of comparing, arises from the discovery of likenesses among things of different species, where we should not at first sight expect a resemblance.)

But, in the second place, as comparisons ought not to be founded on likenesses too obvious, much less ought they to be founded on those which are too faint and distant. These, instead of assisting, strain the fancy to comprehend them, and throw no light upon the subject.

In the third place, the object from which a comparison is drawn ought never to be an unknown object, nor one of which few people can have a clear idea. Therefore similes, founded on philosophical discoveries or on any thing with which persons of a particular trade only, or a particular profession, are acquainted, pro-

duce not their proper effect. They should be drawn from those illustrious and noted objects which most readers have either seen, or can strongly conceive.

In the fourth place, in compositions of a serious or elevated kind, similes should never be drawn from low or mean objects. These degrade and vilify; whereas similes are generally intended to embellish and dignify. Therefore, except in burlesque writings, or where an object is meant to be degraded, mean ideas should never be presented.

ANTITHESIS is founded on the contrast or opposition of two objects. By contrast, objects opposed to each other appear in a stronger light. Beauty, for instance, never appears so charming as when contrasted with ugliness. Antithesis, therefore, may on many occasions be used advantageously to strengthen the impression which we propose that any object should make. Thus Cicero, in his oration for Milo, representing the improbability of Milo's designing to take away the life of Clodius, when every thing was unfavorable to such design, after he had omitted many opportunities of effecting such a purpose, heightens our conviction of this improbability by a skilful use of this figure.—“*Quem igitur cum omnium gratia interficere noluit, hunc voluet cum aliquorum querela? Quem jure, quem loco, quem tempore, quem impune, non est ausus; hunc injuria, iniquo loco, alieno tempore, periculo capitis, non dubitavit occidere?*” Here the antithesis is rendered complete, by the words and members of the sentence, expressing the contrasted objects, being

similarly constructed, and made to correspond with each other.

We must, however, acknowledge that frequent use of antithesis, especially where the opposition in the words is nice and quaint, is apt to make style unpleasing. A maxim or moral saying very properly receives this form; because it is supposed to be the effect of meditation, and is designed to be engraven on the memory, which recalls it more easily by the aid of contrasted expressions. But where several such sentences succeed each other, where this is an author's favorite and prevailing mode of expression, his style is exposed to censure.

INTERROGATIONS and EXCLAMATIONS are passionate figures. The literal use of interrogation is to ask a question; but when men are prompted by passion, whatever they would affirm or deny with great earnestness, they naturally put in the form of a question; expressing thereby the firmest confidence of the truth of their own opinion, and appealing to their hearers for the impossibility of the contrary. Thus, in Scripture, "God is not a man that he should lie, nor the son of man that he should repent. Hath he said it? and shall he not do it? Hath he spoken it? and shall he not make it good?"

Interrogations may be employed in the prosecution of close and earnest reasonings; but exclamations belong only to stronger emotions of the mind; to surprise, anger, joy, grief, and the like. These being natural signs of a moved and agitated mind, always, when properly employed, make us sympathize with those

who use them, and enter into their feelings. Nothing, however, has a worse effect than frequent and unseasonable use of exclamations. Young, inexperienced writers suppose that, by pouring them forth plenteously, they render their compositions warm and animated. But the contrary follows; they render them frigid to excess. When an author is always calling upon us to enter into transports, which he has said nothing to inspire, he excites our disgust and indignation.

Another figure of speech, fit only for animated composition, is called VISION; when, instead of relating something that is past, we use the present tense, and describe it as if passing before our eyes. Thus Cicero, in his fourth oration against Cataline: "*Videor enim mihi hanc urbem videre, lucem orbis terrarum atque arcem omnium gentium, subito uno incendio concidentem; cerno animo sepulta in patria miseros atque insepultos acervos civium; versatur mihi ante oculos aspectus Cethegi, et furor, in vestra cæde bacchantis.*" This figure has great force when it is well executed, and when it flows from genuine enthusiasm. Otherwise, it shares, the same fate with all feeble attempts toward passionate figures; that of throwing ridicule upon the author, and leaving the reader more cool and uninterested than he was before.

The last figure which we shall mention, and which is of frequent use among all public speakers, is CLIMAX. It consists in an artful exaggeration of all the circumstances of some object or action which we wish to place in a strong light. It operates by a gradual rise of one cir.

cumstance above another, till our idea is raised to the highest pitch. We shall give an instance of this figure from a printed pleading of a celebrated lawyer in a charge to the jury, in the case of a woman who was accused of murdering her own child. "Gentlemen, if one man had any how slain another, if an adversary had killed his opposer, or a woman occasioned the death of her enemy; even these criminals would have been capitally punished by the Cornelian law. But if this guiltless infant, who could make no enemy, had been murdered by its own nurse, what punishment would not the mother have demanded? With what cries and exclamations would she have stunned your ears? What shall we say, then, when a woman, guilty of homicide; a mother, of the murder of her innocent child; hath comprised all those misdeeds in one single crime: a crime, in its own nature, detestable; in a woman, prodigious; in a mother, incredible; and perpetrated against one whose age called for compassion; whose near relation claimed affection; and whose innocence deserved the highest favor?" Such regular climaxes, however, though they have great beauty, yet at the same time have the appearance of art and study; and therefore, though they may be admitted into formal harangues, yet they are not the language of passion, which seldom proceeds by steps so regular.

### QUESTIONS.

1. What is *comparison*?
2. Under how many *heads* may *comparison* be *reduced*?
3. What are they called?
4. Which kind occur *most frequently*?



5. When may comparisons be *introduced* with propriety?—(They cannot be *employed* in the midst of passion.) 6. How should *similes* be *employed*? 7. From what objects, in the first place, *must* not comparisons be drawn? 8. From what does the *pleasure* arise, which we receive from the act of comparing? 9. From what objects, in the *second* place, *must* not comparisons be drawn? 10. From what in the *third* place? 11. From what in the *fourth* place? 12. On what is *antithesis* founded? 13. Is a *frequent* use of antithesis pleasing? 14. What is the *literal* use of interrogations? 15. To what do exclamations *belong*? 16. What is the effect of exclamations *properly* employed? 17. What is the effect of an *unreasonable* use of them? 18. What is another figure of speech, *fit only* for animated composition? 19. What is *climax*? 20. What is said of *regular climaxes* generally?



GENERAL CHARACTERS OF STYLE. DIFFUSE, CONCISE, FEEBLE, NERVOUS, DRY, PLAIN, NEAT, ELEGANT, FLOWERY.

THAT different subjects ought to be treated in different kinds of style, is a position so obvious that it requires no illustration. Every one knows that treatises of philosophy should not be composed in the same style with orations. It is equally apparent, that different parts of the same composition require a variation in the style. Yet amid this variety, we still expect to find in the compositions of any one man some degree of uniformity in manner; we expect to find some prevailing character of style impressed on all his writings, which will mark his pecu-

liar genius and turn of mind. The orations in Livy differ considerably in style, as they ought to do, from the rest of his history. The same may be observed in those of Tacitus. Yet in the orations of both these historians, the distinguished manner of each may be clearly traced; the splendid fulness of the one, and the sententious brevity of the other. Wherever there is real genius, it prompts to one kind of style rather than to another. Where this is wanting; where there is no marked nor peculiar character in the compositions of an author; we are apt to conclude, and not without cause, that he is a vulgar and trivial author, who writes from imitation, and not from the impulse of genius.

One of the first and most obvious distinctions in style arises from an author's expanding his thoughts more or less. This distinction forms what are termed (the diffuse and concise styles.) A concise writer compresses his ideas into the fewest words; he employs none but the most expressive; he lops off all those which are not a material addition to the sense. Whatever ornament he admits, is adopted for the sake of force, rather than of grace. The same thought is never repeated. The utmost precision is studied in his sentences; and they are generally designed to suggest more to the reader's imagination than they express.

A diffuse writer unfolds his idea fully. He places it in a variety of lights, and gives the reader every possible assistance for understanding it completely. He is not very anxious to express it at first in its full strength, because he

intends repeating the impression ; and what he wants in strength he endeavors to supply by copiousness. His periods naturally flow into some length ; and, having room for ornament of every kind, he gives it free admittance.

Each of these styles has its peculiar advantages ; and each becomes faulty, when carried to the extreme. Of conciseness, carried as far as propriety will allow, perhaps in some cases farther, Tacitus, the historian, and Montesquieu, in "*l'Esprit de Loix*," are remarkable examples. Of a beautiful and magnificent diffuseness, Cicero is undoubtedly the noblest instance which can be given. Addison, also, and Sir William Temple, may be ranked in the same class.

In determining when to adopt the concise, and when the diffuse manner, we must be guided by the nature of the composition. (Discourses that are to be spoken, require a more diffuse style than books which are to be read.) In written compositions, a proper degree of conciseness has great advantages. (It is more lively, keeps up attention, makes a stronger impression on the mind, and gratifies the reader, by supplying more exercise to his thoughts.) Description, when we wish to have it vivid and animated, should be concise. Any redundant words or circumstances encumber the fancy, and render the object we present to it confused and indistinct. The strength and vivacity of description, whether in prose or poetry, depend much more upon a happy choice of one or two important circumstances, than upon the multiplication of them. When we desire to strike the fancy, or to move

the heart, we should be (concise) when to inform the understanding, which is more deliberate in its motions, and wants the assistance of a guide, (it is better to be full.) Historical narration may be beautiful either in a concise or diffuse manner, according to the author's genius. Livy and Herodotus are diffuse; Thucydides and Sallust are concise; yet they are all agreeable.

The nervous and the feeble are generally considered as characters of style of the same import with the concise and the diffuse. Indeed they frequently coincide; yet this does not always hold; since there are instances of writers, who in the midst of a full and ample style, have maintained a considerable degree of strength. Livy is an instance of the truth of this observation. The foundation of a nervous or weak style is laid in an author's manner of thinking. If he conceive an object strongly, he will express it with energy; but if he have an indistinct view of his subject, it will clearly appear in his style. Unmeaning words and loose epithets will escape him; his expressions will be vague and general; his arrangements indistinct; and our conception of his meaning will be faint and confused. But a nervous writer, be his style concise or extended, gives us always a strong idea of his meaning. His mind being full of his subject, his words are always expressive; every phrase and every figure renders the picture which he would set before us, more striking and complete.

It must however, be observed, that too great study of strength is apt to betray writers into a harsh manner. Harshness proceeds (from un-

common words, from forced inversions in the construction of a sentence, and from neglect of smoothness and ease.) This is reckoned the fault of some of our earliest classics; such as Sir Walter Raleigh, Sir Francis Bacon, Hooker, Harrington, Cudworth, and other writers of considerable reputation in the days of Queen Elizabeth, James I. and Charles I. These writers had nerve and strength in a high degree; and are to this day distinguished by this quality in style. But the language in their hands was very different from what it is now, and was indeed entirely formed upon the idiom and construction of the Latin in the arrangement of sentences. The present form of our language has in some degree sacrificed the study of strength to that of ease and perspicuity. Our arrangement is less forcible, but more plain and natural; and this is now considered as the genius of our tongue.

Hitherto style has been considered under those characters which regard its expressiveness of an author's meaning. We shall now consider it with respect to the degree of ornament employed to embellish it. Here the style of different authors seems to rise in the following gradation; a dry, a plain, a neat, an elegant, a flowery manner.

A dry manner excludes every kind of ornament. Content with being understood, it aims not to please either the fancy or the ear. This is tolerable only in a pure didactic writing; and even there, to make us bear it, great solidity of matter and entire perspicuity of language are required.

A plain style (rises one degree above a dry one. A writer of this character employs very little ornament of any kind, and rests almost entirely upon his sense. But though he does not engage us by the arts of composition, he avoids disgusting us, like a dry and harsh writer.) Beside perspicuity, he observes propriety, purity and precision in his language, which form no inconsiderable degree of beauty. Liveliness and force are also compatible with a plain style; and therefore such an author, if his sentiments be good, may be sufficiently agreeable. The difference between a dry and a plain writer is this: the former is incapable of ornament; the latter goes not in pursuit of it. Of those who have employed a plain style, Dean Swift is an eminent example.

A neat style is next in order; and (here we are advanced into the region of ornament; but not of the most sparkling kind. (A writer of this character shows, by his attention to the choice of words, and to their graceful collocation, that he does not despise the beauty of language.) His sentences are always free from the incumbrance of superfluous words; of a moderate length; inclining rather to brevity, than a swelling structure; and closing with propriety. There is variety in his cadence, but no appearance of studied harmony. His figures, if he use any, are short and accurate, rather than bold and glowing. Such a style may be attained by a writer, whose powers of fancy or genius are not great, by industry and attention. This sort of style is not unsuitable to any subject whatever. A familiar epistle, or a law

paper on the driest subject, may be written with neatness; and a sermon, or a philosophical treatise, in a neat style, is read with satisfaction.

An elegant style implies a higher degree of ornament than a neat one; possessing all the virtues of ornament, without any of its excesses or defects. Complete elegance implies great perspicuity and propriety; purity in the choice of words; and care and skill in their arrangement. It implies, farther, the beauties of imagination spread over style as far as the subject permits; and all the illustration which figurative language adds, when properly employed. An elegant writer, in short, is one who delights the fancy and the ear, while he informs the understanding; who clothes his ideas in all the beauty of expression, but does not overload them with any of its misplaced finery.

A florid style implies excess of ornament. In a young composer it is not only pardonable, but often a promising symptom. But although it may be allowed to youth in their first essays, it must not receive the same indulgence from writers of more experience. In them, judgment should chasten imagination, and reject every ornament which is unsuitable or redundant. That tinsel splendor of language which some writers perpetually affect, is truly contemptible. With such, it is a luxuriancy of words, not of fancy. They forget that, unless founded on good sense and solid thought, the most florid style is but a childish imposition on the public.

## QUESTIONS.

1. Do different subjects admit of the same kind of style? 2. From what does *one* of the *first* and most *obvious* distinctions of style arise? 3. What is this *distinction* termed? 4. What is the character of a *concise* writer? 5. How does a *diffuse* writer communicate his ideas? 6. When do these two kinds of style become *faulty*? 7. How must we be *guided* in determining when to adopt the *concise* and when the *diffuse* style? 8. Which require the most *diffuse* style, discourses to be *spoken*, or those to be *read*? 9. What are the advantages of a *proper degree* of conciseness in written composition? 10. When should *descriptions* be *concise*? 11. How should style be, when the object is to *strike* the *fancy* or move the heart? 12. How should it be, when it is to *inform* the *understanding*? 13. What is the effect of *too great* study of strength? 14. From what does *harshness* proceed? 15. How was the *language* of the early classic authors *formed*? 16. What are the different kinds of style considered as to *ornament*? 17. What is a *dry* style? 18. What is a *plain* style? 19. What is a *neat* style? 20. How may a neat style be *attained*? 21. What is an *elegant* style? 22. What is a *florid* style? 23. By whom may a florid style with propriety be used?

STYLE. SIMPLE, AFFECTED, VENERABLE. DIRECTIONS FOR FORMING A PROPER STYLE.

SIMPLICITY, applied to writing, is a term very commonly used; but, like many other critical terms, often used without precision. The different meanings of the word simplicity are the chief cause of this inaccuracy. It is



Therefore necessary to show, in what sense simplicity is a proper attribute of style. There are (four) different acceptations, in which this term is taken.

The first is simplicity of composition, as opposed to too great a variety of parts. This is the simplicity of plan in tragedy, as distinguished from double plots and crowded incidents; the simplicity of the *Iliad* in opposition to the digressions of Lucan; the simplicity of Grecian architecture in opposition to the irregular variety of the Gothic. Simplicity in this sense is the same with unity.

The second sense is simplicity of thought in opposition to refinement. Simple thoughts are (those which flow naturally; which are suggested by the subject or occasion; and which, when once suggested, are easily understood by all.) Refinement in writing means a less obvious and natural train of thought, which, when carried too far, approaches to intricacy, and displeases us by the appearance of being far sought.) Thus Parnell is a poet of much greater simplicity in his turn of thought than Cowley. In these two senses simplicity has no relation to style.

The third sense of simplicity regards style, and is opposed to too much ornament, or pomp of language. Thus we say Mr. Locke is a simple, Mr. Hervey a florid writer. A simple style, in this sense, coincides with a plain or neat style.

The fourth sense of simplicity also respects style; but it regards not so much the degree of ornament employed, as the easy and natural

manner, in which our language expresses our thoughts. In this sense simplicity is compatible with the highest ornament. Homer, for example, possesses this simplicity in the greatest perfection; and yet no writer has more ornament and beauty. This simplicity is opposed not to ornament, but to affectation of ornament; and is a superior excellence in composition.

A simple writer has no marks of art in his expression; it appears the very language of nature. We see not the writer and his labour, but the man in his own natural character. He may be rich in expression; he may be full of figures and of fancy; but these flow from him without effort; and he seems to write in this manner, not because he had studied it, but because it is the mode of expression most natural to him. With this character of style a certain degree of negligence is not inconsistent; for too accurate an attention to words is foreign to it. Simplicity of style, like simplicity of manners, shows a man's sentiments and turn of mind without disguise. A more studied and artificial mode of writing, however beautiful, has always this disadvantage, that it exhibits an author in form, like a man at court, where splendor of dress and the ceremonial of behavior conceal those peculiarities, which distinguish one man from another. But reading an author of simplicity is like conversing with a person of rank at home and with ease, where we see his natural manners and his real character.

With regard to simplicity in general, we may observe, that the ancient original writers are always most eminent for it. (This proceeds

from a very obvious cause; they wrote from the dictates of genius, and were not formed upon the labours and writings of others.

Of affectation, which is opposed to simplicity of style, we have a remarkable example in Lord Shaftesbury. Though an author of considerable merit, he expresses nothing with simplicity. He seems to have thought it vulgar and beneath the dignity of a man of quality to speak like other men. Hence he is ever in buskins; full of circumlocutions and artificial elegance. In every sentence we see marks of labour and art; nothing of that ease which expresses a sentiment coming natural and warm from the heart. He abounds with figures and ornament of every kind; is sometimes happy in them; but his fondness for them is too visible; and, having once seized some metaphor or allusion, that pleased him, he knows not how to part with it. He possessed delicacy and refinement of taste in a degree that may be called excessive and sickly; but he had little warmth of passion; and the coldness of his character suggested that artificial and stately manner, which appears in his writings. No author is more dangerous to the tribe of imitators than Shaftesbury; who amid several very considerable blemishes, has many dazzling and imposing beauties.

It is very possible, however, for an author to write with simplicity, and yet without beauty. He may be free from affectation, and not have merit. Beautiful simplicity supposes an author to possess real genius, and to write with solidity,

purity, and brilliancy of imagination.) In this case, the simplicity of his manner is the crowning ornament; it heightens every other beauty; it is the dress of nature, without which all beauties are imperfect. (But, if mere absence of affectation were sufficient to constitute beauty of style, weak and dull writers might often lay claim to it.) A distinction therefore must be made between that simplicity which accompanies true genius and is entirely compatible with every proper ornament of style; and that which is the effect of carelessness.

Another character of style, different from those already mentioned, is (vehemence.) This always implies strength; and is not in any respect incompatible with simplicity. It is distinguished by a peculiar ardor; it is the language of a man, whose imagination and passions are glowing and impetuous; who, neglecting inferior graces, pours himself forth with the rapidity and fulness of a torrent. This belongs to the higher kinds of oratory; and is rather expected from a man who is speaking, than from one who is writing in his closet. Demosthenes is the most full and perfect example of this kind of style.

Having explained the different characters of style, we shall conclude our observations with a few directions for attaining a good style in general.

The first direction is, study clear ideas of the subject, on which you are to write or speak. What we conceive clearly and feel strongly, we naturally express with clearness and strength. We should therefore think closely on the sub-

ject, till we have attained a full and distinct view of the matter which we are to clothe in words; till we become warm and interested in it; then, and then only shall we find expression begin to flow.

Secondly, (to the acquisition of a good style, frequency of composing is indispensably necessary.) But it (is not) every kind of composing that will improve style. By a careless and hasty habit of writing, a bad style will be acquired; more trouble will afterwards be necessary to unlearn faults, than to become acquainted with the rudiments of composition. In the beginning, therefore, we ought to write slowly and with much care. Facility and speed are the fruit of practice. We must be cautious, however, not to retard the course of thought, nor cool the ardor of imagination, by pausing too long on every word. On certain occasions a glow of composition must be kept up, if we hope to express ourselves happily, though at the expense of some inaccuracies. A more severe examination must be the work of correction. What we have written should be laid by some time, till the ardor of composition be past; till partiality for our expressions be weakened, and the expressions themselves be forgotten; and then, reviewing our work with a cool and critical eye as if it were the performance of another, we shall discover many imperfections which at first escaped us.

Thirdly, acquaintance with the style of the best authors is peculiarly requisite. Hence a just taste will be formed, and a copious fund of words supplied on every subject. No exercise

perhaps will be found more useful for acquiring a proper style, than translating some passage from an eminent author into our own words. Thus to take, for instance, a page of one of Addison's Spectators, and read it attentively two or three times, till we are in full possession of the thoughts it contains; then to lay aside the book; to endeavor to write out the passage from memory as well as we can; and then to compare what we have written with the style of the author. Such an exercise will shew us our defects; will teach us to correct them; and from the variety of expression which it will exhibit, will conduct us to that which is most beautiful.

Fourthly, caution must be used against servile imitation of any author whatever. Desire of imitating hampers genius, and generally produces stiffness of expression. They, who follow an author closely, commonly copy his faults as well as his beauties. No one will ever become a good writer or speaker, who has not some confidence in his own genius. We ought carefully to avoid using any author's peculiar phrases, and of transcribing passages from him. Such a habit will be fatal to all genuine composition. It is much better to have something of our own, though of moderate beauty, than to shine in borrowed ornaments, which will at last betray the poverty of our genius.

Fifthly, always adapt your style to the subject, and likewise to the capacity of your hearers, if you are to speak in public. To attempt a poetical style, when it should be our business only to reason, is in the highest degree awk-

ward and absurd. To speak with elaborate pomp of words before those who cannot comprehend them, is equally ridiculous. When we are to write or speak, we should previously fix in our minds a clear idea of the end aimed at; keep this steadily in view, and adapt our style to it.

Lastly (let not attention to style engross us so much, as to prevent a higher degree of attention to the thoughts.) This rule is more necessary, since the present taste of the age is directed more to style than to thought. It is much more easy to dress up trifling and common thoughts with some beauty of expression, than to afford a fund of vigorous, ingenious, and useful sentiments. The latter requires genius; the former may be attained by industry. Hence the crowd of writers who are rich in style, but poor in sentiment. Custom obliges us to be attentive to the ornaments of style, if we wish our labours to be read and admired. But he is a contemptible writer, who looks not beyond the dress of language; who lays not the chief stress upon his matter, and employs not such ornaments of style to recommend it, as are manly, not foppish.

### QUESTIONS.

1. Is the term simplicity, as applied to style, always used with *precision*?
2. What is the chief cause of *inaccuracy* in the use of it?
3. In how many *different acceptations* is the term taken, when applied to style?
4. What is the *first*?
5. What is the *second*?
6. What are *simple thoughts*, rhetorically considered?
7. What is to be understood by *refinement* in writing?
8. In these *two senses* has simplicity

any relation to style? 9. What is the *third* acceptance of simplicity, as applied to style? 10. What is the *fourth sense* of simplicity? 11. What characterises a *simple* writer? 12. What may be observed of *simplicity* in *general*? 13. From what does the simplicity of *ancient authors* proceed? 14. What author is remarkable for *affectation*, in opposition to simplicity of style? 15. May one write with *simplicity* and yet with *beauty*? 16. What does *beautiful simplicity* suppose? 17. Does the mere *absence* of affectation constitute beauty of style? 18. What is *another character* of style? 19. What does *vehemence* *always imply*? 20. How is it always distinguished? 21. To what does this style *belong*? 22. What is the *first direction* for attaining a good style? 23. What is necessary that we express ourselves naturally with *clearness* and *strength*? 24. What is the *second direction* for attaining a good style generally? 25. Will *every kind* of composing improve style? 26. How ought we to *write*, at first? 27. From what will *facility* and *speed* in composing proceed? 28. What effect may *pausing* too long on every word have? 29. How should we correct what we *have written*? 30. What is necessary in the *third place* for the attainment of a good style? 31. What will be the use of an acquaintance with good authors? 32. What exercise would be serviceable with them? 33. What is the *fourth direction*? 34. Why is the *imitation* of an author injurious? 35. What is the *fifth direction*? 36. What is the last?



## CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF MR. ADDISON'S STYLE IN NO. 411 OF THE SPECTATOR.

HAVING fully insisted on the subject of language, we shall now commence a critical anal-



ysis of the style of some good author. This will suggest observations, which we have not hitherto had occasion to make, and will show in a practical light the use of those which have been made.

Mr. Addison, though one of the most beautiful writers in our language, is not the most correct; a circumstance which makes his composition a proper subject of criticism. We proceed therefore to examine No. 411, the first of his celebrated essays on the pleasures of the imagination, in the sixth volume of the Spectator. It begins thus:

*Our sight is the most perfect, and most delightful of all our senses.*

This sentence is clear, precise, and simple. The author in a few plain words lays down the proposition, which he is going to illustrate. A first sentence should seldom be long, and never intricate.

He might have said, *our sight is the most perfect and the most delightful.* But in omitting to repeat the particle *the*, he has been more judicious; for, as between *perfect* and *delightful* there is no contrast, such a repetition is unnecessary. He proceeds:

*It fills the mind with the largest variety of ideas, converses with its objects at the greatest distance, and continues the longest in action, without being tired or satiated with its proper enjoyments.*

This sentence is remarkably harmonious, and well constructed. It is entirely perspicuous. It is loaded with no unnecessary words. That quality of a good sentence, which we termed its unity, is here perfectly preserved. The

members of it also grow, and rise above each other in sound, till R is conducted to one of the most harmonious closes which our language admits. It is moreover figurative without being too much so for the subject. There is no fault in it whatever, except this, the epithet *large*, which he applies to *variety*, is more commonly applied to extent than to number. It is plain however, that he employed it to avoid the word *great*, which occurs immediately afterward.

*The sense of feeling can, indeed, give us a notion of extension, shape, and all other ideas that enter at the eye, except colors; but, at the same time, it is very much straitened and confined in its operations, to the number, bulk, and distance of its particular objects.* But is not every sense confined as much as the sense of feeling, to the number, bulk, and distance of its own objects? The turn of expression is also very inaccurate, requiring the two words *with regard*, to be inserted after the word *operations*, in order to make the sense clear and intelligible. The epithet *particular* seems to be used instead of *peculiar*; but these words, though often confounded, are of very different import. *Particular* is opposed to *general*; *peculiar* stands opposed to what is possessed in common with others.

*Our sight seems designed to supply all these defects, and may be considered as a more delicate and diffusive kind of touch, that spreads itself over an infinite multitude of bodies, comprehends the largest figures, and brings into our reach some of the most remote parts of the universe.*

This sentence is perspicuous, graceful, well arranged, and highly musical. Its construction-

is so similar to that of the second sentence, that, had it immediately succeeded it, the ear would have been sensible of a faulty monotony. But the interposition of a period prevents this effect.

*It is this sense which furnishes the imagination with its ideas ; so that, by the pleasures of the imagination or fancy (which I shall use promiscuously) I here mean such as arise from visible objects, either when we have them actually in our view, or when we call up their ideas into our minds by paintings, statues, descriptions, or any the like occasion.*

The parenthesis in the middle of this sentence is not clear. It should have been, *terms which I shall use promiscuously ;* since the verb *use* does not relate to the pleasures of the imagination, but to the terms, *fancy* and *imagination*, which were meant to be synonymous. To call a painting or a statue an *occasion* is not accurate ; nor is it very proper to speak of *calling up ideas by occasions*. The common phrase, *any such means*, would have been more natural.

*We cannot indeed have a single image in the fancy, that did not make its first entrance through the sight ; but we have the power of retaining, altering, and compounding those images which we have once received, into all the varieties of picture and vision, that are most agreeable to the imagination ; for, by this faculty, a man in a dungeon is capable of entertaining himself with scenes and landscapes more beautiful than any that can be found in the whole compass of nature.*

In one member of this sentence there is an inaccuracy in syntax. It is proper to say, *alter-*

*ing and compounding those images which we have once received, into all the varieties of picture and vision. But we cannot with propriety say, retaining them into all the varieties ; yet the arrangement requires this construction. This error might have been avoided by arranging the passage in the following manner: "We have the power of retaining those images which we have once received ; and of altering and compounding them into all the varieties of picture and vision."* The latter part of the sentence is clear and elegant.

*There are few words in the English language, which are employed in a more loose and uncircumscribed sense than those of the fancy and the imagination.*

Except when some assertion of consequence is advanced, these little words *it is* and *there are*, ought to be avoided, as redundant and enfeebling. The two first words of this sentence therefore should have been omitted. The article prefixed to *fancy and imagination* ought also to have been omitted, since he does not mean the powers of *the fancy and the imagination*, but the words only. The sentence should have run thus: "Few words in the English language are employed in a more loose and uncircumscribed sense than *fancy and imagination*."

*I therefore thought it necessary to fix and determine the notion of these two words, as I intend to make use of them in the thread of my following speculations, that the reader may conceive rightly what is the subject which I proceed upon.*

The words *fix* and *determine*, though they may appear so, are not synonymous. We *fix*,

what is loose; we determine; what is uncircumscribed. They may be viewed, therefore, as applied here with peculiar delicacy. The notion of these words is rather harsh, and is not so commonly used, as the meaning of these words. As I intend to make use of them in the thread of my speculations, is evidently faulty. A sort of metaphor is improperly mixed with words in their literal sense. The subject which I proceed upon, is an ungraceful close of a sentence; it should have been, the subject upon which I proceed.

I must therefore desire him to remember, that, by the pleasures of imagination, I mean only such pleasures as arise originally from sight, and that I divide these pleasures into two kinds.

This sentence begins in a manner too similar to the preceding. I mean only such pleasures—the adverb *only* is not in its proper place. It is not intended here to qualify the verb *mean*, but *such pleasures*; and ought therefore to be placed immediately after the latter.

My design being, first of all, to discourse of those primary pleasures of the imagination, which entirely proceed from such objects as are before our eyes; and, in the next place, to speak of those secondary pleasures of the imagination, which flow from the ideas of visible objects, when the objects are not actually before the eye, but are called up into our memories, or formed into agreeable visions of things, that are either absent or fictitious.

Neatness and brevity are peculiarly requisite in the division of a subject. This sentence is somewhat clogged by a tedious phraseology. My design being, first of all to discourse—in the

next place to speak of—such objects as are before our eyes—things that are either absent or fictitious. Several words might have been omitted, and the style made more neat and compact.

*The pleasures of the imagination, taken in their full extent, are not so gross as those of sense, nor so refined as those of the understanding.*

'This sentence is clear and elegant.

*The last are indeed more preferable, because they are founded on some new knowledge or improvement in the mind of man; yet it must be confessed, that those of the imagination are as great and as transporting as the other.*

The phrase, *more preferable*, is so palpable an inaccuracy, that we wonder how it could escape the observation of Mr. Addison. The proposition, contained in the last member of this sentence, is neither clearly nor elegantly expressed. *It must be confessed, that those of the imagination are as great and as transporting as the other.* In the beginning of this sentence he had called the pleasures of the understanding *the last*; and he concludes with observing, that those of the imagination are as great and transporting as *the other*. Beside that *the other* makes not a proper contrast with *the last*, it is left doubtful whether by *the other* are meant the pleasures of the understanding, or the pleasures of sense; though without doubt it was intended to refer to the pleasures of the understanding only.

*A beautiful prospect delights the soul as much as a demonstration; and a description in Homer has charmed more readers than a chapter in Aristotle.*

This is a good illustration of what he had been asserting, and is expressed with that elegance, by which Mr. Addison is distinguished.

*Besides, the pleasures of the imagination have this advantage above those of the understanding, that they are more obvious, and more easy to be acquired.*

This sentence is unexceptionable.

*It is but opening the eye, and the scene enters.*

Though this is lively and picturesque, yet we must remark a small inaccuracy. A scene cannot be said to enter; an actor enters; but a scene appears or presents itself.

*The colors paint themselves on the fancy, with very little attention of thought or application of mind in the beholder.*

This is beautiful and elegant, and well suited to those pleasures of the imagination of which the author is treating.

*We are struck, we know not how, with the symmetry of any thing we see; and immediately assent to the beauty of an object without inquiring into the particular causes and occasions of it.*

We assent to the truth of a proposition; but cannot with propriety be said to assent to the beauty of an object. In the conclusion, particular, and occasions are superfluous words, and the pronoun it is in some measure ambiguous.

*A man of a polite imagination is led into a great many pleasures that the vulgar are not capable of receiving.*

The term *polite* is oftener applied to manners, than to the imagination. The use of *that* instead of *which* is too common with Mr. Addison. Except in cases, where it is necessary to

avoid repetition, which is preferable to that, and is undoubtedly so in the present instance.

*He can converse with a picture, and find an agreeable companion in a statue. He meets with a secret refreshment in a description; and often feels a greater satisfaction in the prospect of fields and meadows, than another does in the possession. It gives him, indeed, a kind of property in every thing he sees; and makes the most rude uncultivated parts of nature administer to his pleasures; so that he looks upon the world, as it were, in another light, and discovers in it a multitude of charms that conceal themselves from the generality of mankind.*

This sentence is easy, flowing, and harmonious. We must, however, observe a slight inaccuracy. *It gives him a kind of property*—to this it there is no antecedent in the whole paragraph. To discover its connection, we must look back to the third sentence preceding, which begins with *a man of polite imagination*. This phrase, *polite imagination*, is the only antecedent to which it can refer; and even this is not a proper antecedent, since it stands in the genitive case of the qualifications only of a man.

*There are, indeed, but very few who know how to be idle and innocent, or have a relish of any pleasures that are not criminal; every diversion they take, is at the expense of some one virtue or another; and their very first step out of business is into vice or folly.*

This sentence is truly elegant, musical and correct.

*A man should endeavor, therefore, to make the sphere of his innocent pleasures as wide as possible,*



that he may retire into them with safety, and find in them such a satisfaction as a wise man would not blush to take.

This also is a good sentence and exposed to no objection.

*Of this nature are those of the imagination, which do not require such a bent of thought as is necessary to our more serious employments: nor, at the same time, suffer the mind to sink into that indolence and remissness, which are apt to accompany our more sensual delights; but, like a gentle exercise to the faculties, awaken them from sloth and idleness without putting them upon any labor or difficulty.*

The beginning of this sentence is incorrect. *Of this nature, says he, are those of the imagination.* It might be asked, of what nature? For the preceding sentence had not described the nature of any class of pleasures. He had said that it was every man's duty to make the sphere of his innocent pleasures as extensive as possible, that within this sphere he might find a safe retreat and laudable satisfaction. The transition therefore is loosely made. It would have been better, if he had said, "this advantage we gain," or "this satisfaction we enjoy," by means of the pleasures of the imagination. The rest of the sentence is correct.

*We might here add, that the pleasures of the fancy are more conducive to health than those of the understanding, which are worked out by dint of thinking; and attended with too violent a labor of the brain.*

*Worked out by dint of thinking, is a phrase, which borders too nearly on the style of com-*

MOD conversation, to be admitted into polished composition.

*Delightful scenes, whether in nature, painting, or poetry, have a kindly influence on the body, as well as the mind, and not only serve to clear and brighten the imagination, but are able to disperse grief and melancholy, and to set the animal spirits in pleasing and agreeable motions. For this reason Sir Francis Bacon, in his Essay upon Health, has not thought it improper to prescribe to his reader a poem or a prospect, where he particularly dissuades him from knotty and subtle disquisitions, and advises him to pursue studies that fill the mind with splendid and illustrious objects, as histories, fables, and contemplations of nature.*

In the latter of these two periods a member is out of its place. *Where he particularly dissuades him from knotty and subtle disquisitions, ought to precede, has not thought it improper to prescribe, &c.*

*I have in this paper, by way of introduction, settled the notion of those pleasures of the imagination, which are the subject of my present undertaking, and endeavored by several considerations to recommend to my readers the pursuit of those pleasures; I shall in my next paper examine the several sources from whence these pleasures are derived.*

These two concluding sentences furnish examples of proper collocation of circumstances. We formerly showed that it is difficult so to dispose of them, as not to embarrass the principal subject. Had the following incidental circumstances, by way of introduction—by several considerations—in this paper—in the next paper, been placed in any other situation, the sentence

would have been neither so neat, nor so clear, as it is on the present construction.

### NOTE.

Instead of adding Questions to this chapter, it is recommended, that the Teacher read over deliberately each sentence or paragraph to be corrected and the pupil then point out the error.

## ELOQUENCE. ORIGIN OF ELOQUENCE GRECIAN ELOQUENCE. DEMOSTHENES.

ELOQUENCE is the art of persuasion. Its most essential requisites are solid argument, clear method, and an appearance of sincerity in the speaker, with such graces of style and utterance as to command attention. Good sense must be its foundation. Without this, no man can be truly eloquent; since fools can persuade none but fools. Before we can persuade a man of sense, we must convince him. Convincing and persuading, though sometimes confounded, are of very different import. Conviction affects the understanding only; persuasion the will and the practice. It is the business of a philosopher to convince us of truth; it is that of an orator to persuade us to act conformably to it by engaging our affections in its favor. Conviction is, however, one avenue to the heart; and it is that which an orator must first attempt to gain; for no persuasion can be stable which is not founded on conviction. But the orator must not be satisfied with convincing; he must address himself to the passions; he must

paint to the fancy, and touch the heart.) Hence, beside solid argument and clear method, all the conciliating and interesting arts of composition and pronunciation enter into the idea of eloquence.

Eloquence may be considered as consisting of three kinds or degrees. The first and lowest is that which aims only to please the hearers. Such in general, is the eloquence of panegyrics, inaugural orations, addresses to great men, and other harangues of this kind. This ornamental sort of composition may innocently amuse and entertain the mind, and may be mixed at the same time with very useful sentiments. But it must be acknowledged, that where the speaker aims only to shine and to please, there is great danger of art being strained into ostentation, and of the composition becoming tiresome and insipid.

The second degree of eloquence is, when the speaker aims, not merely to please, but also to inform, to instruct and to convince; when his art is employed in removing prejudices against himself and his cause; in selecting the most proper arguments, stating them with the greatest force, arranging them in the best order, expressing and delivering them with propriety and beauty; thereby disposing us to pass that judgment, or favor that side of the cause, to which he seeks to bring us. Within this degree chiefly is employed the eloquence of the bar.

The third and highest degree of eloquence is that by which we are not only convinced, but interested, and agitated, and carried along with the speaker; our passions arise with his; we

share all his emotions ; we love, we hate, we resent, as he inspires us ; and are prompted to resolve or to act, with vigor and warmth. Debate in popular assemblies opens the most extensive field to this species of eloquence ; and the pulpit also admits it.

This high species of eloquence is always the offspring of passion. By passion we mean that state of mind in which it is agitated and fired by some object in view. Hence the universally acknowledged power of enthusiasm in public speakers for affecting their audience. Hence all studied declamations and laboured ornaments of style, which show the mind to be cool and unmoved, are inconsistent with persuasive eloquence. Hence every kind of affectation in gesture and pronunciation detracts so much from the weight of a speaker. Hence the necessity of being, and of being believed to be, disinterested and in earnest, in order to persuade.

In tracing the origin of eloquence it is not necessary to go far back into the early ages of the world, or to search for it among the monuments of eastern or Egyptian antiquity. In those ages, it is true, there was a certain kind of eloquence ; but it was more nearly allied to poetry, than to what we properly call oratory. While the intercourse of men was infrequent, and force was the principal mean employed in deciding controversies, the arts of oratory and persuasion, of reasoning and debate, could be little known. The first empires were of the despotic kind. A single person, or at most, a few, held the reins of government. The multitude were accustomed to blind obedience ;

they were driven, not persuaded. Consequently none of these refinements of society, which make public speaking an object of importance, were introduced.

Before the rise of the Grecian republics, we perceive no remarkable appearances of eloquence, as the art of persuasion; and those gave it such a field, as it never had before, and perhaps has never had again since that time.—Greece was divided into many little states. These were governed at first by kings; who being for their tyranny successively expelled from their dominions, there sprung up a multitude of democratical governments, founded nearly upon the same plan, animated by the same high spirit of freedom, mutually jealous, and rivals of each other. Among these Athens was most noted for arts of every kind, but especially for eloquence. We shall pass over the orators, who flourished in the early period of this republic, and take a view of the great Demosthenes, in whom eloquence shone with unrivalled splendor. Not formed by nature either to please or persuade, he struggled with, and surmounted, the most formidable impediments. He shut himself up in a cave, that he might study with less distraction. He declaimed by the sea shore, that he might be used to the noise of a tumultuous assembly; and with pebbles in his mouth, that he might correct a defect in his speech. He practised at home with a naked sword hanging over his shoulder, that he might check an ungraceful motion, to which he was subject. Hence the example of this great man affords the highest encouragement to

every student of eloquence ; since it shows how far art and application availed for acquiring an excellence, which nature appeared willing to deny.

No orator had ever a finer field than Demosthenes in his Olynthiacs and Phillippics which are his capital orations ; and undoubtedly to the greatness of the subject, and to that integrity and public spirit, which breathe in them, they owe much of their merit. The object is to rouse the indignation of his countrymen against Philip of Macedon, the public enemy of the liberties of Greece ; and to guard them against the insidious measures, by which that crafty prince endeavored to lay them asleep to danger. To attain this end, we see him using every proper mean, to animate a people distinguished by justice, humanity and valor ; but in many instances become corrupt and degenerate. He boldly accuses them of venality, indolence, and indifference to the public cause ; while at the same time he reminds them of the glory of their ancestors, and of their present resources. His contemporary orators, who were bribed by Philip, and persuaded the people to peace, he openly reproaches, as traitors to their country. He not only prompts to vigorous measures, but lays down the plan of execution. His orations are strongly animated, and full of the impetuosity and fire of public spirit. His composition is not distinguished by ornament and splendor. It is energy of thought, peculiarly his own, which forms his character, and sets him above all others. He seems not to attend to words, but to things,

We forget the orator, and think of the subject. He has no parade; no studied introductions; but is like a man full of his subject, who, after preparing his audience by a sentence or two for hearing plain truths, enters directly on business.

The style of Demosthenes is (strong and concise; though sometimes harsh and abrupt). His words are very expressive, and his arrangement firm and manly. Negligent of little graces, he aims at that sublime, which lies in sentiment. His action and pronunciation were uncommonly vehement and ardent. His character is of the austere, rather than of the gentle kind. He is always grave, serious, passionate: never degrading himself, nor attempting any thing like pleasantry. If his admirable eloquence be in any respect faulty, it is in this, he sometimes borders on the hard and dry. He may be thought to want smoothness and grace; which is attributed to his imitating too closely the manner of Thucydides, who was his great model for style, and whose history he transcribed eight times with his own hand. But these defects are more than compensated by that masterly force of masculine eloquence, which, as it overpowered all who heard it, cannot in the present day be read without emotion.

### QUESTIONS.

1. What is *eloquence*? 2. What are its most essential requisites? 3. What is its *foundation*? 4. Is there any difference between *convincing* and *persuading*? 5. What is *conviction*? 6. What is *persuasion*? 7. What is necessary, in making *persuasion* stable? 8. What is necessary in eloquence beside *solid argument* and *clear method*? 9. Of how many *kinds or degrees* does eloquence consist? 10. What



is the *first* or *lowest* of these degrees? 11. What is the *second*? 12. What the *third* and *highest* degree of it? 13. Of what is the *third* degree of eloquence the *offspring*? 14. What is *meant* by *passion*? 15. Was the *eloquence* of the ancient Egyptians and of the other ancient eastern nations similar to what we now call *oratory*? 16. When were the *first appearances* of eloquence, as the art of persuasion? 17. Why was Greece favorable for the display of eloquence. 18. Who was their principal *orator*? 19. Was Demosthenes *formed* by *nature* for an orator? 20. How then did he arrive at such eminence in his profession? 21. What are called the best or *capital orations* of Demosthenes? 22. What is the *style* of Demosthenes? 23. On what account is it thought that he was wanting in *smoothness* and *grace*? 24. How are his *defects compensated*?

## ROMAN ELOQUENCE. CICERO. MODERN ELOQUENCE.

HAVING treated of eloquence among the Greeks, we now proceed to consider its progress among the Romans; where we shall find one model at least of eloquence in its most splendid form. The Romans derived their eloquence, poetry and learning, from the Greeks, and were far inferior to them in genius for all these accomplishments. They had neither their vivacity, nor sensibility; their passions were not so easily moved, nor their conceptions so lively; in comparison with them, they were a phlegmatic people. Their language resembled their character; it was regular, firm and stately; but wanted that expressive simplicity.

that flexibility to suit every different species of composition, by which the Greek tongue is peculiarly distinguished.) Hence we always find in Greek productions more (native genius;) in Roman, more regularity and art.

As the Roman government, during the republic, was of the popular kind, public speaking early became the mean of acquiring power and distinction. But in the unpolished times of the state, their speaking hardly deserved the name of eloquence. It was but a short time before the age of Cicero, that the Roman orators rose into any reputation. Crassus and Antonius seem to have been the most eminent; but as none of their works are extant, nor any of Hortensius's, who was Cicero's rival at the bar, it is not necessary to transcribe what Cicero said of them, and of the character of their eloquence.

The object most worthy of our attention, is Cicero himself; whose name alone suggests every thing splendid in oratory. With his life and character in other respects, we are not at present concerned. We shall view him only as an eloquent speaker; and endeavour to mark both his virtues and defects. His virtues are eminently great. In all his orations art is conspicuous. He begins commonly with a regular exordium, and with much address, prepossesses the hearers, and studies to gain their affections. His method is clear, and his arguments arranged with great propriety. In clearness of method, he has advantage over Demosthenes. Every thing is in its proper place; he never attempts to move before he has endeavored to convince; and in moving, particularly the soft-

er passions, he is very successful. (No one ever knew the force of words better than Cicero. He rolls them along with the greatest beauty and pomp; and in the structure of sentences, is eminently curious and exact. He is always full and flowing; never abrupt. He amplifies every thing; yet, though his manner is on the whole diffuse, it is often happily varied, and suited to the subject.) When a great public object roused his mind, and demanded indignation and force, he departs considerably from that loose and declamatory manner to which he at other times is addicted, and becomes very forcible and vehement.

This great orator, however, is not without defects. (In most of his orations, there is too much art. He seems often desirous of obtaining admiration rather than of operating conviction. He is sometimes, therefore, showy, rather than solid; and diffuse where he ought to be urgent.) His periods are always round and sonorous: they cannot be accused of monotony, for they possess variety of cadence; but, from too great fondness for magnificence, he is sometimes deficient in strength. Though the services which he performed for his country were very considerable, yet he is too much his own panegyrist. Ancient manners, which imposed fewer restraints on the side of decorum, may in some degree excuse, but cannot entirely justify his vanity.

Whether Demosthenes or Cicero were the most perfect orator, is a question, on which critics are not agreed. Fenelon, the celebrated Archbishop of Cambray, and author of *Telema-*

thus, seems to have stated their merits with great justice and perspicuity. His judgment is given in his reflections on rhetoric and poetry. We shall translate the passage, though not, it is feared, without losing much of the spirit of the original. "I do not hesitate to declare," says he, "that I think Demosthenes superior to Cicero. I am persuaded, no one can admire Cicero more than I do. He adorns whatever he attempts. He does honour to language. He disposes of words in a manner peculiar to himself. His style has great variety of character. Whenever he pleases, he is even concise and vehement; for instance against Cataline, against Verres, against Anthony. But ornament is too visible in his writings. His art is wonderful, but it is perceived. When the orator is providing for the safety of the republic, he forgets not himself; nor permits others to forget him. Demosthenes seems to escape from himself, and to see nothing but his country. He seeks not elegance of expression; unsought, he possesses it. He is superior to admiration. He makes use of language, as a modest man does of dress, only to cover him. He thunders, he lightens. He is a torrent, which carries every thing before it. We cannot criticise, because we are not ourselves. His subject enchains our attention and makes us forget his language. We lose him from our sight; Philip alone occupies our minds. I am delighted with both these orators; but I confess that I am less affected by the infinite art and magnificent eloquence of Cicero, than by the rapid simplicity of Demosthenes."

The reign of eloquence among the Romans was very short. It expired with Cicero. Nor can we wonder at this; for liberty was no more, and the government of Rome was delivered over to a succession of the most execrable tyrants, that ever disgraced and scourged the human race.

In the decline of the Roman empire, the introduction of Christianity gave rise to a new kind of eloquence in the apologies, sermons, and pastoral writings of the fathers. But none of them afforded very just models of eloquence. Their language, as soon as we descend to the third or fourth century, becomes harsh; and they are generally infected with the taste of that age, a love of swollen and strained thoughts, and of the play of words.

As nothing in the middle ages deserves attention, we pass now to the state of eloquence in modern times. Here it must be confessed, that in no European nation public speaking has been valued so highly, or cultivated with so much care, as in Greece or Rome. The genius of the world appears in this respect to have undergone some alteration. The two countries, where we might expect to find most of the spirit of eloquence, are France and Great Britain; France, on account of the distinguished turn of its inhabitants toward all the liberal arts, and of the encouragement which more than a century past these arts have received from the public; Great Britain, on account of its free government, and the liberal spirit and genius of its people. Yet in neither of these countries has oratory risen nearly to the degree of ancient splendor.

Several reasons may be given, why modern eloquence has been so confined and humble in its efforts. In the first place it seems, that this change must, in part, be ascribed to that accurate turn of thinking, which has been so much cultivated in modern times. Our public speakers are obliged to be more reserved than the ancients, in their attempts to elevate the imagination, and warm the passions; and by the influence of prevailing taste, their own genius is chastened perhaps in too great a degree. It is probable also, that we ascribe to our correctness and good sense, what is chiefly owing to the phlegm and natural coldness of our disposition. For the vivacity and sensibility of the Greeks and Romans, especially of the former, seem to have been much superior to ours, and to have given them a higher relish for all the beauties of oratory.

Though the Parliament of Great Britain is the noblest field, which Europe at present affords to a public speaker, yet eloquence has ever been there a more feeble instrument than in the popular assemblies of Greece and Rome. Under some foreign reigns, the iron hand of arbitrary power checked its efforts; and in latter times, ministerial influence has generally rendered it of small importance. At the bar, our disadvantage, in comparison with the ancients, is great. Among them the judges were commonly numerous; the laws were few and simple; the decision of causes was left in a great measure to equity and the sense of mankind. Hence the field for judicial eloquence was ample. But at present, the system of law is much

more complicated. The knowledge of it is rendered so laborious, as to be the study of a man's life.) Speaking is therefore only a secondary accomplishment, for which he has little leisure.

With respect to the pulpit, it has been a great disadvantage, that the practice of reading sermons, instead of repeating them, has prevailed so universally in England. This indeed may have introduced accuracy; but eloquence has been much enfeebled. Another circumstance too has been prejudicial. The sectaries and fanatics, before the restoration, used a warm, zealous, and popular manner of preaching; and their adherents afterward continued to distinguish themselves by similar ardor. Hatred of these sects drove the established church into the opposite extreme of a studied coolness of expression. Hence from the art of persuasion, which preaching ought ever to be, it has passed in England, into mere reasoning and instruction.

### QUESTIONS.

1. From whom did the Romans derive their eloquence, poetry, and learning? 2. How did the Romans compare with the Greeks in genius for these accomplishments? 3. What was the character of their language? 4. In what is the Latin inferior to the Greek tongue? 5. Who was the most distinguished Roman orator? 6. How did he commonly begin his orations? 7. In what had he an advantage over Demosthenes? 8. What are the leading excellencies of his style? 9. What defects were there in the eloquence of Cicero? 10. Was superior eloquence of long continuance among the Romans? 11. When did it expire? 12. Why did it expire with Cicero? 13. What gave rise to a new kind of eloquence? 14.

Has any modern European nation held *public speaking* in that estimation, or paid that attention to it, which the Greeks and Romans did? 15. Why might we expect to find the genuine *spirit of eloquence* in France? 16. Why in Great Britain? 17. But is it to be found in either of them nearly to the *degree of its ancient splendor*? 18. Why has *modern eloquence* been so confined and humble in its efforts? 19. What is there in the *disposition* of the moderns to have impeded the progress of eloquence? 20. What has checked the progress of eloquence in the parliament of Great Britain? 21. What is the *disadvantage* for eloquence at the bar, with the moderns, which the ancients did not have? 22. What has been a great *disadvantage* to the improvement of public speaking in the pulpit? 23. What advantage has resulted from the practice of reading sermons? 24. What *circumstance* besides the reading of sermons has been prejudicial to pulpit eloquence? 1.



### ELOQUENCE OF POPULAR ASSEMBLIES.

THE foundation of every species of eloquence is good sense and solid thought. It should be the first study of him, who means to address a popular assembly, (to be previously master of the business on which he is to speak; to be well provided with matter and argument; and to rest upon these the chief stress. This will give to his discourse an air of manliness and strength, which is a powerful instrument of persuasion. Ornament, if we have genius for it, will succeed of course; at any rate, it deserves only secondary regard.

To become a persuasive speaker in a popular assembly, it is a capital rule, that a man should



always be persuaded of whatever he recommends to others.) (Never, if it can be avoided, should he espouse that side of an argument, which he does not believe to be right. All high eloquence must be the offspring of passion. This makes every man persuasive, and gives a force to his genius, which it cannot otherwise possess.

Debate in popular assemblies seldom allows a speaker that previous preparation, which the pulpit always, and the bar sometimes, admits. A general prejudice prevails, and not an unjust one, against (set speeches) in public meetings. (At the opening of a debate they may sometimes be introduced with propriety; but, as the debate advances, they become improper; they lose the appearance of being suggested by the business that is going on. Study and ostentation are apt to be visible; and, consequently, though admired as elegant, they are seldom so persuasive as more free and unconstrained discourses.

This, however, (does not) forbid premeditation, on what we intend to speak. With respect to the matter we cannot be too accurate in our preparation; but with regard to words and expressions, it is very possible so far to overdo, as to render our speech stiff and precise. Short notes of the substance of the discourse are not only allowable, but of considerable service, to those especially who are beginning to speak in public. They will teach them a degree of accuracy which, if they speak frequently, they are in danger of losing. They will accustom them to distinct arrangement, without which,

eloquence, however great, cannot produce entire conviction.)

Popular assemblies give scope for the most animated manner of public speaking. Passion is easily excited in a great assembly, where the movements are communicated by mutual sympathy between the orator and the audience.

That ardor of speech, that vehemence and glow of sentiment, which proceed from a mind animated and inspired by some great and public object, form the peculiar character of popular eloquence in its highest degree of perfection.

The warmth, however, which we express, must be always suited to the subject; since it would be ridiculous to introduce great vehemence into a subject of small importance, or which by its nature requires to be treated with calmness. We must also be careful not to counterfeit warmth without feeling it. The best rule is, to follow nature; and never to attempt a strain of eloquence, which is not prompted by our own genius. A speaker may acquire reputation and influence by a calm, argumentative manner. To reach the pathetic and sublime of oratory requires those strong sensibilities of mind, and that high power of expression, which are given to few.

Even when vehemence is justified by the subject, and prompted by genius; when warmth is felt, not feigned; we must be cautious, lest impetuosity transport us too far. If the speaker lose command of himself, he will soon lose command of his audience. He must begin with moderation, and study to warm his hearers gradually and equally with himself. For, if their

passions be not in unison with his, the discord will soon be felt. Respect for his audience should always lay a decent restraint upon his warmth, and prevent it from carrying him beyond proper limits. When a speaker is so far master of himself, as to preserve close attention to argument, and even to some degree of accurate expression; this self command, this effort of reason, in the midst of passion, contributes in the highest degree both to please and to persuade. The advantages of passion are afforded for the purposes of persuasion, without that confusion and disorder which are its usual attendants.

In the most animated strain of popular speaking we must always regard what the public ear will receive without disgust. Without attention to this, imitation of ancient orators might betray a speaker into a boldness of manner, with which the coolness of modern taste would be displeased. It is also necessary to attend with care to the decorums of time, place and character. No ardor of eloquence can atone for neglect of these. No one should attempt to speak in public without forming to himself a just and strict idea of what is suitable to his age and character; what is suitable to the subject, the hearers, the place, and the occasion. On this idea he should adjust the whole train and manner of his speaking.

What degree of conciseness or diffuseness is suited to popular eloquence, it is not easy to determine with precision. A diffuse manner is generally considered as most proper. There is danger, however, of erring in this respect; by

too diffuse a style public speakers often lose more in point of strength than they gain by fullness of illustration. Excessive conciseness indeed must be avoided. We must explain and inculcate ; but confine ourselves within certain limits. We should never forget that, however we may be pleased with hearing ourselves speak, every audience may be tired ; and the moment they grow weary, our eloquence becomes useless. It is better in general, to say too little, than too much : to place our thought in one strong point of view, and rest it there, than by showing it in every light, and pouring forth a profusion of words upon it, to exhaust the attention of our hearers, and leave them languid and fatigued.

### QUESTIONS.

1. What is the foundation of every species of eloquence ?
2. What should be the first study of the person who means to address a popular assembly ?
3. What is considered a capital rule to become a persuasive speaker in a popular assembly ?
4. What is always to be avoided if possible ?
5. Against what is there a general prejudice in public meetings ?
6. At what times may set speeches in public meetings be introduced ?
7. Is premeditation improper ?
8. What will be the advantages of short notes, in speaking to popular assemblies ?
9. What forms the peculiar character of popular eloquence in its highest degree of perfection ?
10. What is the best rule in public speaking ?
11. In what must we be cautious in regard to passion ?
12. What will be the consequence in this case, if a speaker lose command of himself ?
13. What idea should a person to speak in public always form to himself ?
14. What style of public speaking is considered best, the concise or diffuse ?

## ELOQUENCE OF THE BAR.

THE ends of speaking at the bar, and in popular assemblies, are commonly different. In the latter, the orator aims principally to persuade; to determine his hearers to some choice or conduct, as good, fit, or useful. He therefore applies himself to every principle of action in our nature; to the passions and to the heart, as well as to the understanding. But at the bar, (conviction) is the principal object. There the speaker's duty is not to persuade the judges to what is good or useful, but, to exhibit what is just and true; and, consequently, his eloquence is chiefly addressed to the understanding.

At the bar speakers address themselves to one, or to a few judges, who are generally persons of age, gravity, and dignity of character. There those advantages, which a mixed and numerous assembly affords for employing all the arts of speech, are not enjoined. Passion does not rise so easily. The speaker is heard with more coolness; he is watched with more severity; and would expose himself to ridicule by attempting that high and vehement tone which is suited only to a multitude. Beside at the bar the field of speaking is confined within (law and statute.) Imagination is fettered. The advocate has always before him the line, the square, and the compass. These it is his chief business to be constantly applying to the subjects under debate.

Hence, the eloquence of the bar is of a much more limited, more sober, and chastened kind, than that of popular assemblies; and, consequently, the judicial orations of the

ancients must not be considered as exact models of that kind of speaking which is adapted to the present state of the bar. With them, strict law was much less an object of attention than it is with us. In the days of Demosthenes and Cicero, the municipal statutes were few, simple, and general; and the decision of causes was left, in a great measure, to the equity and common sense of the judges. Eloquence, rather than jurisprudence, was the study of pleaders. Cicero says that three months' study would make a complete civilian; nay, it was thought that a man might be a good pleader without any previous study. Among the Romans there was a set of men, called *pragmatici*, whose office it was to supply the orator with all the law knowledge his cause required; which he disposed in that popular form, and decorated with those colors of eloquence, which were most fitted for influencing the judges.

It may also be observed, that the civil and criminal judges in Greece and Rome were more numerous than with us, and formed a kind of popular assembly. The celebrated tribunal of the Areopagus, at Athens, consisted of fifty judges at least. In Rome, the *Judices Selecti* were always numerous, and had the office and power of judge and jury. In the famous cause of Milo, Cicero spoke to fifty-one *Judices Selecti*, and thus had the advantage of addressing his whole pleading, not to one or a few learned judges of the point of law, as is the case with us, but to an assembly of Roman citizens.— Hence those arts of popular eloquence which he employed with such success. Hence, certain

practices which would be reckoned theatrical by us, were common at the Roman bar; such as introducing not only the accused person dressed in deep mourning, but presenting to the judges his family and young children, endeavoring to excite pity by their cries and tears.

The foundation of a lawyer's reputation and success must be laid in a profound knowledge of his profession. If his abilities as a speaker be ever so eminent; yet, if his knowledge of the law be superficial, few will choose to engage him in their defence. Beside previous study, and an ample stock of acquired knowledge, another thing, inseparable from the success of every pleader, is a diligent and painful attention to every cause with which he is entrusted; to all the facts and circumstances with which it is connected. Thus he will, in a great measure, be prepared for the arguments of his opponent; and, being previously acquainted with the weak parts of his own cause, he will be able to fortify them in the best manner against the attack of his adversary.

Though the ancient popular and vehement manner of pleading is now in a great measure superseded, we must not infer that there is no room for eloquence at the bar, and that the study of it is superfluous. There is, perhaps, no scene of public speaking, where eloquence is more requisite. The dryness and subtilty of subjects usually agitated at the bar, require, more (than any other, a certain kind of eloquence, in order to command attention; to give weight to the arguments employed; and to prevent what the pleader advances from passing:

unregarded. The effect of good speaking is always great. There is as much difference in the impression made by a cold, dry, and confused speaker, and that made by one who pleads the same cause with elegance, order, and strength, as there is between our conception of an object when presented in twilight, and when viewed in the effulgence of noon.

Purity and neatness of expression is in this species of eloquence chiefly to be studied; a style perspicuous and proper; not needlessly overcharged with the pedantry of law terms, nor affectedly avoiding these, when suitable and requisite. Verbosity is a fault of which men of this profession are frequently accused; into which the habit of speaking and writing hastily and with little preparation, almost unavoidably betrays them. It cannot therefore, be too earnestly recommended to those who are beginning to practice at the bar, that they early guard against this, while they have leisure for preparation. Let them form themselves to the habit of a strong and correct style; which will become natural to them afterward, when compelled by multiplicity of business to compose with precipitation. Whereas, if a loose and negligent style have been suffered to become familiar, they will not be able even upon occasions when they wish to make an unusual effort, to express themselves with force and elegance.

Distinctness in speaking at the bar is a capital property. It should be shown, first in stating the question; in exhibiting clearly the point in debate; what we admit; what we deny; and where the line of division begins between



us and the adverse party. Next, it should appear in the order and arrangement of all the parts of the pleading. A clear method is of the highest consequence in every species of oration; but in those intricate cases which belong to the bar, it is infinitely essential.

Narration of facts should always be (as concise as the nature of them will admit. They are always very necessary to be remembered; consequently, unnecessary minuteness in relating them overloads the memory. Whereas, if a pleader omit all superfluous circumstances in his recital, he adds strength to the material facts, gives a clearer view of what he relates, and makes the impression of it more lasting.) In argumentation, however, (a more diffuse manner seems requisite) at the bar than on some other occasions. For in popular assemblies, where the subject of debate is often a plain question, arguments gain strength by conciseness. But (the intricacy of law points frequently requires the arguments to be expanded and placed in different lights, in order to be fully apprehended.)

Candor in stating the arguments of his adversary cannot be too much recommended to every pleader. If he disguise them, or place them in a false light, the artifice will soon be discovered; and the judge and the hearers will conclude, that he either wants discernment to perceive, or fairness to admit, the strength of his opponent's reasoning. But, if he state with accuracy and candor the arguments used against him, before he endeavor to combat them, a strong prejudice is created in his favor. He will ap-

appear to have entire confidence in his cause, since he does not attempt to support it by artifice or concealment. The judge will therefore be inclined to receive more readily the impressions made upon him by a speaker who appears both fair and penetrating.

Wit may sometimes be serviceable at the bar, particularly in a lively reply, by which ridicule is thrown on what an adversary has advanced.

But a young pleader should never rest his strength on this dazzling talent. His office is not to excite laughter, but to produce conviction; nor perhaps did any one ever rise to eminence in his profession by being a witty lawyer.

Since an advocate personates his client, he must plead his cause with a proper degree of warmth. He must be cautious, however, of prostituting his earnestness and sensibility by an equal degree of ardor on every subject. There is a dignity of character, which it is highly important for every one of his profession to support. An opinion of probity and honor in a pleader is his most powerful instrument of persuasion. He should always, therefore, decline embarking in causes which are odious and manifestly unjust; and when he supports a doubtful cause, he should lay the chief stress upon those arguments which appear to him to be most forcible; reserving his zeal and indignation for cases where injustice and iniquity are flagrant.

### QUESTIONS.

1. In the eloquence of popular assemblies, at what does the orator *principally aim*? 2. What is the *principal object* of speaking at the bar? 3. To whom do speakers at the bar *address themselves*? 4. By

what is the sphere of speaking at the bar *confined*? 5. Why do not the *judicial orations* of the ancients serve as models of that kind of speaking which is adapted to the present state of the bar? 6. On what must the foundation of a lawyer's *reputation* and *success* be laid? 7. Are we to *infer* that there is no room for eloquence at the bar, since the ancient manner of *pleading* is in a great measure *superseded*? 8. Is *eloquence* at the bar particularly *requisite*? 9. What is *chiefly* to be studied in this *species* of *eloquence*? 10. What is there in speaking at the bar, that should be considered a *capital property*? 11. How should be the *narration of facts*? 12. Why is it necessary to be *concise* in *narration* at the bar? 13. How should be the *argumentative* part? 14. Why is more diffuseness in *argumentation* requisite? 15. How should an advocate state the *arguments* of his adversary? 16. Why is *candor* necessary in stating them? 17. Is *wit* proper for the use of an advocate at the bar? 18. Why is 'a *degree* of warmth *proper* in an advocate?



## ELOQUENCE OF THE PULPIT.

HAVING treated of the eloquence of popular assemblies, and of that of the bar, we shall now consider the strain and spirit of that eloquence which is suited to the pulpit. This field of public speaking has several advantages peculiar to itself. The dignity and importance of its subjects must be allowed to be superior to any other. They admit the highest embellishment in description, and the greatest warmth and vehemence of expression. In treating his subject, the preacher has also peculiar advantages. He speaks not to one, or a few judges,

but to a large assembly. He is not afraid of interruption. He chooses his subject at leisure ; and has all the assistance of the most accurate premeditation. The disadvantages, however, which attend the eloquence of the pulpit are not inconsiderable. The preacher, it is true, has no contention with an adversary ; but debate awakens genius, and excites attention. His subjects, though noble, are trite and common. They are become so familiar to the public ear, that it requires no ordinary genius in the preacher to fix attention. Nothing is more difficult than to bestow on what is common the grace of novelty. Besides, the subject of the preacher usually confines him to abstract qualities, to virtues and vices ; whereas, that of other popular speakers leads them to treat of persons ; which is generally more interesting to the hearers, and occupies more powerfully the imagination. We are taught by the preacher to detest only the crime ; by the pleader to detest the criminal. Hence it happens that, though the number of moderately good preachers is great, so few have arrived at eminence. Perfection is very distant from modern preaching. The object however, is truly noble, and worthy of being pursued with zeal.

To excel in preaching, it is necessary to have a fixed and habitual view of its object. This is to persuade men to become good. Every sermon ought therefore to be a persuasive oration. It is not to discuss some abstruse point, that the preacher ascends the pulpit. It is not to teach his hearers something new ; but to make them

better ; to give them at once clear views and persuasive impressions of religious truths.

The principal characteristics of pulpit eloquence, as distinguished from the other kinds of public speaking, appear to be these two, gravity and warmth. It is neither easy nor common to unite these characters of eloquence. The grave, when it is predominant, becomes a dull, uniform solemnity. The warm, when it wants gravity, borders on the light and theatrical. A proper union of the two, forms that character of preaching which the French call *Onction* ; that affecting, penetrating, and interesting manner, which flows from a strong sense in the preacher of the importance of the truths he delivers, and an earnest desire that they may make full impression on the hearts of his hearers.)

A sermon, as a particular species of composition, requires the strictest attention to unity. By this we mean that there should be some main point to which the whole tenor of the sermon shall refer. It must not be a pile of different subjects heaped upon each other ; but one object must predominate through the whole. Hence, however, it must not be understood, that there should be no divisions or separate heads in a discourse ; nor that one single thought only should be exhibited in different points of view. Unity is not to be understood in so limited a sense ; it admits some variety ; it requires only that union and connection be so far preserved, as to make the whole concur in some one impression on the mind. Thus, for instance, a preacher may employ several different argu-

ments to enforce the love of God ; he may also inquire into the causes of the decay of this virtue ; still one great object is presented to the mind. But if, because his text says, "He that loveth God, must love his brother also ;" he should, therefore, mix in the same discourse arguments for the love of God, and for the love of our neighbor, he would grossly offend against unity, and leave a very confused impression on the minds of his hearers.

Sermons are always more striking, and generally more useful, the more precise and particular the subject of them is. Unity can never be so perfect in a general, as in a particular subject. General subjects, indeed, such as the excellency or the pleasures of Religion, are often chosen by young preachers, as the most showy, and the easiest to be handled ; but these subjects produce not the high effects of preaching. Attention is much more commanded, by taking some particular view of a great subject, and employing, on that, the whole force of argument and eloquence. To recommend some one virtue, or inveigh against a particular vice, affords a subject not deficient in unity or precision. But, if that virtue or vice be considered as assuming a particular aspect in certain characters, or certain situations in life, the subject becomes still more interesting. The execution is more difficult, but the merit and the effect are higher.

A preacher should be cautious not to exhaust his subject ; since nothing is more opposite to persuasion, than unnecessary and tedious fulness. There are always some things which he may

suppose to be known, and some which require only brief attention. If he endeavor to omit nothing which his subject suggests, he must unavoidably encumber it and diminish its force.

(To render his instructions interesting to his hearers) should be the grand object of every preacher. He should bring home to their hearts the truths which he inculcates; and make each suppose himself particularly addressed. (He should avoid all intricate reasonings; avoid expressing himself in general, speculative propositions; or laying down practical truths in an abstract, metaphysical manner.) A discourse ought to be carried on in the strain of direct address to the audience; not in the strain of one writing an essay, but of one speaking to a multitude, and studying to connect what is called application, or what immediately refers to practice, with the doctrinal parts of the sermon.

It is always highly advantageous to keep in view the different ages, characters, and conditions of men, and to accommodate directions and exhortations to each of these different classes. Whenever you advance what touches a man's character or is applicable to his circumstances, you are sure of his attention. No study is more necessary for a preacher than the study of human life, and of the human heart. To discover a man to himself in a light, in which he never saw his character before, produces a wonderful effect. Those sermons, though the most difficult in composition, are not only the most beautiful, but also the most useful, which are founded on the illustration of some peculiar character, or remarkable piece of history in the

sacred writings; by pursuing which we may trace, and lay open, some of the most secret windings of the human heart. Other topics of preaching are become trite; but this is an extensive field which hitherto has been little explored, and possesses all the advantages of being curious, new, and highly useful. Bishop Butler's sermon on the *character of Balaam* is an example of this kind of preaching.

Fashion, which operates so extensively on human manners, has given to preaching, at different times, a change of character. This however is a torrent, which swells to-day and subsides to-morrow. Sometimes poetical preaching is fashionable; sometimes philosophical. At one time it must be all pathetic; at another, all argumentative; as some celebrated preacher has set the example. Each of these modes is very defective; and he, who conforms himself to it, will both confine and corrupt his genius. Truth and good sense are the sole basis, on which he can build with safety. Mode and humor are feeble and unsteady. No example should be servilely imitated. From various examples the preacher may collect materials for improvement; but servility of imitation extinguishes all genius, or rather proves entire want of it.

### QUESTIONS.

1. What *peculiar advantages* has the eloquence of the pulpit? 2. What *peculiar advantages* has a *preacher* in treating his subject? 3. What *disadvantages* attend pulpit eloquence? 4. What is necessary to excel in preaching? 5. What is the *object* of preaching? 6. What are the *characteristics*



of pulpit eloquence? 7. Is it *easy and common* to unite gravity and warmth? 8. What does the *proper union* of gravity and warmth form? 9. As a *particular species* of composition, what style do sermons require? 10. What is to be understood by the *unity* of a sermon? 11. What kind of sermons are always the most *striking* and generally the most *useful*? 12. What subjects are best suited to a sermon? 13. In what should a preacher always be *cautious*? 14. What should be the *grand object* of every preacher? 15. What should he avoid? 16. How should a discourse from the pulpit be *carried on*? 17. What *study* is particularly necessary for a preacher? 18. In preaching, what is the effect of too great *imitation* of another?



## CONDUCT OF A DISCOURSE IN ALL ITS PARTS. INTRODUCTION, DIVISION, NARRATION, AND EXPLICATION.

HAVING already considered what is peculiar to each of the three great fields of public speaking, popular assemblies, the bar, and the pulpit; we shall now treat of what is common to them all, and explain the conduct of a discourse or oration in general.

The parts which compose a regular oration are these six; the exordium or introduction; the state or division of the subject; narration or explication; the reasoning or arguments; the pathetic part; and the conclusion. It is not necessary that each of these enter into every public discourse, nor that they always enter in this order. There are many excellent dis-

courses in which some of these parts are omitted. But, as they are the constituent parts of a regular oration, and as in every discourse some of them must occur, it is agreeable to our present purpose to examine each of them distinctly.

The design of the introduction is to conciliate the good will of the hearers; to excite their attention; and to render them open to persuasion. When the speaker is previously secure of the good will, attention and docility of his audience; a formal introduction may be omitted. Respect for his hearers will in that case require only a short exordium, to prepare them for the other parts of his discourse.

The introduction is a part of a discourse which requires no small care. It is always important to begin well; to make a favorable impression at first setting out, when the minds of the hearers, as yet vacant and free, are more easily prejudiced in favor of the speaker. We must add, also, that a good introduction is frequently found to be extremely difficult. Few parts of a discourse give more trouble to the composer, or require more delicacy in the execution.

- An introduction should be easy and natural. It should always be suggested by the subject.

- The writer should not plan it before he has meditated in his own mind the substance of his discourse. By taking the opposite course, and composing in the first place an introduction, the writer will often find that he is either led to lay hold of some common-place topic, or that instead of the introduction being accommodated to the discourse, he is under the necessity of

accommodating the discourse to the introduction.

In this part of a discourse correctness of expression should be carefully studied.—This is peculiarly requisite, on account of the situation of the hearers. At the beginning, they are more disposed to criticise, than at any other period; they are then occupied by the subject and the arguments; their attention is entirely directed to the speaker's style and manner.) Care therefore is requisite to prepossess them in his favor; though too much art must be cautiously avoided, since it will then be more easily detected, and will derogate from that persuasion, which the other parts of the discourse are intended to produce.

Modesty is also an indispensable characteristic of a good introduction. If the speaker begin with an air of arrogance and ostentation, the self-love and pride of his hearers will be presently awakened, and follow him with a very suspicious eye through the rest of his discourse. His modesty should appear not only in his expression, but in his whole manner; in his looks, in his gestures, and in the tone of his voice. Every audience is pleased with those marks of respect and awe which are paid by the speaker. The modesty, however, of an introduction should betray nothing mean or abject. Together with modesty and deference to his hearers, the orator should show a certain sense of dignity, arising from persuasion of the justice or importance of his subject.

Particular cases excepted, the orator should not put forth all his strength at the beginning but it should rise and grow upon his hearer

his discourse advances. The introduction is seldom the place for vehemence and passion. The audience must be gradually prepared before the speaker venture on strong and passionate sentiments. Yet, when the subject is such that the very mention of it naturally awakens some passionate emotion; or when the unexpected presence of some person or object in a popular assembly inflames the speaker; either of these will justify an abrupt and vehement exordium. Thus the appearance of Cataline in the senate renders the violent opening of Cicero's first oration against him very natural and proper "*Quousque tandem, Catalina, abutere patientia nostra?*" Bishop Atterbury, preaching from this text, "Blessed is he, whosoever shall not be offended in me," ventures on this bold exordium: "And can any man then be offended in thee, blessed Jesus?" Which address to our Saviour he continues, till he enters on the division of his subject. But such introductions should be attempted by very few, since they promise so much vehemence and ardor through the rest of the discourse, that it is extremely difficult to satisfy the expectation of the hearers. An introduction should not anticipate any material part of the subject. When topics or arguments, which are afterwards to be enlarged upon, are hinted at and in part exhibited in the introduction; they lose, upon their second appearance, the grace of novelty. The impression intended to be made by any capital thought is always made with greatest advantage when it is made entire, and in its proper place.

An introduction should be proportioned in length and kind to the discourse which follows

it. In length, as nothing can be more absurd than to erect a large portico before a small building ; and in kind, as it is no less absurd to load with superb ornaments the portico of a plain dwelling-house ; or to make the approach to a monument as gay as that to an arbor.

After the introduction, the proposition or enunciation of the subject commonly succeeds ; concerning which we shall only observe, that it should be clear and distinct, and expressed without affectation, in the most concise and simple manner. To this generally succeeds the (division,) or laying down the method of the discourse ; in the management of which the following rules should be carefully observed.

First, The parts into which the subject is divided, must be really distinct from each other. It were an absurd division, for example, if a speaker should propose to explain first the advantages of virtue, and next those of justice or temperance ; because the first head plainly comprehends the second, as a genus does the species. Such a method of proceeding involves the subject in confusion.

Secondly, We must be careful always to follow the order of nature ; beginning with the most simple points ; with such as are most easily understood, and necessary to be first discussed ; and proceeding to those which are built upon the former, and suppose them to be known. The subject must be divided into those parts, into which it is most easily and naturally resolved.

Thirdly, The members of a division ought to exhaust the subject ; otherwise the division is

incomplete ; the subject is exhibited by pieces only, without displaying the whole.

Fourthly, Let conciseness and precision be peculiarly studied. A division always appears to most advantage, when the several heads are expressed in the clearest, most forcible, and fewest words possible. This never fails to strike the hearers agreeably ; and contributes also to make the divisions more easily remembered.

Fifthly, Unnecessary multiplication of heads should be cautiously avoided. To divide a subject into many minute parts, by endless divisions and subdivisions, produces a bad effect in speaking. In a logical treatise this may be proper ; but it renders an oration hard and dry, and unnecessarily fatigues the memory. A sermon may admit from three to five or six heads, including subdivisions ; seldom are more allowable.

The next constituent part of a discourse is narration or explication. These two are joined together, because they fall nearly under the same rules, and because they generally answer the same purpose ; serving to illustrate the cause, or the subject, of which one treats, before proceeding to argue on one side or the other ; or attempting to interest the passions of the hearers.

—To be clear and distinct, to be probable, and to be concise, are the qualities, which critics chiefly require in narration. Distinctness is requisite to the whole of the discourse, but belongs especially to narration, which ought to throw light on all that follows. At the bar, a fact, or a single circumstance, left in obscurity,

or misunderstood by the judge, may destroy the effect of all the argument and reasoning, which the pleader employs. If his narration be improbable, it will be disregarded; if it be tedious and diffuse, it will fatigue and be forgotten. To render narration distinct, particular attention is requisite in ascertaining clearly the names, dates, places and every other important circumstance of the facts recounted. In order to be probable in narration, it is necessary to exhibit the characters of the persons of whom we speak, and to show that their actions proceeded from such motives as are natural, and likely to gain belief. To be as concise as the subject will admit, all superfluous circumstances must be rejected; by which the narration will be rendered more forcible and more clear.

In sermons, explication of the subject to be discoursed on occupies the place of narration at the bar, and is to be conducted in a similar manner. It must be concise, clear, and distinct; in a style correct and elegant, rather than highly adorned. To explain the doctrine of the text with propriety; to give a full and clear account of the nature of that virtue or duty which forms the subject of discourse, is properly the didactic part of preaching; on the right execution of which much depends. In order to succeed, the preacher must meditate profoundly on the subject; so as to place it in a clear and striking point of view. He must consider what light it may derive from other passages of scripture; whether it be a subject nearly allied to some other, from which it ought to be distinguished; whether it can be advantageously illustrated by comparing or opposing it to some other thing;

by searching into causes, or tracing effects; by pointing out examples, or appealing to the hearts of the hearers; that thus a precise and circumstantial view may be afforded of the doctrine inculcated. By distinct and apt illustrations of the known truths of religion, a preacher may both display great merit, as a composer; and what is infinitely more valuable, render his discourses weighty, instructive, and useful.

### QUESTIONS.

1. How many parts compose a *regular discourse*; and what are they?
2. Is it necessary that each of these parts *enter* into every public discourse?
3. What is the *design* of the *introduction*?
4. When may a regular *introduction* be omitted?
5. By what should the introduction of a discourse be *suggested*?
6. Why should *correctness* of expression be carefully studied in the introduction?
7. Why is *modesty* an indispensable characteristic of a good introduction?
8. Should all the *strength* of an orator be put forth at the *beginning* of a discourse?
9. Why not?
10. Should an introduction *anticipate* any *material* part of a discourse?
11. By what should the *length* and kind of an introduction be proportioned?
12. What *commonly* succeeds the introduction?
13. What *generally* succeeds the *proposition* of a discourse?
14. What is the *first* rule for the management of the *division* of a discourse?
15. What is the *second*?
16. What is the *third*?
17. What is the *fourth*?
18. What is the *fifth*?
19. What is the next *constituent* part of a discourse?
20. What are the *qualities* required in narration?
21. What is necessary to render narration *distinct*?
22. What to be *probable*?
23. What to be *concise*?
24. What in sermons *occupies* the place of narration at the bar?
25. How can a preacher *display* merit, as a composer, and *render* his discourses weighty, instructive, and useful?



**THE ARGUMENTATIVE PART OF A DISCOURSE. THE RATHETIC PART, AND THE PERORATION.**

AS the great end for which men speak on any serious occasion, is to convince their hearers that something is true, or right, or good, and thus to influence their practice; reason and argument must constitute the foundation of all manly and persuasive eloquence.

With regard to arguments, three things are requisite. First, invention of them; secondly, proper disposition and arrangement of them; and thirdly, expressing them in the most forcible manner. Invention is undoubtedly the most material, and the basis of the rest. But in this, art can afford only small assistance. It can aid a speaker however in arranging and expressing those arguments which his knowledge of the subject has discovered.

Supposing the arguments properly chosen, we must avoid blending those together that are of a separate nature. All arguments whatever are intended to prove one of these three things; that something is true; that it is right or fit; or that it is profitable and good. Truth, duty, and interest are the three great subjects of discussion among men. But the arguments employed upon either of them are generally distinct; and he, who blends them all under one topic, which he calls his argument, as in sermons is too frequently done, will render his reasoning indistinct and inelegant.

With respect to the different degrees of strength in arguments, the common rule is, to advance in the way of climax from the weakest to the most forcible. This method is recom-

intended when the speaker is convinced that his cause is clear, and easy to be proved. But this rule must not be universally observed. (If he distrust his cause, and have but one material argument, it is often proper to place this argument in the front; to prejudice his hearers early in his favor, and thus dispose them to pay attention to the weaker reasons which he may afterwards introduce.) When amid a variety of arguments there is one or two more feeble than the rest, though proper to be used, Cicero advises to place them in the middle, as a situation less conspicuous, than either the beginning or end of the train of reasoning.

When arguments are strong and satisfactory, the more they are separated the better. Each can then bear to be introduced alone, placed in its full light, amplified and contemplated. But, when they are of a doubtful or presumptive nature, it is safer to crowd them together, to form them into a phalanx, that, though individually weak, they may mutually support each other.

Arguments should never be extended too far, nor multiplied too much. This serves rather to render a cause suspicious, than to increase its strength. A needless multiplicity of arguments burdens the memory, and diminishes the weight of that conviction, which a few well chosen arguments produce. To expand them also beyond the bounds of reasonable illustration is always enfeebling. When a speaker endeavors to expose a favorable argument in every light possible, fatigued by the effort, he loses the spirit, with which he set out; and ends with feebleness, what he began with force.

Having attended thus far to the proper ar-

arrangement of arguments, we proceed to another essential part of a discourse, the pathetic; in which, if any where, eloquence reigns, and exerts its power. On this head the following directions appear useful.

Consider carefully whether the subject admit the pathetic, and render it proper; and, if it do, what part of the discourse is most fit for it. To determine these points belongs to good sense. Many subjects admit not the pathetic; and even in those, that are susceptible of it, an attempt to excite the passions in a wrong place, may expose an orator to ridicule. It may in general be observed, that, if we expect any emotion, which we raise, to have a lasting effect, we must secure in our favor the understanding and judgment. The hearers must be satisfied, that there are sufficient grounds for their engaging in the cause with zeal and ardor. When argument and reasoning have produced their full effect, the pathetic is admitted with the greatest force and propriety.

A speaker should cautiously avoid giving his hearers warning that he intends to excite their passions. Every thing of this kind chills their sensibility. There is also a great difference between telling the hearers that they ought to be moved, and actually moving them. To every emotion or passion, nature has adapted certain corresponding objects; and without setting these before the mind, it is impossible for an orator to excite that emotion. We are warmed with gratitude, we are touched with compassion, not when a speaker shows us that these are noble dispositions, and that it is our duty to feel them; nor when he exclaims against us for

our indifference and coldness. Hitherto he has addressed only our reason or conscience. He must describe the kindness and tenderness of our friend ; he must exhibit the distress suffered by the person for whom he would interest us. Then, and not before, our hearts begin to be touched, our gratitude, our compassion, begins to flow. The basis, therefore, of all successful execution in pathetic oratory, is to paint the object of that passion which we desire to raise in the most natural and striking manner ; to describe it with such circumstances as are likely to awaken it in the minds of others.)

To succeed in the pathetic, it is necessary to attend to the proper language of the passions. This, if we consult nature, we shall ever find unaffected and simple. It may be animated by bold and strong figures, but it will have no ornament, no finery. There is a great difference between painting to the imagination and to the heart. The one may be done with deliberation and coolness ; the other must always be rapid and ardent. In the former, art and labor may be suffered to appear ; in the latter, no proper effect can be produced, unless it be the work of nature only. Hence all digressions should be avoided which may interrupt or turn aside the swell of passion. Hence comparisons are always dangerous, and commonly quite improper in the midst of the pathetic. It is also to be observed, that violent emotions cannot be lasting. The pathetic therefore should not be prolonged too much. Due regard should always be preserved to what the hearers will bear ; for, he who attempts to carry them farther in passions than they will follow him, frustrates his pur-

pose. By endeavoring to warm them too much, he takes the surest method of freezing them completely.

Concerning the peroration or conclusion of a discourse, a few words will be sufficient. Sometimes the whole pathetic part comes in most properly at the conclusion. Sometimes, when the discourse has been altogether argumentative, it is proper to conclude with summing up the arguments, placing them in one view, and leaving the impression of them full and strong on the minds of the hearers. For the great rule of a conclusion, and what nature obviously suggests, is, place that last, on which you choose to rest the strength of your cause.

In every kind of public speaking it is important to hint the precise time of concluding; to bring the discourse just to a point; neither ending abruptly and unexpectedly, nor disappointing the expectation of the hearers, when they look for the end of the discourse.

The speaker should always close with dignity and spirit, that the minds of the hearers may be left warm, and that they may depart with a favorable impression of the subject and of himself.

### QUESTIONS.

1. What must constitute the foundation of all *manly* and *persuasive* eloquence?
2. With regard to *arguments*, what are *requisite*?
- (3) What is the *common rule* with respect to the different degrees of strength in argument?
4. Under what circumstances is *this rule* not to be observed?
5. What should be the disposition of arguments, when they are *strong* and *satisfactory*?
6. What is the *basis* of all successful execution in *pathetic oratory*?
7. What is the *great rule* for the conclusion of a discourse?

### PRONUNCIATION OR DELIVERY.

THE great objects to which every public speaker should direct his attention, in forming his delivery, are, first, to speak so as to be fully and easily understood by his hearers; and next, to express himself with such grace and energy, as to please and to move them.

To be fully and easily understood, the chief requisites are, a due degree of loudness of voice, distinctness, slowness, and propriety of pronunciation.)

To be heard is undoubtedly the first requisite. The speaker must endeavor to fill with his voice the space occupied by the assembly. Though this power of voice is in a great measure a natural talent, it may receive considerable assistance from art. Much depends on the proper pitch and management of the voice. Every man has three pitches in his voice; the high, the middle, and the low. The high is used in calling aloud to some one at a distance; the low approaches to a whisper; the middle is that, which is employed in common conversation, and which should generally be used in public speaking. For it is a great error to suppose, that the highest pitch of the voice is requisite, to be well heard by a great assembly. This is confounding two things materially different, loudness or strength of sound, with the key or note on which we speak. The voice may be rendered louder without altering the key; and the speaker will always be able to give most body, most persevering force of sound, to that pitch of voice, to which, in conversation, he is accustomed. Whereas, if he begin on the highest key, he will fatigue him-

self a. 'speak with pain ; and, wherever a man speaks with pain to himself, he is always heard with pain by his audience. Give the voice, therefore, full strength and swell of sound, but always pitch it on your ordinary speaking key ; a greater quantity of voice should never be uttered, than can be afforded without pain, and without any extraordinary effort. To be well heard, it is useful for a speaker to fix his eye on some of the most distant persons in the assembly, and to consider himself as speaking to them. We naturally and mechanically utter our words with such strength, as to be heard by one, to whom we address ourselves, provided he be within the reach of our voice. This is the case in public speaking, as well as in common conversation. But it must be remembered, that speaking too loudly is peculiarly offensive. The ear is wounded, when the voice comes upon it, in rumbling, indistinct masses ; beside, it appears, as if assent were demanded, by mere vehemence and force of sound.

To being well heard, and clearly understood, distinctness of articulation is more conducive, perhaps, than mere loudness of sound. The quantity of sound, requisite to fill even a large space, is less than is commonly supposed ; with distinct articulation, a man of a weak voice will make it extend farther, than the strongest voice can reach without it. This therefore demands peculiar attention. The speaker must give every sound its due proportion, and make every syllable, and even every letter be heard distinctly. To succeed in this, rapidity of pronunciation must be avoided. A lifeless, drawling method, however, is not to be indulged. To

pronounce with a proper degree of slowness, and with full and clear articulation, cannot be too industriously studied, nor too earnestly recommended. Such pronunciation gives weight and dignity to a discourse. It assists the voice by the pauses and rests which it allows it more easily to make; and it enables the speaker to swell all his sounds with more energy and more music. It assists him also in preserving a due command of himself, whereas a rapid and hurried manner excites that flutter of spirit, which is the greatest enemy to all right execution in oratory.

To propriety of pronunciation nothing is more conducive, than giving to every word which we utter, that sound which the most polite usage appropriates to it in opposition to broad, vulgar, or provincial pronunciation. On this subject, however, written instructions avail nothing. But there is one observation which it may be useful to make. In our language, every word of more syllables than one, has one accented syllable. The genius of the language requires the voice to mark that syllable by a stronger percussive, and to pass more slightly over the rest. The same accent should be given every word in public speaking and in common discourse. Many persons err in this respect. When they speak in public and with solemnity, they pronounce differently from what they do at other times. They dwell upon syllables, and protract them; they multiply accents on the same word, from a false idea that it gives gravity and force to their discourse, and increases the pomp of public declamation. But this is one of the greatest faults which can be



committed in pronunciation; it constitutes what is termed a theatrical or mouthing manner, and gives an artificial affected air to speech, which detracts greatly from its agreeableness and its impression.

We shall now treat of those higher parts of delivery, by studying which, a speaker endeavors, not merely to render himself intelligible, but to give grace and force to what he utters. These may be comprehended under four heads, emphasis, pauses, tones, and gestures.

By emphasis is meant a fuller and stronger sound of voice, by which we distinguish the accented syllable of some word, on which we intend to lay particular stress, and to show how it affects the rest of the sentence. To acquire the proper management of emphasis, the only rule is, study to acquire a just conception of the force and spirit of those sentiments, which you are to deliver. In all prepared discourses, it would be extremely useful, if they were read over or rehearsed in private, with a view of ascertaining the proper emphasis, before they were pronounced in public; marking at the same time the emphatical words in every sentence, or at least in the most important parts of the discourse, and fixing them well in memory. A caution, however, must be given against multiplying emphatical words too much. They become striking, only when used with prudent reserve. If they recur too frequently; if a speaker attempt to render every thing which he says of high importance, by a multitude of strong emphases, they will soon fail to excite the attention of his hearers.

Next to emphasis, pauses demand attention.

They are of two kinds; first, emphatical pauses; and secondly, such as mark the distinctions of sense. An emphatical pause is made after something has been said of peculiar moment, on which we wish to fix the hearer's attention. Sometimes a matter of importance is preceded by a pause of this nature. Such pauses have the same effect with strong emphases, and are subject to the same rules; especially to the caution just now given, of not repeating them too frequently. For, as they excite uncommon attention, and consequently raise expectation, if this be not fully answered, they occasion disappointment and disgust.

But the most frequent and the principal use of pauses is, to mark the divisions of the sense, and at the same time, to permit the speaker to draw his breath; and the proper management of such pauses is one of the most nice and difficult articles in delivery. A proper command of the breath is peculiarly requisite. To obtain this, every speaker should be very careful to provide a full supply of breath for what he is to utter. It is a great mistake, to suppose that the breath must be drawn only at the end of a period, when the voice is allowed to fall. It may easily be gathered at the intervals of a period, when the voice suffers only a momentary suspension. By this management, a sufficient supply may be obtained for carrying on the longest period, without improper interruptions.

Pauses in public discourse must be formed upon the manner in which we express ourselves in sensible conversation, and not upon the stiff, artificial manner, which we acquire from perusing books according to common punctuation.

Punctuation in general is very arbitrary; often capricious and false; dictating a uniformity of tone in the pauses; which is extremely unpleasing. For it must be observed, that to render pauses graceful and expressive, they must not only be made in the right places, but also be accompanied by proper tones of voice; by which the nature of these pauses is intimated much more than by their length, which can never be exactly measured. Sometimes, only a slight and simple suspension of the voice is proper; sometimes a degree of cadence is requisite; and sometimes that peculiar tone and cadence, which mark the conclusion of a period. In all these cases, a speaker is to regulate himself by the manner in which he speaks, when engaged in earnest discourse with others.

In reading or reciting verse, there is a peculiar difficulty in making the pauses with propriety. There are two kinds of pauses, which belong to the music of verse; one at the end of a line, and the other in the middle of it. Rhyme always renders the former sensible, and compels observance of it in pronunciation. In blank verse it is less perceivable; and, when there is no suspension of the sense, it has been doubted, whether in reading such verse, any regard should be paid to the close of a line. On the stage, indeed, where the appearance of speaking in verse should be avoided, the close of such lines as make no pause in the sense, should not be rendered perceptible to the ear. On other occasions, we ought, for the sake of melody, to read blank verse in such manner, as to make each line sensible to the ear. In attempting this, however, every appearance of singsong

and tone must be cautiously avoided. The close of a line, where there is no pause in the meaning, should be marked only by so slight a suspension of sound, as may distinguish the passage from one line to another, without injuring the sense.

The pause in the middle of the line falls after the 4th, 5th, 6th, or 7th syllable, and no other. When this pause coincides with the slightest division in the sense, the line may be read with ease; as in the two first verses of Pope's *Messiah* :

Ye nymphs of Solyma, begin the song,  
To heavenly themes sublimer strains belong.

But if words, that have so intimate a connection, as not to admit even a momentary separation, be divided from each other by this cæsural pause; we then perceive a conflict between the sense and sound, which renders it difficult to read such lines gracefully. In such cases it is best to sacrifice sound to sense. For instance, in the following lines of Milton :

—————What in me is dark  
Illumine; what is low, raise and support.

The sense clearly dictates the pause after "illumine," which ought to be observed; though, if melody only were to be regarded, "illumine" should be connected with what follows, and no pause made before the 4th or 6th syllable. So also in the following line of Pope's *Epistle to Arbuthnot* :

I sit; with sad civility I read.

The ear points out the pause as falling after "sad," the fourth syllable. But to separate "sad" and "civility" would be very bad reading. The sense allows no other pause than after the

second syllable, "sit ;" which, therefore, is the only one to be observed.

We proceed to treat of tones in pronunciation, which are different both from emphasis and pauses ; consisting in the modulation of the voice, the notes or variations of sound which are employed in public speaking. (The most material instruction which can be given on this subject, is to form the tones of public speaking upon the tones of animated conversation. Every one, who is engaged in speaking on the subject which interests him nearly, has an eloquent, or persuasive tone and manner. But, when a speaker departs from his natural tone of expression, he becomes frigid and unpersuasive. Nothing is more absurd than to suppose, that as soon as a speaker ascends a pulpit, or rises in a public assembly, he is instantly to lay aside the voice with which he expresses himself in private, and to assume a new, studied tone, and a cadence, altogether different from his natural manner. This has vitiated all delivery, and has given rise to cant and tedious monotony. Let every public speaker guard against this error. Whether he speak in private, or in a great assembly, let him remember that he still speaks. Let him take nature for his guide, and she will teach him to express his sentiments and feelings, in such manner, as to make the most forcible and pleasing impression upon the minds of his hearers.

It now remains to treat of gesture, or what is called action, in public discourse. The best rule is, attend to the looks and gesture, in which earnestness, indignation, compassion, or any other emotion, discovers itself to most ad-

vantage in the common intercourse of men; and let these be your model.) A public speaker must, however, adopt that manner which is most natural to himself. His motions and gestures ought all to exhibit that kind of expression which nature has dictated to him; and, unless this be the case, no study can prevent their appearing stiff and forced. But, though nature is the basis on which every grace of gesture must be founded, yet there is room for some improvements of art. The study of action consists, chiefly in guarding against awkward and disagreeable motions, and in learning to perform such as are natural to the speaker, in the most graceful manner. Numerous are the rules which writers have laid down for the attainment of a proper gesticulation. But written instructions on this subject can be of little service. To become useful, they must be exemplified. A few of the simplest precepts, however, may be observed with advantage. Every speaker should study to preserve as much dignity as possible in the attitude of his body. He should generally prefer an erect posture; his position should be firm, that he may have the fullest and freest command of all his motions. If any inclination be used, it should be toward the hearers, which is a natural expression of earnestness. The countenance should correspond with the nature of the discourse; and, when no particular emotion is expressed, a serious and manly look is always to be preferred. The eyes should never be fixed entirely on any one object, but move easily round the audience. In motion, made with the hands, consists the principal part of gesture, in speaking. It is natural for the right

hand to be employed more frequently than the left. Warm emotions require the exercise of them both together. But, whether a speaker gesticulate with one, or with both his hands, it is important that all his motions be easy and unrestrained. Narrow and confined movements are usually ungraceful; and consequently motions made with the hands, should proceed from the shoulder, rather than from the elbow. Perpendicular movements are to be avoided. Oblique motions, are most pleasing and graceful. Sudden and rapid motions, are seldom good. Earnestness can be fully expressed without their assistance.

We cannot conclude this subject, without earnestly admonishing every speaker to guard against affectation, which is the destruction of good delivery. (Let his manner, whatever it be, be his own; neither imitated from another, nor taken from some imaginary model, which is unnatural to him.) Whatever is native, though attended by several defects, is likely to please, because it shows us the man; and because it has the appearance of proceeding from the heart. To attain a delivery, extremely correct and graceful, is what few can expect; since so many natural talents must concur in its formation. But to acquire a forcible and persuasive manner, is within the power of most persons. They need only to dismiss bad habits, follow nature, and speak in public as they do in private, when they speak in earnest, and from the heart.

### QUESTIONS,

1. What are the *great objects* to which every public speaker should direct his attention, in forging his delivery? 2. What are the *chief requisites* to be

fully and easily understood? 3. What is meant by *emphasis*? 4. What is the rule for acquiring the proper *management of emphasis*? 5. How many *kinds of pauses* are there? 6. What are they? 7. What is an *emphatical pause*? 8. How must *pauses in public discourses* be *formed*? 9. How many *kinds of pauses* are there which belong to the *music of verse*? 10. What are they? 11. What *instruction* can be given on the subject of *tonis in pronunciation*? 12. What is the *best rule* for looks and gestures? 13. What *manner* must a public speaker adopt? 14. What is necessary to acquire a *forcible and persuasive manner of speaking*?



### MEANS OF IMPROVING IN ELOQUENCE.

TO those who are anxious to excel in any of the higher kinds of oratory, nothing is more necessary than to cultivate habits of the several virtues, and to refine and improve their moral feelings. A true orator must possess generous sentiments, warm feelings, and a mind turned toward admiration of those great and high objects which men are by nature formed to venerate. Connected with manly virtues, he should possess strong and tender sensibility to all the injuries, distresses, and sorrows of his fellow creatures.

Next to moral qualifications, what is most requisite for an orator, is a fund of knowledge. There is no art by which eloquence can be taught in any sphere, without a sufficient acquaintance with what belongs to that sphere. Attention to the ornaments of style can only assist an orator in setting off to advantage the stock of materials which he possesses; but the materials themselves must be derived from other



sources than from rhetoric. A pleader must make himself completely acquainted with the law; he must possess all that learning and experience which can be useful for supporting a cause, or convincing a judge. A preacher must apply himself closely to the study of divinity, of practical religion, of morals, and of human nature; that he may be rich in all topics of instruction and persuasion. He who wishes to excel in the supreme council of the nation, or in any public assembly, should be thoroughly acquainted with the business that belongs to such assembly; and should attend with accuracy to all the facts which may be the subject of question or deliberation.

Beside the knowledge peculiar to his profession, a public speaker should be acquainted with the general circle of polite literature. Poetry he will find useful for embellishing his style, for suggesting lively images or pleasing illusions. History may be still more advantageous; as the knowledge of facts, of eminent characters, and of the course of human affairs, finds place on many occasions. Deficiency of knowledge, even in subjects not immediately connected with his profession, will expose a public speaker to many disadvantages, and give his rivals who are better qualified, a decided superiority.

To every one who wishes to excel in eloquence, application and industry cannot be too much recommended. Without this it is impossible to excel in any thing. No one ever became a distinguished pleader, or a preacher, or speaker, in any assembly, without previous labor and application. Industry, indeed, is not only necessary to every valuable acquisition, but it

is designed by Providence as the seasoning of every pleasure, without which life is doomed to languish. No enemy is so destructive both to honorable attainments, and to the real and spirited enjoyment of life, as that relaxed state of mind which proceeds from indolence and dissipation. He who is destined to excel in any art, will be distinguished by enthusiasm for that art; which, firing his mind with the object in view, will dispose him to relish every necessary labor. This was the characteristic of the great men of antiquity; and this must distinguish moderns who wish to imitate them. This honorable enthusiasm should be cultivated by students in oratory. If it be wanting to youth, manhood will flag exceedingly.

Attention to the best models contributes greatly to improvement in the arts of speaking and writing. Every one, indeed, should endeavor to have something that is his own, that is peculiar to himself, and will distinguish his style. Genius is certainly depressed, or want of it betrayed, by slavish imitation. Yet no genius is so original, as not to receive improvement from proper examples in style, composition, and delivery. They always afford some new ideas, and serve to enlarge and correct our own. They quicken the current of thought, and excite emulation.

In imitating the style of a favorite author, a material distinction should be observed between written and spoken language. These are, in reality, two different modes of communicating ideas. In books we expect correctness, precision, all redundancies pruned, all repetitions avoided, language completely polished. Speaking allows a more easy, copious style, and less

confined by rule; repetitions may often be requisite; parentheses may sometimes be ornamental; the same thought must often be placed in different points of view; since the hearers can catch it only from the mouth of the speaker, and have not the opportunity, as in reading, of turning back again, and of contemplating what they do not entirely comprehend. Hence, the style of many good authors would appear stiff, affected, and even obscure, if transferred into popular oration. How unnatural, for instance, would Lord Shaftesbury's sentences sound in the mouth of a public speaker? Some kinds of public discourse, indeed, such as that of the pulpit, where more accurate preparation and more studied style are allowable, would admit such a manner better than others, which are expected to approach nearer to extemporaneous speaking. But still there is generally such a difference between the composition intended only to be read, and one proper to be spoken, as should caution us against a close and improper imitation.

The composition of some authors approaches nearer to the style of speaking than that of others; and they may, therefore, be imitated with more safety. In our own language, Swift and Bolingbroke are of this description. The former, though correct, preserves the easy and natural manner of an unaffected speaker. The style of the latter is more splendid; but still it is the style of speaking, or rather of declamation.

Frequent exercise, both in composing and speaking, is a necessary mean of improvement. That kind of composition is most useful which

is connected with the profession, or sort of public speaking, to which persons devote themselves. This they should ever keep in view, and gradually inure themselves to it. At the same time they should be cautious not to allow themselves to compose negligently on any occasion. He who wishes to write or speak correctly, should in the most trivial kind of composition, in writing a letter, or even in common conversation, study to express himself with propriety. By this we do not mean that he is never to write or speak but in elaborate and artificial language. This would introduce stiffness and affectation, infinitely worse than the greatest negligence. But we must observe, that there is in every thing a proper and becoming manner; and, on the contrary, there is also an awkward performance of the same thing. The becoming manner is often the most light and seemingly most careless; but taste and attention are requisite to seize the just idea of it. That idea, when acquired, should be kept in view, and upon it should be formed whatever we write or speak.

Exercises in speaking have always been recommended to students; and when under proper regulation, must be of great use. Those public and promiscuous societies in which numbers are brought together, who are frequently of low stations and occupations; who are connected by no common bond of union, except a ridiculous rage for public speaking, and have no other object in view than to exhibit their supposed talents; are institutions not only useless but injurious. They are calculated to become seminaries of licentiousness, petulance, and fac-

tion. Even the allowable meetings into which students of oratory may form themselves, need direction in order to render them useful. If their subjects of discourse be improperly chosen; if they support extravagant or indecent topics; if they indulge themselves in loose and flimsy declamation; or accustom themselves without preparation to speak pertly on all subjects; they will unavoidably acquire a very faulty and vicious taste in speaking. It should therefore be recommended to all those who are members of such societies, to attend to the choice of their subjects; to take care that they be useful and manly, either connected with the course of their studies, or related to morals and taste, to action and life. They should also be temperate in the practice of speaking; not speak too often, nor on subjects of which they are ignorant; but only when they have proper materials for a discourse, and have previously considered and digested the subject. In speaking, they should be cautious always to keep good sense and persuasion in view, rather than a show of eloquence. By these means they will gradually form themselves to a manly, correct and persuasive manner of speaking.

It may now be asked, of what use will the study of critical and rhetorical writers be to those who wish to excel in eloquence? They certainly ought not to be neglected; and yet, perhaps, very much cannot be expected from them. It is, however, from the original ancient writers that the greatest advantage may be derived; and it is a disgrace to any one whose profession calls him to speak in public, to be unacquainted with them. In all the ancient

rhetorical writers there is indeed one defect ; they are too systematical. They aim at doing too much ; at reducing rhetoric to a perfect art, which may even supply invention with materials on every subject ; so that one would suppose they expected to form an orator by rule, as they would form a carpenter. But, in reality, all that can be done is to assist and enlighten taste, and to point out to genius the course it ought to hold.

Aristotle was the first who took rhetoric out of the hands of the sophists, and founded it on reason and solid sense. Some of the profoundest observations which have been made on the passions and manners of men, are to be found in his *Treatise on Rhetoric* ; though in this, as in all his writings, his great conciseness often renders him obscure. The Greek rhetoricians who succeed him, most of whom are now lost, improved on his foundation. Two of them still remain, Demetrius Phalereus, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Both wrote on the construction of sentences, and deserve to be consulted ; particularly Dionysius, who is a very accurate and judicious critic.

To recommend the rhetorical writings of Cicero, is superfluous. Whatever on the subject of eloquence is suggested by so great an orator, must be worthy of attention. His most extensive work on this subject, is that *de Oratore*. None of his writings are more highly finished than this treatise. The dialogue is polite ; the characters are well supported, and the management of the whole is beautiful and pleasing. The *Orator ad M. Brutum* is also a valuable treatise ; and indeed through all Cicero's rhet-

orical works are displayed those sublime ideas of eloquence which are calculated to form a just taste, and to inspire that enthusiasm for the art which is highly conducive to excellence.

But of all ancient writers on the subject of oratory, the most instructive and most useful is Quintilian. His Institutions abound with good sense, and discover a taste in the highest degree just and accurate. Almost all the principles of good criticism are found in them. He has well digested the ancient ideas concerning rhetoric, and has delivered his instructions in elegant and polished language.

### QUESTIONS.

1. What is necessary to excel in any of the higher kinds of oratory? 2. What next to moral qualities is most requisite? 3. From what authors may the greatest advantages be derived, for improvement in speaking? 4. What defect is there in all the ancient rhetorical writings? 5. Who was the first that founded rhetoric on reason and solid sense? 6. Who was the most instructive and most useful of the ancient writers on oratory?



### COMPARATIVE MERIT OF THE ANCIENTS AND MODERNS.

A VERY curious question has been agitated, with regard to the comparative merit of the ancients and moderns. In France, this dispute was carried on with great heat, between Boileau and Madame Dacier, for the ancients, and Perrault and La Motte, for the moderns. Even at this day, men of letters are divided on the subject. A few reflections upon it may be useful.

To decry the ancient classics is a vain attempt. Their reputation is established upon too solid a foundation to be shaken. Imperfections may be traced in their writings ; but to discredit their works in general, can belong only to peevishness or prejudice. The approbation of the public through so many centuries, establishes a verdict in their favor, from which there is no appeal.

In matters of mere reasoning the world may be long in error ; and systems of philosophy often have a currency for a time, and then die. But in objects of taste there is no such fallibility ; as they depend not on knowledge and science, but upon sentiment and feeling. Now the universal feeling of mankind must be right : Homer and Virgil, therefore, must continue to stand upon the same ground which they have so long occupied.

Let us guard, however, against blind veneration for the ancients, and institute a fair comparison between them and the moderns. If the ancients had the pre-eminence in genius, yet the moderns must have some advantage in all arts which are improved by the natural progress of knowledge.

Hence, in natural philosophy, astronomy, chymistry, and other sciences, which rest upon observations of facts, the moderns have a decided superiority over the ancients. Perhaps, too, in precise reasoning, philosophers of modern ages are superior to those of ancient times ; as a more extensive literary intercourse has contributed to sharpen the faculties of men. The moderns have also the superiority in history and in political knowledge ; owing to the



extension of commerce, the discovery of different countries, the superior facility of intercourse, and the multiplicity of events, and revolutions, which have taken place in the world. In poetry, likewise, some advantages have been gained, in point of regularity and accuracy. In dramatic performances, improvements have certainly been made upon the ancient models. The variety of characters is greater; greater skill has been displayed in the conduct of the plot; and a happier attention to probability and decorum. Among the ancients we find higher conceptions, greater simplicity, and more original fancy. Among the moderns, there is more of art and correctness, but less genius. But though this remark may, in general, be just, there are some exceptions from it; Milton and Shakspeare are inferior to no poets in any age.

Among the ancients, were many circumstances, favorable to the exertions of genius. They travelled much in search of learning, and conversed with priests, poets, and philosophers. They returned home full of discoveries, and fired by uncommon objects. Their enthusiasm was greater; and few being stimulated to excel as authors, their fame was more intense and flattering. In modern times good writing is less prized. We write with less effort. Printing has so multiplied books, that assistance is easily procured. Hence mediocrity of genius prevails. To rise beyond this, and to soar above the crowd, is given to few.

In epic poetry, Homer and Virgil are still unrivalled; and orators, equal to Demosthenes and Cicero, we have none. In history, we have no modern narration so elegant, so picturesque, so

animated, and interesting, as those of Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Livy, Tacitus, and Sallust. Our dramas, with all their improvements, are inferior in poetry and sentiment to those of Sophocles and Euripides. We have no comic dialogue that equals the correct, graceful, and elegant simplicity of Terence. The elegies of Tibullus, the pastorals of Theocritus, and the lyric poetry of Horace, are still unrivalled. By those, therefore, who wish to form their taste, and nourish their genius, the utmost attention must be paid to the ancient classics, both Greek and Roman.

After these reflections on the ancients and moderns, we proceed to a critical examination of the most distinguished kinds of composition, and of the characters of those writers, whether ancient or modern, who have excelled in them. Of orations and public discourses, much has already been said. The remaining prose compositions may be divided into historical writing, philosophical writing, epistolary writing, and fictitious history.

### QUESTIONS.

1. In what have the moderns a *decided superiority* over the ancients? 2. In what else have the moderns *the superiority*? 3. Why have the moderns the superiority in *history and political knowledge*? 4. What *advantages* have been gained by the moderns in *poetry*? 5. What *improvements* have they made, in *dramatic performances*? 6. What *general* remark on the comparative merits of *ancients and moderns* is made? 7. What two modern poets are *exceptions* from this general remark? 8. What circumstances among the ancients were favorable to the *exertions of genius*? 9. Who in *epic poetry* among the ancients

are unrivalled? 10. Who among their *orators*? 11. In *history*, who among the ancients excelled? 12. What ancient *dramatic* writers were there of great merit? 13. What *comic* writer of *dialogue* was there? 14. Who excelled in *elegies*, who in *pastorals*, and who in *lyric poetry*?

### HISTORICAL WRITING.

**HISTORY** is a record of truth for the instruction of mankind. Hence, the great requisites in a historian, are impartiality, fidelity and accuracy.

In the conduct of historical detail, the first object of a historian should be, to give his work all possible unity. History should not consist of unconnected parts. Its portions should be united by some connecting principle, which will produce in the mind an impression of something that is one, whole and entire. Polybius, though not an elegant writer, is remarkable for this quality.

A historian should trace actions and events to their sources. He should, therefore, be well acquainted with human nature and politics. His skill in the former, will enable him to describe the characters of individuals; and his knowledge of the latter, to account for the revolutions of government, and the operation of political causes on public affairs. With regard to political knowledge, the ancients wanted some advantages, which are enjoyed by the moderns. In ancient times there was less communication among neighboring states; no intercourse by established posts, nor by ambassadors at distant courts. Larger experience, too,

of the different modes of government has improved the modern historian, beyond the historian of antiquity.

It is however, in the form of narrative, and not by dissertation, that the historian is to impart his political knowledge. Formal discussions expose him to the suspicion of being willing to accommodate his facts to his theory. They have also an air of pedantry, and evidently result from want of art. For reflections, whether moral, political, or philosophical, may be insinuated in the body of a narrative.

Clearness, order, and connection, are primary virtues in historical narration. These are attained when the historian is complete master of his subject; can see the whole at one view; and comprehend the dependance of all its parts. History being a dignified species of composition, it should also be conspicuous for gravity. There should be nothing mean nor vulgar in the style; no quaintness, no smartness, no affectation, no wit. A history should likewise be interesting; and this is the quality which chiefly distinguishes a writer of genius and eloquence.

To be interesting, a historian must preserve a medium between rapid recital, and prolix detail. He should know when to be concise, and when to enlarge. He should make a proper selection of circumstances. These give life, body, and coloring to his narration. They constitute what is termed historical painting.

In all these virtues of narration, particularly in picturesque description, the ancients eminently excel. Hence, the pleasure of reading Thucydides, Livy, Sallust, and Tacitus. In historical painting there are great varieties.

Livy and Tacitus paint in very different ways. The descriptions of Livy are full, plain, and natural; those of Tacitus are short and bold.

One embellishment, which the moderns have laid aside, was employed by the ancients. They put orations into the mouths of celebrated personages. By these they diversified their history, and conveyed both moral and political instruction. Thucydides was the first, who adopted this method; and the orations, with which his history abounds, are valuable remains of antiquity. It is doubtful, however, whether this embellishment should be allowed to the historian; for they form a mixture, unnatural to history, of truth and fiction. The moderns are more chaste, when on great occasions, the historian delivers in his own person, the sentiments and reasonings of opposite parties.

Another splendid embellishment of history is the delineation of characters.—These are considered, as exhibitions of fine writing; and hence the difficulty of excelling in this province. For characters may be too shining and labored. The accomplished historian avoids here to dazzle too much. He is solicitous to give the resemblance in a style equally removed from meanness and affectation. He studies the grandeur of simplicity.

Sound morality should always reign in history. A historian should ever show himself on the side of virtue. It is not, however, his province, to deliver moral instructions in a formal manner. He should excite indignation against the designing and the vicious; and by appeals to the passions, he will not only improve his reader, but take away from the natural coolness of historical narration.

In modern times, historical genius has shone most in Italy. Acuteness, political sagacity, and wisdom, are all conspicuous in Machiavel, Guicciardin, Davila, Bentivoglio, and Father Paul. In Great Britain, history has been fashionable only a few years. For though Clarendon and Burnet are considerable historians, they are inferior to Hume, Robertson, and Gibbon.

The inferior kinds of historical composition, are annals, memoirs, and lives. Annals are a collection of facts in chronological order; and the properties of an annalist are fidelity and distinctness. Memoirs are a species of composition, in which an author pretends not to give a complete detail of facts, but only to record what he himself knew, or was concerned in, or what illustrates the conduct of some person, or some transaction, which he chooses for his subject. It is not, therefore expected of such a writer, that he possess the same profound research, and those superior talents, which are requisite in a historian. It is chiefly required of him, that he be sprightly and interesting. The French, during two centuries, have poured forth a flood of memoirs; the most of which are little more than agreeable trifles. We must, however, exempt from this censure, the memoirs of the Cardinal de Retz, and those of the Duke of Sully. The former join to a lively narrative, great knowledge of human nature. The latter deserve very particular praise. They approach to the usefulness and dignity of legitimate history.—They are full of virtue and good sense; and are well calculated to form both the heads and hearts of those who are de-

signed for public business, and high stations in the world.

Biography is a very useful kind of composition, less stately than history; but perhaps not less instructive. It affords full opportunity of displaying the characters of eminent men, and of entering into a thorough acquaintance with them. In this kind of writing, Plutarch excels; but his matter is better than his manner; he has no peculiar beauty nor elegance. His judgment and accuracy also are sometimes taxed. But he is a very humane writer, and fond of displaying great men in the gentle lights of retirement.

Before we conclude this subject, it is proper to observe, that of late years, a great improvement has been introduced into historical composition. More particular attention than formerly, has been given to laws, customs, commerce, religion, literature, and to every thing that shows the spirit and genius of nations. It is now conceived, that a historian ought to illustrate manners, as well as facts and events.—Whatever displays the state of mankind in different periods; whatever illustrates the progress of the human mind, is more useful than details of sieges and battles.

### QUESTIONS.

1. What is *history*?
2. What are the *great requisites* in an historian?
3. What is the *first object* of an historian in the conduct of *detail*?
4. How should an historian treat *actions* and *events*?
5. With what should an historian be *well acquainted*?
6. What advantage will an historian find from a knowledge of human nature and *politics*?
7. In what *form* is an historian to impart his *political knowl-*

edge? 8. What are reckoned *primary virtues* in historical narration? 9. When are clearness, order and connection *attained*? 10. For what else should history be *conspicuous*? 11. How can *history be interesting*? 12. In what did the ancient historians *eminently excel*? 13. What is considered another *splendid embellishment* of history? 14. Is *morality necessary* in history? 15. Where, in modern times, has *historical genius* shone most? 16. What are the *inferior kinds* of historical composition? 17. What are *Annals*? 18. What are *Memoirs*? 19. What is *Biography*? 20. Who *excels* in this species of composition? 21. What late improvement has been introduced into historical composition?

## PHILOSOPHICAL WRITING AND DIALOGUE.

OF philosophy the professed design is instruction. With the philosopher, therefore, style, form, and dress are inferior objects. But they must not be wholly neglected. The same truths and reasonings, delivered with elegance, will strike more, than in a dull and dry manner.

Beyond mere perspicuity, the strictest precision and accuracy are required in a philosophical writer; and these qualities may be possessed without dryness. Philosophical writing admits a polished, neat, and elegant style. It admits the calm figures of speech; but rejects whatever is florid and tumid. Plato and Cicero have left philosophical treatises, composed with much elegance and beauty. Seneca is too fond of an affected, brilliant, sparkling manner. Locke's *Treatise on Human Understanding*, is a model of a clear and distinct philosophical style. In the writings of Shaftesbury, on the other



hand, philosophy is dressed up with too much ornament and finery.

Among the ancients philosophical writing often assumed (the form of dialogue.) Plato is eminent for the beauty of his dialogues. In richness of imagination, no philosophic writer, ancient or modern, is equal to him. His only fault is the excessive fertility of his imagination, which sometimes obscures his judgment, and frequently carries him into allegory, fiction, enthusiasm, and the airy regions of mystical theology. Cicero's dialogues are not so spirited and characteristic as those of Plato. They are, however, agreeable, and well supported; and show us conversation, carried on among some principal persons of ancient Rome, with freedom, good breeding, and dignity. Of the light and humorous dialogue, Lucian is a model; and he has been imitated by several modern writers. Fontenelle has written dialogues, which are sprightly and agreeable; but his characters, whoever his personages be, all become Frenchmen. The divine dialogues of Dr. Henry More, amid the academic stiffness of the age, are often remarkable for character and vivacity. Bishop Berkley's dialogues are abstract, yet perspicuous.

### QUESTIONS.

1. What is the *design* of philosophy?
2. What with the philosopher are considered *inferior objects*?
3. But are style, form and dress to be *wholly neglected*?
4. What beyond perspicuity are required in a *philosophical writer*?
5. What work is a *correct model* of philosophical style?
6. What *form* did philosophical writing often assume among the ancients?
7. Who excelled for *beauty* in dialogue?
8. How do

Cicero's *dialogues* compare with Plato's? 8. What is said of the dialogues of *Lucian*? 10. Of *Fontenelle*? 11. Of Dr. Henry More? 12. Of Bishop Berkley?

### EPISTOLARY WRITING.

IN epistolary writing we expect ease and familiarity; and much of its charm depends on its introducing us into some acquaintance with the writer. Its fundamental requisites, are (nature and simplicity, sprightliness and wit.) The style of letters, like that of conversation, should flow easily. It ought to be neat and correct, but no more. Cicero's epistles (are the most valuable collection of letters, extant, in any language. They are composed with purity and elegance, but without the least affectation. Several letters of Lord Bolingbroke and of Bishop Atterbury are masterly. In those of Pope there is generally too much study; and his letters to ladies, in particular, are full of affectation. Those of Swift and Arbuthnot, are written with ease and simplicity.) Of a familiar correspondence, the most accomplished model, are the letters of Madame de Sevigné. They are easy, varied, lively and beautiful. The letters of Lady Mary Wortley Montague, are perhaps more agreeable to the epistolary style, than any in the English language.

### QUESTIONS.

1. What do we expect in epistolary writing? 2. What are its *fundamental requisites*? 3. What should be the *style* of letters? 4. What is the character of *Cicero's epistles*? 5. What of *Pope's*? 6.

What is said of the letters of *Swift and Arbuthnot*?  
 7. What is said of those of *Madame de Sevigne*? 8.  
 What is said of those of *Lady Montague*?

### FICTITIOUS HISTORY.

THIS species of composition includes a very numerous, and in general a very insignificant class of writings, called romances and novels. Of these, however, the influence is known to be great, both on the morals and taste of a nation. Notwithstanding the bad ends to which this mode of writing is applied, it might be employed for very useful purposes. Romances and novels describe human life and manners, and discover the errors into which we are betrayed by the passions. Wise men in all ages have used fables and fictions as vehicles of knowledge; and it is an observation of Lord Bacon, that the common affairs of the world are insufficient to fill the mind of man. He must create worlds of his own, and wander in the regions of imagination.

All nations whatsoever have discovered a love of fiction, and talents for invention. The Indians, Persians, and Arabians, abounded in fables and parables. Among the Greeks, we hear of the Ionian and Milesian tales. During the dark ages, fiction assumed an unusual form, from the prevalence of chivalry. Romances arose, and carried the marvellous to its summit. Their knights were patterns not only of the most heroic courage, but of religion, generosity, courtesy and fidelity; and the heroines were no less distinguished for modesty, delicacy, and

dignity of manners. Of these romances, the most perfect model is the *Orlando Furioso*. But, as magic and enchantment came to be disbelieved and ridiculed, the chivalerian romances were discontinued, and were succeeded by a new species of fictitious writing.

Of the second stage of romance writing, the *Cleopatra* of Madame Scuderi and the *Arcadia* of Sir Philip Sidney, are good examples. In these, however, there was still too large a portion of the marvellous; and the books were too voluminous and tedious. Romance writing appeared, therefore, in a new form, and dwindled down to the familiar novel. Interesting situations in real life are the groundwork of novel writing. Upon this plan, the French have produced some works of considerable merit. Such are the *Gil Blas* of Le Sage, and the *Marianne* of Marivaux.

In this mode of writing the English are inferior to the French; yet in this kind there are some performances which discover the strength of the British genius. (No fiction was ever better supported, than the adventures of *Robinson Crusoe*. Fielding's novels are highly distinguished for humor and boldness of character. Richardson, the author of *Clarissa*, is the most moral of all our novel writers; but he possesses the unfortunate talent of spinning out pieces of amusement into an immeasurable length.) The trivial performances which daily appear under the title of lives, adventures, and histories, by anonymous authors, are most insipid, and, it must be confessed, often tend to deprave the morals, and to encourage dissipation and idleness.

## QUESTIONS.

1. What kind of writings does fictitious history include? 2. What do romances and novels describe? 3. What observation has *Lord Bacon* made on the use of fictitious writing? 4. Have all nations discovered a taste for this species of composition? 5. From what circumstance did fictitious writing assume an unusual form during the dark ages? 6. What is the groundwork of novel writing? 7. Who have produced works of merit on this plan? 8. How do the *English* compare with the *French* in this mode of writing? 9. What English works of this kind are of distinguished merit? 10. What is said of the common daily works of fiction which are published at the present time?

## NATURE OF POETRY. ITS ORIGIN AND PROGRESS. VERSIFICATION.

WHAT, it may be asked, is poetry? and how does it differ from prose? Many disputes have been maintained among critics upon these questions. The essence of poetry is supposed by Aristotle, Plato, and others, to consist in fiction. But this is too limited a description. Many think the characteristic of poetry lies in imitation. But imitation of manners and characters, may be carried on in prose, as well as in poetry.

Perhaps the best definition is this, "poetry is the language of passion, or of enlivened imagination, formed most commonly into regular numbers." As the primary object of a poet is to please and to move, it is to the imagination and the passions that he addresses himself. It is by pleasing and moving, that he aims to instruct and reform.

Poetry is older than prose. In the beginning

of society there were occasions, upon which men met together for feasts and sacrifices, when music, dancing, and songs were the chief entertainment. The meetings of American tribes are distinguished by music and songs. In songs, they celebrate their religious rites and martial achievements; and in such songs we trace the beginning of poetic composition.

Man is, by nature, both a poet and musician. The same impulse which produced a poetic style, prompted a certain melody or modulation of sound, suited to the emotions of joy or grief, love or anger. Music and poetry are united in song, and mutually assist and exalt each other. The first poets sung their own verses. Hence the origin of versification, or the arrangement of words to tune or melody.

Poets and songs are the first objects that make their appearance in all nations. Apollo, Orpheus and Amphion were the first tapers of mankind among the Greeks. The Gothic nations had their scalders, or poets. The Celtic tribes had their bards. Poems and songs are among the antiquities of all countries; and, as the occasions of their being composed are nearly the same, so they remarkably resemble each other in style. They comprise the celebration of gods, and heroes, and victories. They abound in fire and enthusiasm; they are wild, irregular, and glowing.

During the infancy of poetry, all its different kinds were mingled in the same composition; but in the progress of society, poems assumed their different regular forms. Time separated into classes the several kinds of poetic composition. The ode, and the elegy, the epic poem,

and the drama, are all reduced to rule, and exercise the acuteness of criticism.

### QUESTIONS.

1. What is poetry? 2. What is the *primary object* of the poet? 3. To what does he *address* himself? 4. Which is the *oldest*, poetry or prose? 5. What is the *origin* of versification? 6. Who first made their appearance in all nations? 7. What do the poems of the ancients *comprise*? 8. What change has been produced by time in the *several kinds* of poetic composition?

### ENGLISH VERSIFICATION.

NATIONS, whose language and pronunciation were musical, rested their versification chiefly on the *qualities* of their syllables; but mere quantity has very little effect in English verse. For the difference, made between long and short syllables, in our manner of pronouncing them, is very inconsiderable.

The only perceptible difference among our syllables, arises from that strong percussion of voice, which is termed accent. This accent, however, does not always make the syllable longer, but only gives it more force of sound; and it is rather upon a certain order and succession of accented, and unaccented syllables, than upon their quantity, that the melody of our verse depends.

In the constitution of our verse, there is another essential circumstance. This is, the cesural pause, which falls near the middle of each line. This pause may fall after the fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh syllable; and by this mean, uncom-

\* quantities

mon variety and richness are added to English versification.

Our English verse is (of iambic) structure, composed of a nearly alternate succession of unaccented and accented syllables. (When the pause falls earliest, that is, after the fourth syllable, the briskest melody is thereby formed. Of this, the following lines from Pope, are a happy illustration :

On her white breast | a sparkling cross she wore,  
Which Jews might kiss | and infidels adore ;  
Her lively looks | a sprightly mind disclose,  
Quick as her eyes, | and as unfix'd as those,  
Favors to none, | to all she smiles extends,  
Oft she rejects, | but never once offends.

When the pause falls after the fifth syllable, dividing the line into two equal portions, (the melody is sensibly altered.) The verse, losing the brisk air of the former pause, becomes more smooth and flowing.

Eternal sunshine | of the spotless mind,  
Each prayer accepted, | and each wish resigned.

When the pause follows the sixth syllable, the melody becomes grave. The movement of the verse is more solemn and measured.

The wrath of Peleus' son, | the direful spring  
Of all the Grecian woes, | O goddess, sing.

The grave cadence becomes still more sensible, when the pause follows the seventh syllable. This kind of verse, however, seldom occurs ; and its effect is to diversify the melody.

And in the smooth, descriptive | murmur still,  
Long lov'd, ador'd ideas, | all adieu.

Our blank verse is a noble, bold, and disencumbered mode of versification. It is free (from the full close which rhyme forces upon the ear at the end of every couplet.) Hence it is peculiarly suited to subjects of dignity and force.



It is more favorable than rhyme to the sublime, and highly pathetic. It is the most proper for an epic poem, and for tragedy. Rhyme finds its proper place in the middle regions of poetry; and blank verse in the highest.

The present form of our English heroic rhyme, in couplets, is modern. The measure used in the days of Elizabeth, James, and Charles I. was the stanza of eight lines. Waller was the first, who introduced couplets; and Dryden established the usage. Waller smoothed our verse, and Dryden perfected it. The versification of Pope is peculiar. It is flowing, smooth, and correct, in the highest degree. He has totally thrown aside the triplets so common in Dryden. (In ease and variety) Dryden excels Pope. He frequently makes his couplets run into one another, with somewhat of the freedom of blank verse.

### QUESTIONS.

1. Upon what did nations whose language and pronunciation were *musical* rest their versification?
2. Upon what does the *melody* of English verse depend?
3. What other *essential* circumstance is there in the constitution of English verse?
4. Where *may* this pause fall?
5. What is the *structure* of English verse?
6. How is the *briskest melody* formed?
7. What is the effect when the pause falls after the *fifth syllable*?
8. When after the *sixth*?
9. When after the *seventh*?
10. What is the character of our *blank verse*?
11. From what is it *free*?
12. To what subject is it *peculiarly suited*?
13. For what is it the *most proper*?
14. Who first *introduced* couplets in poetry?
15. What is the *versification* of Pope?
16. How does Dryden *excel* Pope?

## PASTORAL POETRY.

IT was not before men had begun to assemble in great cities, and the bustle of courts and large societies was known, that pastoral poetry assumed its present form. From the tumult of a city life, men looked back with complacency to the innocence of rural retirement. In the court of Ptolemy, Theocritus wrote the first pastorals with which we are acquainted; and in the court of Augustus, Virgil imitated him.

The pastoral is a very agreeable species of poetry. It lays before us the gay and pleasing scenes of nature. It recalls objects which are commonly the delight of our childhood and youth. It exhibits a life, with which we associate ideas of innocence, peace, and leisure. It transports us into Elysian regions. It presents many objects favorable to poetry; rivers and mountains, meadows and hills, rocks and trees, flocks and shepherds void of care.

A pastoral poet is careful to exhibit whatever is most pleasing in the pastoral state. He paints its simplicity, tranquillity, innocence, and happiness; but conceals its rudeness and misery. If his pictures be not those of real life, they must resemble it. This is a general idea of pastoral poetry. But, to understand it more perfectly, let us consider, 1. The scenery; 2. The characters; and lastly, the subjects it should exhibit.

The scene must always be in the country; and the poet must have a talent for description. In this respect, Virgil is excelled by Theocritus, whose descriptions are richer and more picturesque. In every pastoral, a rural prospect should be drawn, with distinctness. It is not

enough to have unmeaning groups of roses and violets, of birds, breezes, and brooks thrown together. (A good poet gives such a landscape as a painter might copy. His objects are particularized. The stream, the rock, or the tree, so stands forth, as to make a figure in the imagination, and give a pleasing conception, of the place where we are.

In his allusions to natural objects as well as in professed descriptions of the scenery, the poet must study variety. He must diversify his face of nature by presenting us new images. He must also suit the scenery to the subject of his pastoral; and exhibit nature under such forms, as may correspond with the emotions and sentiments he describes. Thus Virgil, when he gives the lamentation of a despairing lover, communicates a gloom to the scene.

*Tantura inter densas, umbrosa cacumina, fagos,  
Assidue veniebat; ibi hæc incondita solus  
Montibus et sylvis studio jactabat inani.*

With regard to the characters in pastorals it is not sufficient, that they be persons residing in the country. Courtiers and citizens, who resort thither occasionally, are not the characters, expected in pastorals. We expect to be entertained by shepherds, or persons wholly engaged in rural occupations. The shepherd must be plain and unaffected in his manner of thinking. An amiable simplicity must be the groundwork of his character; though there is no necessity for his being dull and insipid. He may have good sense and even vivacity; tender and delicate feelings. But he must never deal in general reflections, or abstract reasonings; nor in conceits of gallantry; for these are consequences of refinement. When Aminta in Tasso is

disentangling his mistress's hair from the tree, to which a savage had bound it; he is made to say, "Cruel tree, how couldst thou injure that lovely hair, which did thee so much honor? Thy rugged trunk was not worthy of so lovely knots. What advantage have the-servants of love, if those precious chains are common to them and to trees?" Strained sentiments, like these, suit not the woods. The language of rural personages is that of plain sense and natural feeling; as in the following beautiful lines of Virgil:

*Sepibus in nostris parvam te roseida mala  
(Dux ego vester eram) vidi cum matre legentem;  
Alter ab undecimo tum me jam ceperat annus,  
Jam fragiles poteram a terra contingere ramos,  
Ut vidi, ut perii, ut me malus abstulit error!*

The next inquiry is, what are the proper subjects of pastorals? For it is not enough, that the poet give us shepherds discoursing together. Every good poem has a subject, that in some way interests us. In this lies the difficulty of pastoral writing. The active scenes of country life are too barren of incidents. The condition of a shepherd has few things in it that excite curiosity or surprise. Hence of all poems the pastoral is most meagre in subject, and least diversified in strain. Yet this defect is not to be ascribed solely to barrenness of subjects. It is in a great measure the fault of the poet. For human nature and human passions are much the same in every situation and rank of life. What a variety of objects within the rural sphere do the passions present! The struggles and ambition of shepherds; their adventures, their disquiet and felicity; the rivalry of lovers; unexpected successes and disas-

ters ; are all proper subjects for the pastoral muse. )

Theocritus and Virgil are the two great fathers of pastoral writing. For simplicity of sentiment, harmony of numbers, and richness of scenery, the former is highly distinguished. But he sometimes descends to ideas that are gross and mean, and makes his shepherds abusive and immodest. Virgil, on the contrary, preserves the pastoral simplicity without any offensive rusticity.

Modern writers of pastorals have, in general, imitated the ancient poets. Sannazarius, however, a Latin poet, in the age of Leo X. attempted a bold innovation, by composing piscatory eclogues, and changing the scene from woods to the sea, and the character from shepherds to fishermen. But the attempt was so unhappy that he has no followers. The toilsome life of fishermen has nothing agreeable to present to the imagination. Fishes and marine productions have nothing poetical in them. Of all the moderns, Gesner, a poet of Switzerland, has been the most happy in pastoral composition. Many new ideas are introduced in his Idyls. His scenery is striking, and his descriptions lively. He is pathetic, and writes to the heart. Neither the pastorals of Pope, nor of Philips, do much honor to English poetry. The pastorals of Pope are barren ; their chief merit is the smoothness of the numbers. Philips attempted to be more simple and natural, than Pope ; but wanted genius to support the attempt. His topics, like those of Pope, are beaten ; and instead of being natural or simple, he is flat and insipid. Shenstone's pastoral ballad is one of

the most elegant poems of the kind in the English language.

In latter times, pastoral writing has been extended into regular drama; and this is the chief improvement the moderns have made in it. Two pieces of this kind are highly celebrated, Guarini's *Pastor Fido*, and Tasso's *Aminta*. Both possess great beauties; but the latter is the preferable poem, because less intricate, and less affected; though not wholly free from Italian refinement. As a poem, however, it has great merit. The poetry is pleasing and gentle, and the Italian language confers on it much of that softness, which is suited to the pastoral.

The *Gentle Shepherd* of Allan Ramsay, is a pastoral drama, which will bear comparison with any composition of the kind in any language. To this admirable poem it is a disadvantage, that it is written in the old rustic dialect of Scotland, which must soon be obsolete: and it is a farther disadvantage, that it is formed so entirely on the rural manner of Scotland, that none, but a native of that country, can thoroughly understand and relish it. It is full of natural description, and excels in tenderness of sentiment. The characters are well drawn, the incidents affecting, the scenery and manners lively and just.

### QUESTIONS.

1. When did pastoral poetry assume its present form? 2. What objects does pastoral poetry lay before us? 3. What does it exhibit? 4. What objects does it present favorable to poetry? 5. Where must the scene always be laid? 6. What landscape does a good poet give? 7. How are his objects treated? 8. When must he study variety? 9. With what charac-

ter do we expect to be entertained? 10. What variety of objects within the *rural sphere* do the passions present? 11. Who are the *great fathers* of pastoral writing? 12. What is said of *Theocritus*, as a pastoral writer; and of *Virgil*? 13. What *pastoral ballad* is considered one of the most elegant poems in the English language? 14. In latter times to what has pastoral writing been extended?

### LYRIC POETRY.

THE ode is a species of poetry, which has much dignity, and in which many writers in every age have distinguished themselves. Ode in Greek is the same with song or hymn; and lyric poetry implies, that the verses are accompanied with a lyre or musical instrument. In the ode, poetry retains its first form and its original union with music. Sentiments commonly constitute its subject. It recites no action. Its spirit and the manner of its execution mark its character. It admits a bolder and more passionate strain than is allowed in simple recital. Hence the enthusiasm that belongs to it. Hence that neglect of regularity, those digressions, and that disorder, it is supposed to admit.

All odes may be classed under four denominations. 1. Hymns addressed to God, or composed on religious subjects. 2. Heroic odes, which concern the celebration of heroes, and great actions. 3. Moral and philosophical odes, which refer chiefly to virtue, friendship and humanity. 4. Festive and amorous odes, which are calculated merely for amusement and pleasure.

Enthusiasm being considered as the characteristic of the ode, it has often degenerated

into licentiousness. This species of writing has, above all others, been infected by want of order, method, and connection. The poet is out of sight in a moment. He is so abrupt and eccentric, so irregular and obscure, that we cannot follow him. It is not indeed necessary that the structure of the ode be so perfectly regular as an epic poem. But in every composition there ought to be a whole; and this whole, should consist of connected parts. The transition from thought to thought, may be light and delicate, but the connection of ideas should be preserved; the author should think, and not rave.

Pindar, the father of lyric poetry, has led his imitators into enthusiastic wildness. They imitate his disorder, without catching his spirit. In Horace's odes every thing is correct, harmonious, and happy. His elevation is moderate, not rapturous. Grace and elegance are his characteristics. He supports a moral sentiment with dignity, touches a gay one with felicity, and has the art of trifling most agreeably. His language, too, is most fortunate.

Many Latin poets of later ages have imitated him. Casimir, a Polish poet of the last century, is of this number; and discovers a considerable degree of original genius and poetic fire. He is, however, far inferior to the Roman; in graceful expression. Buchanan, in some of his lyric compositions, is very elegant and classical.

In our own language, Dryden's ode on St. Cecilia, is well known. Mr. Gray, in some of his odes, is celebrated for tenderness and sublimity; and in Dodsley's Miscellanies are several very beautiful lyric poems. Professedly Pin-



daric odes are seldom intelligible. Cowley is doubly harsh in his Pindaric compositions. His Anacreontic odes are happier; and perhaps, the most agreeable and perfect in their kind of all his poems.

### QUESTIONS.

1. What is an *ode*?
2. What is it in Greek?
3. What is *Lyric poetry*?
4. What constitutes the subject of the ode?
5. What mark its character?
6. How many kinds of *odes* are there?
7. What is the first?
8. What is the second?
9. What is the third?
10. What is the fourth?
11. What is the characteristic of an ode?
12. With what faults is this species of writing infected?
13. What should be the character of every composition?
14. Who was the father of *lyric poetry*?
15. What was his characteristic?
16. What is the character of the *odes* of Horace?



### DIDACTIC POETRY.

OF didactic poetry, it is the express intention to convey instruction and knowledge. It may be executed in different ways. The poet may treat some instructive subject in a regular form; or without intending a great or regular work, he may inveigh against particular vices, or make some moral observations on human life and characters.

The highest species of didactic poetry is a regular treatise on some philosophical, grave or useful subject. Such are the books of Lucretius de Rerum Natura, the Georgics of Virgil, Pope's Essays on Criticism, Akenside's Pleasures of the Imagination, Armstrong on Health, and

the Art of Poetry, by Horace, Vida, and Boileau.

In all such works, as instruction is the professed object, the chief merit consists in (sound thought, just principles, and apt illustrations.) It is necessary, however, that the poet enliven his lessons by (figures, incidents, and poetical painting.) Virgil, in his Georgics, embellishes the most trivial circumstances in rural life. When he teaches that the labor of the farmer must begin in the spring, he expresses himself thus :

Vere novo gelidas canis cum montibus humor  
Liquitur, et Zephyro putris se gleba resolvit ;  
Depresso incipiat jam tum mihi Taurus aratro  
Ingemere, et sulco attritus splendescere vomer.

In all didactic works such method is requisite, as will clearly exhibit a connected train of instruction. With regard to episodes and embellishments, writers of didactic poetry are indulged great liberties.—For, in a poetical performance, a continued series of instruction, without embellishment, soon fatigues. The (digressions in the Georgics of Virgil, are his principal beauties. The happiness of a country life, the fable of Aristeus, and the tale of Orpheus and Eurydice, cannot be praised too much.)

A didactic poet ought also to connect his episodes with his subject. In this, Virgil is eminent. Among modern didactic poets, Akenside and Armstrong, are distinguished. The former is rich and poetical; but the latter maintains greater equality, and more chaste and correct elegance.

Of didactic poetry, satires and epistles run into the most familiar style. Satire seems to have been at first a relict of ancient comedy,

The grossness of which was corrected by Ennius and Lucilius. At length, Horace brought it into its present form. Reformation of manners is its professed end; and vice and vicious characters are the objects of its censure. There are three different modes, in which it has been conducted by the three great and ancient satirists, Horace, Juvenal, and Persius.

The satires of Horace have not much elevation. They exhibit a measured prose. Ease and grace characterize his manner; and he glances rather at the follies and weakness of mankind, than at their vices. He smiles while he reproveth. He moralizes like a sound philosopher, but with the politeness of a courtier. Juvenal is more declamatory and serious; and has greater strength and fire. Persius has distinguished himself by a noble and sublime morality.

Poetical epistles, when employed on moral or critical subjects, seldom rise into a higher strain of poetry, than satires.—But in the epistolary form, many other subjects may be treated; as love, poetry, or elegiac. The ethical epistles of Pope are a model; and in them he shows the strength of his genius. Here he had a full opportunity for displaying his judgment and wit, his concise and happy expression, together with the harmony of his numbers. His imitations of Horace are so happy, that it is difficult to say, whether the original or the copy ought to be most admired.

Among moral and didactic writers, Dr. Young ought not to be passed over in silence. Genius appears in all his works; but his *Universal Passion* may be considered, as possessing the

full merit of that animated conciseness, particularly requisite in satirical and didactic compositions. At the same time, it is to be observed, that his wit is often too sparkling, and his sentences too pointed. In his *Night Thoughts* there is great energy of expression, several pathetic passages, many happy images, and many pious reflections. But the sentiments are frequently overstrained and turgid, and the style harsh and obscure.

### QUESTIONS.

1. What is the intention of *didactic poetry*? 2. How may it be *executed*? 3. What is the *highest species* of didactic poetry? 4. What poems of the kind can you name? 5. In what does the *chief merit* of such works consist? 6. In what way may they *enliven* his productions? 7. What method is *requisite*? 8. What are the *principal beauties* in Virgil's *Georgics*? 9. How ought a didactic poet to *connect* his episodes? 10. Who are the most distinguished *modern didactic poets*? 11. Who brought satire into its *present form*? 12. What *ethical epistles* are considered a model of that kind of writing? 13. What is said of Dr. Young's *works generally*?

### DESCRIPTIVE POETRY:

IN descriptive poetry, the highest exertions of genius may be displayed. In general, indeed, description is introduced as an embellishment, not as the subject of a regular work. It is the test of a poet's imagination, and always distinguishes an original from a second rate genius. A writer of an inferior class, sees nothing new or peculiar in the object he would paint;

his conceptions are loose and vague; and his expressions feeble and general. A true poet places an object before our eyes. He gives it the colouring of life; a painter might copy from him.

The great art of picturesque description lies in the selection of circumstances.—These ought never to be vulgar or common. They should mark strongly the object. No general description is good; all distinct ideas are formed upon particulars. There should also be uniformity in the circumstances selected. In describing a great object, every circumstance brought forward should tend to aggrandize; and in describing a gay object, all the circumstances should tend to beautify it. Lastly, the circumstances in description should be expressed with conciseness and simplicity.

The largest and fullest descriptive performances, in perhaps any language, is Thompson's Seasons; a work, which possesses very uncommon merit. The style is splendid and strong, but sometimes harsh and indistinct. He is an animated and beautiful describer; for he had a feeling heart, and a warm imagination. He studied nature with care; was enamoured of her beauties; and had the happy talent of painting them like a master. To show the power of a single well chosen circumstance in heightning a description, the following passage may be produced from his Summer, where, relating the effects of heat in the torrid zone, he is led to take notice of the pestilence that destroyed the English fleet at Carthage, under Admiral Vernon.

———You, gallant Vernon, saw  
 The miserable scene ; you, pitying saw  
 To infant weakness sunk the warrior's arm !  
 Saw the deep racking pang ; the ghastly form ;  
 The lip pale quivering, and the beamless eye  
 No more with ardour bright ; you heard the groans  
 Of agonizing ships from shore to shore ;  
 Heard nightly plung'd amid the sullen waves  
 The frequent corse.———

All the circumstances here selected, tend to heighten the dismal scene ; but the last image is the most striking in the picture.

Of descriptive narration, there are beautiful examples, in Parnell's Tale of the Hermit. The setting forth of the hermit to visit the world, his meeting a companion, and the house in which they are entertained, of the vain man, the covetous man, and the good man, are pieces of highly finished painting. But the richest and the most remarkable of all the descriptive poems in the English language, are (the Allegro and the Penseroso of Milton.) They are the storehouse, whence many succeeding poets have enriched their descriptions, and are inimitably fine poems. Take for instance, the following lines from the Penseroso :

———I walk unseen  
 On the dry, smooth shaven green,  
 To behold the wandering moon  
 Riding near her highest noon ;  
 And sit, as if her head she bow'd,  
 Steeping through a fleecy cloud.  
 Oft on a plat of rising ground  
 I hear the far off curfew sound,  
 Over some wide watered shore  
 Swinging slow with solemn roar ;  
 Or if the air will not permit,  
 Some still removed place will sit  
 Where glowing embers through the room  
 Teach light to counterfeit a gloom ;  
 Far from all resort of mirth,  
 Save the cricket on the hearth,  
 Or the bellman's drowsy charm,  
 To bless the doors from nightly harm  
 Or let my lamp at midnight hour  
 Be seen in some high lonely tower,  
 Exploring Plato, to unfold

What worlds, or what vast regions hold,  
 Th' immortal mind, that hath forsook  
 Her mansion in this fleshy nook ;  
 And of these demons, that are found  
 In fire, air, flood, or under ground.

Here are no general expressions ; all is picturesque, expressive, and concise. One strong point of view is exhibited to the reader ; and the impression made, is lively and interesting.

Both Homer and Virgil excel in poetical description. In the second *Æneid*, the sacking of Troy, is so particularly described, that the reader finds himself in the midst of the scene. The death of Priam is a master-piece of description. Homer's battles are all wonderful. Ossian, too, paints in strong colours, and is remarkable for touching the heart. He thus portrays the ruins of Balclutha ; " I have seen the walls of Balclutha ; but they were desolate.—The fire had resounded within the halls ; and the voice of the people is now heard no more. The stream of Clutha was removed from its place by the fall of the walls ; the thistle shook there its lonely head : the moss whistled to the wind. The fox looked out of the window ; the rank grass waved round his head. Desolate is the dwelling of Moina ; silence is in the house of her fathers."

Much of the beauty of descriptive poetry depends upon a proper choice of epithets. Many poets are often careless in this particular ; hence the multitude of unmeaning and redundant epithets. Hence the "*Liquidi Fontes*" of Virgil, and the "*Prata Canis Albicant Pruinis*" of Horace. To observe that water is liquid, and that snow is white, is little better than mere

tautology. Every epithet should add a new idea to the word which it qualifies. So in Milton ;

Who shall tempt with wandering feet  
The dark unbottom'd, infinite abyss ;  
And through the palpable obscure find out  
His uncouth way ; Or spread his airy flight,  
Upborne with indefatigable wings,  
Over the vast abrupt ?

The description here is strengthened by the epithets. The wandering feet, the unbottomed abyss, the palpable obscure, the uncouth way, the indefatigable wing, are all happy expressions.

### QUESTIONS.

1. What opportunity is there for *genius* in descriptive poetry ? 2. How does a *true poet* place an object ? 3. In what does the *great art* of picturesque description lie ? 4. What *should* these circumstances be ? 5. What is considered the largest and fullest *descriptive performance* in any language ? 6. What are Thompson's principal *beauties* ? 7. But what are judged the *richest* and *most remarkable* descriptive poems in the English language ? 8. What ancient writers *excel* in poetical description ? 9. On what does *much* of the *beauty* of descriptive poetry depend ?

### THE POETRY OF THE HEBREWS.

IN treating of the various kinds of poetry, that of the scriptures justly deserves a place. The sacred books present us the most ancient monuments of poetry now extant, and furnish a curious subject of criticism. They display the taste of a remote age and country. They exhibit a singular, but beautiful species of composition ; and it must give great pleasure, if we



find the beauty and dignity of style adequate to the weight and importance of the matter. Dr. Lowth's learned treatise on the poetry of the Hebrews, ought to be perused by all. It is an exceedingly valuable work, both for elegance of style, and justness of criticism. We cannot do better than to follow the track of this ingenious author.

Among the Hebrews, poetry was cultivated from the earliest times. Its general construction is singular and peculiar. It consists, in dividing every period into correspondent, for the most part into equal members, which answer to each other, both in sense and sound. In the first member of a period a sentiment is expressed; and in the second, the same sentiment is amplified; or repeated in different terms, or sometimes contrasted with its opposite. Thus, "Sing unto the Lord a new song; sing unto the Lord, all the earth. Sing unto the Lord, and bless his name; show forth his salvation from day to day. Declare his glory among the heathen; his wonders among all people."

This form of poetical composition is deduced from the manner in which the Hebrews sang their sacred hymns. These were accompanied with music, and performed by bands of singers and musicians, who alternately answered each other.—One band began the hymn thus; "The Lord reigneth, let earth rejoice;" and the chorus or semi-chorus, took up the corresponding versicle; "Let the multitudes of the isles be glad thereof."

But, independent of its peculiar mode of construction, the sacred poetry is distinguished by the highest beauties of strong, concise, bold, and

figurative expression. Conciseness and strength are two of its most remarkable characters. The sentences are always short. The same thought is never dwelt upon long. Hence the sublimity of the Hebrew poetry; and all writers, who attempt the sublime, might profit much by imitating in this respect, the style of the Old Testament. No writings abound so much in bold and animated figures, as the sacred books. Metaphors, comparisons, allegories, and personifications, are particularly frequent. But, to relish these figures justly, we must transport ourselves into Judea, and attend to particular circumstances in it. Through all the region, little or no rain falls in the summer months. Hence, to represent distress, frequent allusions are made to a dry and thirsty land where no water is; and hence to describe a change from distress to prosperity, their metaphors are founded on the falling of showers, and the bursting out of springs in a desert. Thus, in Isaiah, "The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad, and the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose. For in the wilderness shall waters break out, and streams in the desert; and the parched ground shall become a pool; and the thirsty land springs of water; in the habitation of dragons there shall be grass, with rushes and reeds."

Comparisons, employed by the sacred poets, are generally short, touching only one point of resemblance. Such is the following: "He that ruleth over men, must be just, ruling in the fear of God; and he shall be as the light of the morning, when the sun riseth: even a morning

without clouds ; as the tender grass, springing out of the earth by clear shining, after rain."

Allegory is likewise frequently employed in the sacred books ; and a fine instance of this occurs in the lxxxth Psalm, wherein the people of Israel are compared to a vine. Of parables, the prophetic writings are full ; and, if to us they sometimes appear obscure, we should remember, that in early times it was universally the custom among all eastern nations, to convey sacred truths under mysterious figures.

The figure, however, which elevates beyond all others, the poetical style of the scriptures, is personification. The personifications of the inspired writers exceed, in force and magnificence, those of all other poets. This is more particularly true, when any appearance or operation of the Almighty is concerned. "Before him went the pestilence. The waters saw thee, O God, and were afraid. The mountains saw thee, and they trembled. The overflowings of the waters passed by ; the deep uttered his voice, and lifted up his hands on high." The poetry of the scriptures is very different from modern poetry. It is the burst of inspiration. Bold sublimity, not correct elegance, is its character.

The several kinds of poetry, found in scripture, are chiefly the didactic, elegiac, pastoral and lyric. The book of Proverbs is the principal instance of the didactic species of poetry. Of elegiac poetry, the lamentation of David over Jonathan, is a very beautiful instance. Of pastoral poetry, the Song of Solomon is a high exemplification ; and of lyric poetry, the Old Tes-

tament is full. The whole book of Psalms is a collection of sacred odes.)

Among the composers of the sacred books, there is an evident diversity of style. Of the sacred poets, the most eminent are (the author of the book of Job, David, and Isaiah.) In the compositions of David there is a great variety of manner. In the soft and tender he excels; and in his Psalms are many lofty passages. But in strength of description he yields to Job; in sublimity, to Isaiah. Without exception, Isaiah is the most sublime of all poets. Dr. Lowth compares Isaiah to Homer, Jeremiah to Simonides; and Ezekiel to Eschylus. Among the minor prophets, Hosea, Joel, Micah, Habakkuk, and especially Nahum, are distinguished for poetical spirit. In the prophecies of Daniel and Jonah, there is no poetry.

The book of Job is extremely ancient; the author uncertain; and it is remarkable, that it has no connection with the affairs or manners of the Hebrews. It is the most descriptive of all the sacred poems. A peculiar glow of fancy and strength of description, characterize the author; and no writer abounds so much in metaphors. He renders visible, whatever he treats. The scene is laid in the land of Uz; or Idumea, which is a part of Arabia; and the imagery employed, differs from that which is peculiar to the Hebrews.

### QUESTIONS:

1. Where do we find the most ancient monuments of poetry? 2. When was poetry first cultivated among the Hebrews? 3. In what does the construction of Hebrew poetry consist? 4. From what is

the form of poetical composition deduced? 5. By what else is the poetry of scripture distinguished? 6. What are two of its most remarkable characters? 7. What is the figure which elevates beyond all other the poetical style of the scriptures? 8. What are the several kinds of poetry in scripture? 9. In what books are these several kinds found? 10. Who are reckoned the most eminent of the sacred poets? 11. What is said of the book of Job?

---

### EPIC POETRY.

(OF all poetical works, the epic poem is the most dignified.) To contrive a story which is entertaining, important and instructive; to enrich it with happy incidents; to enliven it by a variety of characters and descriptions; and to maintain a uniform propriety of sentiment, and a due elevation of style, are the highest efforts of poetical genius.

(An epic poem is the recital of some illustrious enterprise in a poetical form.) Epic poetry is of a moral nature, and tends to the promotion of virtue. With this view, it acts by extending our ideas of perfection, and exciting admiration. Now this is accomplished only by proper representations of heroic deeds and virtuous characters. Valor, truth, justice, fidelity, friendship, piety, and magnanimity, are objects, which the epic muse presents to our minds in the most splendid and honorable colors.

Epic composition is distinguished from history by its poetical form, and its liberty of fiction. It is a more calm composition than tragedy. It requires a grave, equal, and supported dignity. On some occasions it demands the pathetic and the violent; and it embraces a greater compass

of time and action, than dramatic writing admits. The action or subject of an epic poem, must have three properties. It must be one; it must be great; it must be interesting. One action or enterprise must constitute its subject. Aristotle insists on unity, as essential to epic poetry; because independent facts never affect so deeply, as a tale that is one and connected. Virgil has chosen for his subject the establishment of Æneas in Italy; and the anger of Achilles, with its consequences, is the subject of the Iliad.

It is not, however, to be understood, that epic unity excludes all episodes. On the contrary, critics consider them as great ornaments of epic poetry. They diversify the subject, and relieve the reader by shifting the scene. Thus Hector's visit to Andromache in the Iliad, and Erminia's adventure with the shepherd, in the seventh book of the Jerusalem, afford us a well judged and pleasing retreat from camps and battles.

Secondly, the subject of an epic poem must be so great and splendid, as to fix attention, and to justify the magnificent apparatus the poet bestows on it. The subject should also be of ancient date. Both Lucan and Voltaire have transgressed this rule. By confining himself to strictly to historical truth, the former does not please; and the latter has improperly mingled well known events with fictitious. Hence they exhibit not that greatness which the epic requires.

The third requisite in an epic subject is, that it be interesting. This depends in a great measure upon the choice of it. But it depends much more upon the skilful management of the

poet. He must so frame his plan, as to comprehend many affecting incidents. He must sometimes dazzle with valiant achievement; sometimes he must be awful and august; often tender and pathetic; and he must sometimes give us gentle and pleasing scenes of love, friendship, and affection.

(To render the subject interesting, much also depends upon the dangers and obstacles which must be encountered.) It is by the management of these, that the poet must rouse attention, and hold his reader in suspense and agitation.

(It is generally supposed by critics, that an epic poem should conclude successfully; as an unhappy conclusion depresses the mind.) Indeed, it is on the prosperous side, that epic poets generally conclude. But two authors of great name, Milton and Lucan, hold the contrary course. The one concludes with the subversion of Roman liberty; and the other with the expulsion of man from Paradise.

(No precise boundaries can be fixed for the duration of the epic action.) The action of the Iliad lasts, according to Bossu, only forty seven days. The action of the Odyssey extends to eight years and a half; and that of the Æneid includes about six years.

The personages in an epic poem, should be proper and well supported. They should display the features of human nature; and may admit different degrees of virtue, and even vice; though the principal characters should be such as will raise admiration and love. Poetic characters are of two sorts, general and particular. General characters, are such, as are wise, brave, and virtuous, without any further distinc-

tion. Particular characters express the species of bravery, of wisdom, and of virtue, for which any one is remarkable. In this discrimination of characters, Homer excels. Tasso approaches the nearest to him in this respect; and Virgil is the most deficient.

Among epic poets it is the practice to select some personage as the hero of the tale. This renders the unity of the subject more perfect, and contributes highly to the interest and perfection of this species of writing. It has been asked, who then is the hero of *Paradise Lost*? The devil, say some critics, who affect to be pleasant against Milton. But they mistake his intention, by supposing, that whoever is triumphant, in the close, must be the hero of the poem. For Adam is Milton's hero; that is, the capital and most interesting figure in his poem.

In epic poetry, there are besides human characters, gods, and supernatural beings. This forms what is called the machinery of epic poetry; and the French suppose this essential to the nature of an epic poem. They hold, that in every epic composition, the main action is necessarily carried on by the intervention of gods. But there seems to be no solid reason for their opinion.—Lucan has no gods, nor supernatural agents. The author of *Leonidas* also has no machinery.

But though machinery is not absolutely necessary to the epic plan, it ought not to be totally excluded from it. The marvellous has a great charm for most readers. It leads to sublime description, and fills the imagination. At the same time it becomes a poet to be temperate in the use of supernatural machinery; and so to



employ the religious faith or superstition of his country, as to give an air of probability to events, most contrary to the common course of nature.

With regard to the allegorical personages, fame, discord, love, and the like, they form the worst kind of machinery. In description they may sometimes be allowed; but they should never bear any part in the action of the poem. As they are only mere names of general ideas, they ought not to be considered as persons; and cannot mingle with human actors, without an intolerable confusion of shadows with realities.

In the narration of the poet, it is of little consequence, whether he relate the whole story in his own character, or introduce one of his personages to relate a part of the action that passed before the poem opens. Homer follows one method in his Iliad, and the other in his Odyssey. It is to be observed, however, that if the narrative be given by any of the actors, it gives the poet greater liberty of spreading out such parts of the subject, as he inclines to dwell upon in person, and of comprising the rest within a short recital. When the subject is of great extent, and comprehends the transactions of several years, as in the Odyssey and Æneid, this method seems preferable. But when the subject is of smaller compass and shorter duration, as in the Iliad and Jerusalem, the poet may, without disadvantage, relate the whole in his own person.

What is of most importance in the narration is, that it be perspicuous, animated, and enriched with every poetic beauty. No sort of com-

position requires more strength, dignity, and fire, than an epic poem. It is the region in which we look for every thing sublime in description, tender in sentiment, and bold or lively in expression. The ornaments of epic poetry, are grave and chaste. Nothing loose, ludicrous, or affected, finds place there. All the objects it presents, ought to be great, tender, or pleasing. Descriptions of disgusting or shocking objects are to be avoided; hence the fable of the Harpies in the *Æneid*, and the allegory of Sin and Death, in *Paradise Lost*, should have been omitted.

### QUESTIONS.

1. What kind of poetical works is *most dignified*?
2. What is an *epic poem*?
3. What is the *nature and tendency* of epic poetry?
4. With this view, how does it *act* upon the mind?
5. What objects does the *epic muse* present to our minds?
6. How is epic composition *distinguished* from history?
7. How *many properties* must the action or subject of an epic poem have; and what are they?
8. Does *epic unity* exclude episodes?
9. Why should the subject be *great and splendid*?
10. Should the subject be of ancient or modern date?
11. Upon what does the *interesting* property of subject in an epic poem depend?
12. Upon what does it *depend* besides the choice of it?
13. How is the poet to *rouse* attention and hold the reader in *suspense and agitation*?
14. How should an epic poem *conclude*?
15. Can the *duration* of action be *fixed* by precise boundaries?
16. What should be the *personages* of an epic poem?
17. What should they *display*?
18. Of how many sorts are poetic character?
19. What are *general* characters?
20. What are *particular* characters?
21. What is the *practice* among epic poets of some personage?
22. Who is the *hero* of Milton's *Paradise Lost*?
23. What forms the *machinery* of epic poetry?

24. Is this machinery *essential* in epic poetry? 25. Is it *necessary*? 26. What use should be made of *allegorical personages*? 27. How should the *narration* be conducted? 28. What is of most *importance* in *narration*?

### HOMER'S ILIAD AND ODYSSEY.

THE father of epic poetry is Homer; and in order to relish him, we must divest ourselves of modern ideas of dignity and refinement, and transport our imagination almost three thousand years back in the history of mankind. The reader is to expect a picture of the ancient world. The two great characters of Homer's poetry, are fire and simplicity. But, to have a clear idea of his merit, let us consider the Iliad under the three heads of the subject or action, the characters, and the narration.

The subject of the Iliad is happily chosen. For no subject could be more splendid than the Trojan war. A great confederacy of the Grecian states, and ten years siege of Troy, must have spread far abroad the renown of many military exploits, and given an extensive interest to the heroes, who were concerned in them. Upon these traditions, Homer grounded his poem; and, as he lived two or three centuries after the Trojan war, he had full liberty to intermingle fable with history. He chose not, however, the whole Trojan war for his subject; but with great judgment, selected the quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon, which includes the most interesting period of the war. He has thus given greater unity to his poem. He has

gained one hero, or principal character, that is, Achilles; and shown the pernicious effects of discord among confederated princes.

The praise of high invention has in every age been justly given to Homer. (His incidents, speeches, characters, divine and human; his battles, his little history pieces of the persons slain, discover a boundless invention. Nor is his judgment less worthy of praise. His story is conducted with great art.) He rises upon us gradually. His heroes are introduced with exquisite skill to our acquaintance. The distress thickens, as the poem advances; every thing serves to aggrandize Achilles, and to make him the capital figure.

In characters, Homer is (without a rival.) He abounds in dialogue and conversation, and this produces a spirited exhibition of his personages. This dramatic method, however, though more natural, expressive, and animated, is less grave and majestic, than narrative. Some of Homer's speeches are unseasonable, and others trifling. With the Greek vivacity, he has also some of the Greek loquacity.

In no character, perhaps, does he display greater art, than in that of Helen. (Notwithstanding her frailty and crimes, he contrives to make her an interesting object. The admiration, with which the old generals behold her, when she is coming toward them; her veiling herself and shedding tears in the presence of Priam; her grief at the sight of Menelaus; her upbraiding of Paris for his cowardice, and her returning fondness for him, are exquisite strokes, and worthy of a great master.

Homer has been accused of making Achilles

too brutal a character ; and critics seem to have adopted this censure from two lines of Horace ;

*Impiger, iracundus, inexorabilis, acer,  
Jura negat sibi nata ; nihil non arrogat armis.*

It appears that Horace went beyond the truth. Achilles is passionate ; but he is not a contemner of law. He has reason on his side ; for though he discovers too much heat, it must be allowed, that he had been notoriously wronged. Beside bravery and contempt of death, he has the qualities of openness and sincerity. He loves his subjects, and respects the gods.

He is warm in his friendships ; and throughout, he is high spirited, gallant, and honourable.

Homer's gods make a great figure ; but his machinery was not his own invention. He followed the traditions of his country.

But though his machinery is often lofty and magnificent, yet his gods are often deficient in dignity. They have all the human passions ; they drink, and feast, and are vulnerable, like men. While, however, he at times degrades his divinities, he knows how to make them appear with most awful majesty. Jupiter, for the most part, is introduced with great dignity ; and several of the most sublime conceptions in the Iliad are founded on the appearances of Neptune, Minerva, and Apollo.

The style of Homer is easy, natural, and highly animated. Of all the great poets, he is the most simple in his style and resembles most the style of the poetical parts of the Old Testament. Pope's translation of him affords no idea of his manner. His versification, however, is allowed to be uncommonly melodious, and

to carry beyond that of any poet, resemblance of sound to sense.

In narration, Homer is (always concise and descriptive.) He paints his objects in a manner to our sight. His battles are singularly admirable. We see them in all their hurry, terror, and confusion. In similies no poet abounds so much. His comparisons, however, taken in general, are not his greatest beauties; they come upon us in too quick succession; and often disturb his narration or description. His lions, bulls, eagles, and herds of sheep, recur too frequently.

The criticism of Longinus upon the *Odyssey*, is not without foundation; that in this poem Homer may be likened to the setting sun, whose grandeur remains without the heat of his meridian beams. It wants the vigor and sublimity of the *Iliad*; yet possesses so many beauties, as to be justly entitled to high praise. It is a very amusing poem, and has much greater variety than the *Iliad*. It contains many interesting stories and pleasing pictures of ancient manners. Instead of the ferocity which pervades the *Iliad*, it presents us most amiable images of humanity and hospitality. It entertains us with many a wonderful adventure, and many a landscape of nature; and instructs us by a rich vein of morality and virtue, running through every part of the poem.

There are some defects, however, in the *Odyssey*. Many of its scenes fall below the majesty of an epic poem. The last twelve books are, in many places, languid and tedious, and perhaps, the poet is not happy in the discovery of Ulysses to Penelope. She is too cautious

and distrustful ; and we meet not that joyous surprise, expected on such an occasion.

### QUESTIONS.

1. Who is the father of *epic poetry* ? 2. How can we be able to *relish* him ? 3. What are the two great characters of his poetry ? 4. Was the *subject* of the Iliad well *chosen* ? 5. What was it ? (The quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon.) 6. In what did Homer discover his *invention* ? 7. In what is his *judgment* pre-eminant ? 8. How are his heroes introduced ? 9. How is Homer in *characters* ? 10. In what *character* does he discover singular *art* ? 11. What is the management of his *machinery* ? 12. What is the *style* of Homer ? 13. What is the character of his *narration* ? 14. What are *defects* of the Odyssey ?



### THE ÆNEID OF VIRGIL.

THE distinguishing excellencies of the Æneid are (elegance and tenderness.) Virgil is less animated and less sublime than Homer; but he has fewer negligences, greater variety, and more dignity. The Æneid has all the correctness and improvements of the Augustan age. We meet no contention of heroes about a female slave; no violent scolding, nor abusive language; but the poem opens with the utmost magnificence.

The subject of the Æneid, which is (the establishment of Æneas in Italy) is extremely happy. Nothing could be more interesting to the Romans, than Virgil's deriving their origin from so famous a hero as Æneas. The object was splendid itself; it gave the poet a theme, taken

from the traditional history of his country; it allowed him to adopt Homer's mythology; and afforded him frequent opportunities of glancing at all the future great exploits of the Romans, and of describing Italy in its ancient and fabulous state.

Unity of action is perfectly preserved in the Æneid. The settlements of Æneas in Italy by order of the gods, is constantly kept in view. The episodes are properly linked to the main subject, and the nodus or intrigue of the poem is happily formed.) The wrath of Juno, who opposes Æneas, gives rise to all his difficulties, and connects the human with the essential operations, through the whole poem.

Great art and judgment are displayed in the Æneid; but even Virgil is not without his faults. One is, that he has ~~so~~ few marked characters. Achates, Cloanthus, Gyas, and other Trojan heroes, who accompanied Æneas into Italy, are undistinguished figures. Even Æneas himself is not a very interesting hero. He is described, indeed, as pious and brave; but his character is not marked by those strokes that touch the heart. The character of Dido is the best supported in the whole Æneid. Her warmth of passion, keenness of resentment, and violence of character, exhibit a more animated figure than any other Virgil has drawn.

The management of the subject, also, is in some respects exceptionable. The six last books received not the finishing hand of the author; and, for this reason, he ordered his poem to be committed to the flames. The wars with the Latins are in dignity inferior to the more interesting objects previously presented to us;



and the reader is tempted to take part with Turnus against Æneas.

The principal excellency of Virgil, and what he possesses beyond all poets, is tenderness. His soul was full of sensibility. He felt himself all the affecting circumstances in the scenes he describes; and knew how, by a single stroke, to reach the heart. In an epic poem, this merit is next to sublimity. The second book of the *Æneid*, is one of the greatest master pieces ever executed. The death of old Priam, and the family pieces of Æneas, Anchises, and Creusa, are as tender as can be conceived. In the fourth book, the unhappy passion and death of Dido are admirable. The interview of Æneas with Andromache and Helenus, in the third book; the episodes of Pallas and Evander, of Nisus and Euryalus, of Lausus and Mezentius, are all striking instances of the power of raising the tender emotions. The best and most finished books are the first, second, fourth, sixth, seventh, eighth, and twelfth.)

Virgil's battles are, in fire and sublimity, far inferior to Homer's. But in one important episode, the descent into hell, he has outdone Homer in the *Odyssey*, by many degrees. There is nothing in all antiquity, equal in its kind to the sixth book of the *Æneid*. The scenery, the objects, and the description are great, solemn and sublime.

With regard to the comparative merit of these two great princes of epic poetry, it must be allowed that Homer was the greater genius, and Virgil the more correct writer. Homer is more original, and more bold, more sublime and more forcible. In judgment they are both em-

inent. Homer has all the Greek vivacity; Virgil all the Roman stateliness. The imagination of Homer is the most copious; that of Virgil the most correct. The strength of the former lies in warming the fancy; that of the latter in touching the heart. Homer's style is more simple and animated; Virgil's more elegant and uniform.

### QUESTIONS.

1. What are the distinguishing excellencies of the *Æneid*? 2. What is the *subject* of it? 3. What is said of the *unity* of the action? 4. What is said of the *intrigue* of the poem? 5. What is said of the *episodes*? 6. Has Virgil many distinguished *characters*? 7. Which is his *best* character? 8. What is the *principal excellency* of Virgil? 9. Which are his *best* and *most finished* books? 10. How do Virgil's *battles* compare with Homer's? 11. In what *episode* has Virgil excelled Homer?



### LUCAN'S PHARSALIA.

LUCAN is inferior to Homer and Virgil; yet he deserves attention. There is little invention in his *Pharsalia*; and it is conducted in too historical a manner to be strictly epic. It may be arranged, however, in the epic class, (as it treats of great and heroic adventures.) The subject of the *Pharsalia*, has all the epic dignity and grandeur; and it possesses unity of object, viz. the triumph of Cæsar over Roman liberty.

But, though the subject of Lucan is confessedly heroic, it has two defects. Civil wars present objects too shocking for epic poetry, and

furnish odious and disgusting views of human nature.) But Lucan's genius seems to delight in savage scenes.

The other defect of Lucan's subject is, that it was too near the time in which he lived. This deprived him of the assistance of fiction and machinery; and thereby rendered his work less splendid and amusing. (The facts, on which he founds his poem, were too well known, and too recent, to admit fables and the interposition of gods.)

The characters of Lucan are drawn with spirit and force. But, though Pompey is his hero, he has not made him very interesting. He marks not Pompey by any high distinction, either for magnanimity or valor. He is always surpassed by Cæsar. Cato is Lucan's favorite character; and, whenever he introduces him, he rises above himself.

In managing his story, Lucan confines himself too much to chronological order. This breaks the thread of his narration, and hurries him from place to place. He is also too digressive; frequently quitting his subject, to give us some geographical description, or philosophical disquisition.

There are several poetical and spirited descriptions in the Pharsalia; but the strength of this poet does not lie either in narration or description. His narration is often dry and harsh; his descriptions are often overwrought, and employed on disagreeable objects. His chief merit consists in his sentiments; which are noble, striking, glowing, and ardent. He is the most philosophical, and the most patriotic poet of antiquity. He was a stoic; and the spirit of that

philosophy breathes through his poem. He is elevated and bold ; and abounds in well timed exclamations and apostrophes.

As his vivacity and fire are great, he is apt to be carried away by them. His great defect is want of moderation. He knows not where to stop. When he would aggrandize his objects, he becomes timid and unnatural. There is much bombast in his poem. His taste is marked with the corruption of his age ; and, instead of poetry, he often exhibits declamation.

On the whole, however, he is an author of lively and original genius. His high sentiments, and his fire, serve to atone for many of his defects. His genius had strength, but no tenderness nor amenity. Compared with Virgil, he has more fire and sublimer sentiments ; but in every thing else, falls infinitely below him, particularly in purity, elegance, and tenderness.

Statius, and Silius Italicus, though poets of the epic class, are too inconsiderable for particular criticism.

### QUESTIONS.

1. Is Lucan equal to *Homer* and *Virgil*? 2. What entitles his *Pharsalia* to a place among epic poems? 3. What is the *subject* of it? 4. What *two defects* has the subject? 5. What other defect is there in the subject? 6. How are his *characters drawn*? 7. What defect is there in the *management* of the story? 8. In what does his *chief merit* consist? 9. What is his *great defect*? 10. How does Lucan compare with *Virgil*?

### TASSO'S JERUSALEM.

JERUSALEM DELIVERED, is a strictly regular epic poem, and abounds with beauties. The subject

The recovery of Jerusalem from infidels, by the united powers of Christendom. The enterprise was splendid, venerable, and heroic; and an interesting contrast is exhibited between the Christians and Saracens. Religion renders the subject august, and opens a natural field for machinery and sublime description. The action, too, lies in a country, and in a period of time, sufficiently remote to admit an intermixture of fable with history.

Rich invention is a capital quality in Tasso. He is full of events, finely diversified. He never fatigues his reader by mere war and fighting. He frequently shifts the scene; and from camps and battles, transports us to more pleasing objects. Sometimes the solemnities of religion; sometimes the intrigues of love; at other times the adventures of a journey, or the incidents of pastoral life, relieve and entertain the reader. The work, at the same time, is artfully connected; and, in the midst of variety, there is perfect unity of plan.

Many characters enliven the poem; and these distinctly marked and well supported. Godfrey, the leader of the enterprise, is prudent, moderate, and brave; Tancred, amorous, generous, and gallant. Rinaldo, who is properly the hero of the poem, is passionate and resentful, but full of zeal, honor, and heroism. Solyman is high minded; Erminia tender; Armida, artful and violent, and Clorinda, masculine. In drawing characters, Tasso is superior to Virgil, and yields to no poet but Homer.

He abounds in machinery. When celestial beings interpose, his machinery is noble. But devils, enchanters, and conjurers, act too great

a part throughout his poem.) In general, the marvellous is carried to extravagance. The poet was too great an admirer of the romantic spirit of knight errantry.

In describing magnificent objects, his style is firm and majestic. In gay and pleasing description, it is soft and insinuating. Erminia's pastoral retreat in the seventh book, and the arts and beauty of Armida in the fourth book, are exquisitely beautiful. His battles are animated, and properly varied by incidents. (It is rather by actions, characters, and descriptions, that he interests us, than by the sentimental part of his work.) He is far inferior to Virgil in tenderness; and, when he aims at being sentimental and pathetic, he is apt to become artificial.

It has often been objected to Tasso, that he abounds in point and conceit; but this censure has been carried too far. For, in his general character, he is masculine and strong. The humor of decrying him, passed from the French critics to those of England. But their strictures are founded either in ignorance or prejudice. For the *Jerusalem* is, in my opinion, the third regular epic poem in the world; and stands next to the *Iliad* and *Æneid*. (In simplicity and fire, Tasso is inferior to Homer; in tenderness to Virgil; in sublimity to Milton; but for fertility of invention, variety of incidents, expression of characters, richness of description, and beauty of style, no poet, except the three just named, can be compared to him.)

### QUESTIONS.

1. What kind of a poem is Tasso's *Jerusalem Delivered*?
2. What is the subject of it?
3. What

renders the subject *august*? 4. What is the *capital quality* of Tasso? 5. What *enliven* the poem? 6. What is said of the *machinery* used in this poem? 7. How does Tasso chiefly *interest us*? 8. What rank does Dr. Blair assign to the *Jerusalem*? 9. How does Tasso compare with *Homer, Virgil* and *Milton*?

### THE LUSIAD OF CAMOENS.

THE Portuguese boast of Camoens, as the Italians do of Tasso. The discovery of the East Indies by Vasco de Gama, an enterprise alike splendid and interesting, is the subject of the poem of Camoens. The adventures, distresses, and actions of Vasco and his countrymen, are well fancied and described; and the *Lusiad* is conducted on the epic plan. The incidents of the poem are magnificent; and, joined with some wildness and irregularity, there is displayed in it much poetic spirit, strong fancy, and bold description. In the poem, however, there is no attempt toward painting characters. Vasco is the hero, and the only personage that makes any figure.

The machinery of the *Lusiad* is perfectly extravagant; being formed of an odd mixture of Christian ideas and Pagan mythology. Pagan divinities appear to be the deities; and Christ and the Holy Virgin to be inferior agents. One great object, however, of the Portuguese expedition is to extend the empire of Christianity, and to extirpate Mahometanism. In this religious undertaking the chief protector of the Portuguese is Venus, and their great adversary is Bacchus. Jupiter is introduced, as foretelling

the downfall of Mahomet. Vasco during a storm implores the aid of Christ and the Virgin ; and in return to this prayer Venus appears, and discovering the storm to be the work of Bacchus, complains to Jupiter, and procures the winds to be calmed. All this is most preposterous ; but, towards the end of his work, the poet offers an awkward apology for his mythology ; making the goddess Thetis inform Vasco, that she and the other heathen divinities are no more than names to describe the operations of Providence.

In the *Lusiad*, however, there is some fine machinery of a different kind. (The appearance of the genius of the river Ganges, in a dream to Emanuel, king of Portugal, inviting him to discover his secret springs, and acquainting him that he was the monarch, destined to enjoy the treasures of the East, is a happy idea.) But in the fifth canto, the poet displays his noblest conception of this sort, where Vasco recounts to the king of Malinda, all the wonders of his voyage. He tells him, that when the fleet arrived at the Cape of Good Hope, which had never been doubled before, by a navigator, there appeared to them suddenly a huge phantom, rising out of the sea in the midst of tempest and thunder, with a head that reached the clouds, and a countenance that filled them with terror. This was the genius of that hitherto unknown ocean ; and he menaced them in a voice of thunder for invading those unknown seas ; fortelling the calamities that were to befall them, if they should proceed ; and then with a mighty noise disappeared. This is a very solemn and striking piece of machinery ; and shows that Camoens was a poet of a bold and lofty imagination.



## QUESTIONS.

1. Of what nation was *Camoens*? 2. What was the *subject* of his *Lusiad*? 3. What is *displayed* in it? 4. Who is the *hero*? 5. What is said of the *machinery*? / 6. What *apology* does the poet make for his improper mixture of christianity and paganism? 7. What *machinery* is there of a *different* kind?



## THE TELEMACHUS OF FENELON.

IT would be unpardonable in a review of epic poets to forget the amiable Fenelon. His work, though in prose, is a poem; and the plan in general is well contrived, having epic grandeur and unity of action. He employs the ancient mythology; and excels in the application of it. There is great richness as well as beauty in his descriptions. To soft and calm scenes, his genius is more peculiarly suited; such as the incidents of pastoral life, the pleasures of virtue, or a country flourishing in peace.

His first books are eminently excellent. (The adventures of Calypso) are the chief beauty of his work. Vivacity and interest join in the narration. In the books which follow, there is less happiness in the execution; and an apparent languor. The author, (in warlike adventures) is most unfortunate.

Some critics have refused to rank this work among epic poems. Their objection arises from the minute details it exhibits of virtuous policy, and from the discourses of Mentor, which recur too frequently, and too much in the strain of common-place morality. To these peculiarities, however, the author was led by the design with which he wrote, that of forming a young

prince to the cares and duties of a virtuous monarch.)

Several epic poets have described a descent into hell; and in the prospects they have given us of the invisible world, we may observe the gradual refinement in the opinions of men, concerning a future state of rewards and punishments. Homer's descent of Ulysses into hell, is indistinct and dreary. The scene is in the country of the Cimmerians, which is always covered with clouds and darkness; and when the spirits of the dead appear, we hardly know whether Ulysses is above or below ground. The ghosts, too, even of the heroes, appear dissatisfied with their condition.

In Virgil, the descent into hell discovers great refinement, corresponding to the progress of philosophy. The objects are more distinct, grand and awful. There is a fine description of the separate mansions of good and bad spirits. Fenelon's visit of Telemachus to the shades, is still (much more philosophical) than Virgil's. He refines the ancient mythology by his knowledge of the true religion, and adorns it with that beautiful enthusiasm, for which he is so remarkable. His relation of the happiness of the just is an excellent description in the mystic strain.

### QUESTIONS.

1. What are the *chief beauties* of Telemachus? 2. In what is the author *most unfortunate*? 3. With what *design* was this poem written? 4. What is the advantage of the descent into hell over that of Homer and Virgil?

## THE HENRIADE OF VOLTAIRE.

THE *Henriade* is, without doubt, (a regular epic poem.) In several places of this work, Voltaire discovers that boldness of conception, that vivacity and liveliness of expression, by which he is so much distinguished. Several of his comparisons are new and happy. But the *Henriade* is not his master-piece. In the tragic line he has certainly been more successful, than in the epic. French versification is illy suited to epic poetry. It is not only fettered by rhyme, but wants elevation. Hence, not only feebleness, but sometimes prosaic flatness in the style. The poem consequently languishes, and the reader is not animated by that spirit which is inspired by a sublime composition of the epic kind.

(The triumph of Henry IV. over the arms of the League) is the subject of the *Henriade*. The action of the poem properly includes (only the siege of Paris.) It is an action perfectly epic; and conducted (with due regard to unity, and to the rules of critics.) But (it has great defects. It is founded on civil wars; and presents to the mind those odious objects, massacres and assassinations. It is also of too recent date, and too much within the bounds of well known history. The author has farther erred by mixing fiction with truth.) The poem, for instance, opens with a voyage of Henry's to England, and an interview between him and Queen Elizabeth; though Henry never saw England, nor ever conversed with Elizabeth. In subjects of such notoriety, a fiction of this kind shocks every intelligent reader.

A great deal of machinery is employed by

Voltaire, for the purpose of embellishing his poem. But it is of the worst kind, that of allegorical beings. Discord, cunning, and love, appear as personages, and mix with human actors. This is contrary to all rational criticism.— Ghosts, angels and devils, have a popular existence; but every one knows that allegorical beings are no more than representations of human passions and dispositions; and ought not to have place, as actors, in a poem which relates to human transactions.

(In justice, however, it must be observed, that the machinery of St. Louis possesses real dignity. The prospect of the invisible world, which St. Louis gives to Henry in a dream, is the finest passage in the *Henriade*.) Death, bringing the souls of the departed in succession before God, and the place of the destinies opened to Henry, are striking and magnificent objects.

Though some of Voltaire's episodes are properly extended, his narration is too general. The events are superficially related, and too much crowded. The strain of sentiment, however, which pervades the *Henriade* is high and noble.)

### QUESTIONS.

1. What kind of a poem is the *Henriade*? 2. What is the subject of it? 3. What does the action of it include? 4. How is it conducted? 5. What defects has it? 6. What kind of machinery is used in it? 7. Is all the machinery bad? 8. What is the defect in his narration? 9. What is said of his sentiments?

## MILTON'S PARADISE LOST.

MILTON chalked out a new and very extraordinary course. As soon as we open his Paradise Lost, we are introduced into an invisible world, and surrounded by celestial and infernal beings. Angels and devils are not his machinery, but his principal actors. What in any other work would be the marvellous, is in this the natural course of events; and (doubts may arise) whether his poem be strictly an epic composition. But whether it be so or not, it is certainly one of the highest efforts of poetical genius; and in one great characteristic of epic poetry, majesty and sublimity, is equal to any that bears this name.

The subject of his poem led Milton upon difficult ground. If it had been more human and less theological; if his occurrences had been more connected with real life; if he had afforded a greater display of the characters and passions of men; his poem would have been more pleasing to most readers. His subject, however, was peculiarly suited to the daring sublimity of his genius. As he alone was fitted for it, so he has shown in the conduct of it a wonderful stretch of imagination and invention. From a few hints, given in the Sacred Scriptures, he has raised a regular structure, and filled his poem with a variety of incidents. He is sometimes dry and harsh; and too often the metaphysician and divine. But the general tenor of his work is interesting, elevated, and affecting. The artful change of his objects, and the scene, laid now in heaven, now on earth, and now in hell, afford sufficient diversity; while unity of plan is perfectly supported. Calm scenes are exhibit-

ed in the employments of Adam and Eve, in Paradise; and busy scenes, and great actions in the enterprises of Satan, and in the wars of angels. The amiable innocence of our First Parents, and the proud ambition of Satan, afford a happy contrast through the whole poem, which gives it an uncommon charm. But the conclusion perhaps is too tragic for epic poetry.)

The subject naturally admits no great display of character; but such as could be introduced, are properly supported. Satan makes a striking figure; and is the best drawn character in the poem. Milton has artfully given him a mixed character, not altogether void of some good qualities. He is brave, and faithful to his troops. Amid his impiety he is not without remorse. He is even touched with pity for our First Parents; and from the necessity of his situation justifies his design against them. He is actuated by ambition and resentment, rather than by pure malice. The characters of Belzebub, Moloch, and Belial, are well painted. The good angels, though described with dignity, have more uniformity of character. Among them, however, the mild condescension of Raphael and the tried fidelity of Abdiel, form proper characteristic distinctions. The attempt to describe God Almighty himself, was too bold, and accordingly most unsuccessful. The innocence of our First Parents is delicately painted. In some speeches, perhaps, Adam appears too knowing and refined for his situation. Eve is hit off more happily. Her gentleness, modesty, and frailty, are expressively characteristic of the female character.

Milton's great and distinguishing excellence is

his sublimity. In this, perhaps, he excels even Homer. The first and second books of Paradise Lost are almost a continued series of the highest sublime. But his sublimity differs from that of Homer; which is always accompanied by impetuosity and fire. The sublime of Milton is a calm and amazing grandeur. Homer warms and hurries us along; Milton fixes us in a state of elevation and astonishment. Homer's sublimity appears most in his description of actions; Milton's in that of wonderful and stupendous objects.

But, while Milton excels most in sublimity, his work abounds in the beautiful, the pleasing and the tender. When the scene is in paradise, the imagery is gay and smiling. His descriptions show a fertile imagination; and in his similes he is remarkably happy. If faulty, it is from their too frequent allusions to matters of learning, and to ancient fables. It must also be confessed, that there is a falling off in the latter part of Paradise Lost.

The language and versification of Milton have high merit. His blank verse is harmonious and diversified; and his style is full of majesty. There may be found indeed some prosaic lines in his poem. But in a work so long and so harmonious, these may be forgiven.

Paradise Lost, amid beauties of every kind, has many inequalities. No high and daring genius was ever uniformly correct. Milton is too frequently theological and metaphysical; his words are often technical; and he is affectedly ostentatious of his learning. Many of his faults, however, are to be imputed to the pedantry of his age. He discovers a vigor, a

grasp of genius equal to every thing great ; sometimes he arises above every other poet ; and sometimes he falls below himself.

### QUESTIONS.

1. Have there been any *doubts* whether this is strictly an epic poem ? 2. What general remarks are made on this poem as an *effort* of poetical genius ? 3. Was the ground upon which he was led *difficult* ? 4. To what was his subject suited ? 5. What is the *general tenor* of his work ? 6. What is said of the *conclusion* ? 7. How are his characters *supported* ? 8. In what was the author *most unsuccessful* ? 9. In what consists his *distinguishing* excellence ? 10. In what besides sublimity does this work *abound* ? 11. What are the *faults* of Milton ? 12. To what are *many* of his faults to be imputed ?

### DRAMATIC POETRY. TRAGEDY.

IN all civilized nations, dramatic poetry has been a favorite amusement. It divides itself into the two forms of tragedy and comedy. Of these, tragedy is the most dignified ; as great and serious objects interest us more than little and ludicrous ones. The former rests on the high passions, the virtues, crimes, and sufferings of mankind ; the latter, on their humours, follies, and pleasures ; and ridicule is its sole instrument.

Tragedy is a direct imitation of human manners and actions. It does not, like an epic poem, exhibit characters by description or narration ; it sets the personages before us, and makes them act and speak with propriety. This



species of writing, therefore, requires deep knowledge of the human heart; and, when happily executed, it has the power of raising the strongest emotions.

In its general strain and spirit, tragedy is favourable to virtue. Characters of honor claim our respect and approbation; and, to raise indignation, we must paint a person in the odious colors of vice and depravity. Virtuous men indeed are often represented by the tragic poet, as unfortunate; for this happens in real life. But he always engages our hearts in their behalf; and never represents vice as finally triumphant and happy. Upon the same principle, if bad men succeed in their designs, they are yet finally conducted to punishment. It may therefore be concluded, that tragedies are moral compositions.

It is affirmed by Aristotle, that the design of tragedy is to purge our passions by means of pity and terror. But, perhaps, it would have been more accurate, to have said, that the object of this species of composition is to improve our virtuous sensibility. If a writer excite our pity for the afflicted, inspire us with proper sentiments on beholding the vicissitudes of life, and stimulate us to avoid the misfortunes of others by exhibiting their errors, he has accomplished all the moral purposes of tragedy.

In a tragedy it is necessary to have an interesting story, and that the writer conduct it in a natural and probable manner. For the end of tragedy is not so much to elevate the imagination as to affect the heart. This principle, which is founded on the clearest reason, excludes from tragedy all machinery, or fabulous

intervention of gods. Ghosts alone, from their foundation in popular belief, have maintained their place in tragedy.

To promote an impression of probability, the story of a tragedy, according to some critics, should never be a pure fiction, but ought to be built on real facts. This, however, is carrying the matter too far. For a fictitious tale, if properly conducted, will melt the heart as much as real history. Hence, the tragic poet mixes many fictitious circumstances with well known facts. Most readers never think of separating the historical from the fabulous. They attend only to what is probable, and are touched by events, that resemble nature. Accordingly some of the most affecting tragedies are entirely fictitious in their subjects. Such are the Fair Penitent, Douglas, and the Orphan.

In its origin, tragedy was rude and imperfect. Among the Greeks (it was at first nothing more than the song, which was sung at the festival of Bacchus.) These songs were sometimes sung by the whole company, and sometimes by separate bands, answering alternately to each other, and making a chorus. To give this entertainment some variety, Thespis, who lived about five hundred years before the Christian era, introduced a person between the songs, who made a recitation in verse. Eschylus, who lived fifty years after him, introduced a dialogue between two persons or actors, comprehending some interesting story; and placed them on a stage adorned with scenery. The drama now began to assume a regular form; and was soon after brought to perfection by Sophocles and Eurypides.

It thus appears that (the chorus) was the foundation of tragedy. But what is remarkable, the dramatic dialogue, which was only an addition to it, at length became the principal part of the entertainment; and the chorus, losing its dignity, came to be accounted only an accessory in tragedy. At last, in modern tragedy, it has entirely disappeared; and its absence from the stage, forms the chief distinction between the ancient and modern drama.

The chorus, it must be allowed, rendered tragedy more magnificent, instructive, and moral. But on the other hand, it was unnatural, and lessened the interest of the piece. It removed the representation from the resemblance of life. It has accordingly been with propriety excluded from the stage.

(The three unities of action, place, and time, have been considered as essential to the proper conduct of dramatic fable. Of these three, unity of action is undoubtedly most important. This consists in the relation which all the incidents introduced, bear to some design or effect, combining them naturally into one whole. This unity of subject is most essential to tragedy.— For a multiplicity of plots, by distracting the attention, prevents the passions from rising to any height. Hence the absurdity of two independent actions in the same play. There may indeed be underplots; but the poet should make these subservient to the main action. They should conspire to bring forward the catastrophe of the play.

Of a separate and independent action, or intrigue, there is a clear example in Addison's Cato. The subject of this tragedy is the death

of Cato, a noble personage, and supported by the author with much dignity. But all the love scenes in the play; the passion of Cato's two sons for Lucia, and that of Juba for Cato's daughter, are mere episodes. They break the unity of the subject, and form a very unseasonable junction of gallantry, with high sentiments of patriotism.

Unity of action must not, however, be confounded with simplicity of plot. Unity and simplicity import different things in dramatic composition. The plot is simple, when a small number of incidents is introduced into it. With respect to plots, the ancients were more simple than the moderns. The Greek tragedies appear indeed to be too naked, and destitute of interesting events. The moderns admit a much greater variety of incidents; which is certainly an improvement, as it renders the entertainment more animated and more instructive. It may, however, be carried too far; for an overcharge of action and intrigue produces perplexity and embarrassment. Of this, the *Mourning Bride* of Congreve is an example. The incidents succeed each other too rapidly; and the catastrophe, which ought to be plain and simple, is artificial and intricate.

Unity of action must be maintained, not only in the general construction of the fable, but in all the acts and scenes of the play. The division of every play into five acts is founded merely on common practice, and the authority of Horace.

*Neve minor, neu sit quinto productior actu  
Fabula.*

There is nothing in nature which fixes this rule.

On the Greek stage the division by acts was unknown. The word act never occurs once in the Poetics of Aristotle. Practice, however, has established this division; and the poet must be careful that each act terminate in a proper place. The first act should contain a clear exposition of the subject. It should excite curiosity, and introduce the personages to the acquaintance of the spectators. During the second, third, and fourth acts, the plots should gradually thicken. The passions should be kept constantly awake. There should be no scenes of idle conversation or mere declamation. The suspense and concern of the spectators should be excited more and more. This is the great excellency of Shakespeare. Sentiment, passion, pity, and terror, should pervade every tragedy.

In the fifth act, which is the seat of the catastrophe, the author should most fully display his art and genius. The first requisite is, that the unravelling of the plot be brought about by probable and natural means. Secondly, the catastrophe should be simple, depending on few events, and including but few persons. Passionate sensibility languishes when divided among many objects. Lastly, in the catastrophe, every thing should be warm and glowing; and the poet must be simple, serious, and pathetic; using no language but that of nature.

It is not essential to the catastrophe of a tragedy that it end happily. Sufficient distress and agitation, with many tender emotions may be raised, in the course of the play. But in general the spirit of tragedy leans to the side

of leaving the impression of virtuous sorrow strong upon the mind.

A curious question here occurs; how happens it, that the emotions of sorrow in tragedy afford gratification to the mind? It seems to be the constitution of our nature, that all the social passions should be attended with pleasure. Hence nothing is more pleasing than love and friendship. Pity is, for wise ends, a strong instinct; and it necessarily produces some distress on account of its sympathy with sufferers. The heart is at the same moment warmed by kindness, and afflicted by distress. Upon the whole, the state of the mind is agreeable. We are pleased with ourselves, not only for our benevolence, but for our sensibility. The pain of sympathy is also diminished by recollecting that the distress is not real; and by the power of action and sentiment, of language and poetry.

After treating of the acts of a play, it is proper to notice the scenes. The entrance of a new person upon the stage, forms what is called a new scene. These scenes or successive conversations, should be closely connected; and much of the art of dramatic composition consists in maintaining this connection. For this purpose two rules must be observed. 1. During the course of one act the stage should never be left empty a moment, for this would make a gap in the representation. Whenever the stage is evacuated, the act is closed. This rule is generally observed by French tragedians; but it is much neglected by the English. 2. No person should come upon the stage, or leave it, without some apparent reason. If this rule be neglected, the dramatis personæ are little bet-

ter than so many puppets ; for the drama professes imitation of real transactions.

To unity of action, critics have added the unities (of time and place.) Unity of place, requires the scene never to be shifted ; that the action of the play continue in the same place where it began. Unity of time, strictly taken, requires that the time of the action be no longer, than the time allowed for the representation of the play. Aristotle, however, permits the action to comprehend a whole day. These rules are intended to bring the imitation nearer to reality.

Among the Greeks there was no division of acts. In modern times the practice has prevailed of suspending the spectacle some little time between the acts. This practice gives latitude to the imagination, and renders strict confinement to time and place less necessary. Upon this account, therefore, too strict an observance of these unities should not be preferred to higher beauties of execution, nor to the introduction of more pathetic situations. But transgressions of these unities, though they may be often advantageous, ought not to be too frequent, nor violent. Hurrying the spectator from one distant city to another, or making several days or weeks pass during the representation, would shock the imagination too much, and therefore cannot be allowed in a dramatic writer.

Having examined dramatic action, we shall now attend to the characters, most proper to be exhibited in a tragedy. Several critics affirm that the nature of tragedy requires the principal personages to be always of high or princely rank ; as the sufferings of such persons seize

the heart most forcibly. But this is more specious than solid. For the distresses of *Désdemona*, *Monimia*, and *Belvidera*, interest us as much, as if they had been princesses or queens. It is sufficient, that in tragedy there be nothing degrading or mean in the personages exhibited. High rank may render the spectacle more splendid; but it is the tale itself, and the art of the poet, that make it interesting and pathetic.

In describing his characters, the poet should be careful so to order the incidents, which relate to them, as to impress the spectators with favourable ideas of virtue, and of the divine administration. Pity should be raised for the virtuous in distress; and the author should studiously beware of making such representations of life, as would render virtue an object of aversion.

Unmixed characters, either of good or ill men, are not, in the opinion of Aristotle, fit for tragedy. For the distresses of the former, as unmerited, hurt us; and the sufferings of the latter excite no compassion. Mixed characters afford the best field for displaying, without injury to morals, the vicissitudes of life. They interest us the most deeply; and their distresses are most instructive, when represented as springing out of their own passions, or, as originating in some weakness, incident to human nature.

The Greek tragedies are often founded on mere destiny and inevitable misfortunes. Modern tragedy aims at a higher object, and takes a wider range; as it shows the direful effects of ambition, jealousy, love, resentment, and of every strong emotion. But of all the passions which furnish matter for tragedy, love has most



occupied the modern stages. To the ancient theatre, love was almost unknown. This proceeded from the national manners of the Greeks, which encouraged a greater separation of the sexes, than takes place in modern times; and did not admit female actors upon the ancient stage; a circumstance, which operated against the introduction of love stories. (No solid reason, however, can be assigned for this predominancy of love upon the stage. Indeed it not only limits the natural extent of tragedy, but degrades its majesty. Mixing it with the great and solemn revolutions of human fortune, tends to give tragedy the air of gallantry and juvenile entertainment.) Without any assistance from love, the drama is capable of producing its highest effects upon the mind.

Beside the arrangement of his subject, and the conduct of his personages, the tragic poet must attend to the propriety of his sentiments. These must be suited to the characters of the persons, to whom they are attributed, and to the situations, in which they are placed. It is chiefly in the pathetic parts, that the difficulty and importance of this rule are greatest. We go to a tragedy, expecting to be moved; and, if the poet cannot reach the heart, he has no tragic merit; and we return cold and disappointed from the performance.

To paint and to excite passion strongly, are prerogatives of genius. They require not only ardent sensibility, but the power of entering deeply into characters. It is here, that candidates for the drama are least successful. A man, under the agitation of passion, makes known his feelings in the glowing language of

sensibility. He does not coolly describe what his feelings are, yet this sort of secondary description, tragic poets often give us, instead of the primary and native language of passion. Thus, in Addison's *Cato*, when Lucia confesses to Portius her love for him, but swears that she will never marry him; Portius, instead of giving way to the language of grief and astonishment, only describes his feelings :

Fix'd in astonishment, I gaze upon thee.  
 Like one just blasted by a stroke from heaven,  
 Who pants for breath, and stiffens yet alive  
 In dreadful looks; a monument of wrath.

This might have proceeded from a bystander, or an indifferent person; but it is altogether improper in the mouth of Portius. Similar to this descriptive language, are the unnatural and forced thoughts, which tragic poets sometimes employ, to exaggerate the feelings of persons, whom they wish to paint, as strongly moved. Thus, when Jane Shore on meeting her husband in distress, and finding that he had forgiven her, calls on the rains to give her their drops, and to the springs to lend her their streams, that she may have a constant supply of tears; we see plainly that it is not Jane Shore that speaks; but the poet himself, who is straining his fancy, and spurring up his genius to say something uncommonly strong and lively.

The language of real passion is always plain and simple. It abounds indeed in figures, that express a disturbed and impetuous state of mind, but never employs any for parade and embellishment. Thoughts, suggested by passion, are natural and obvious; and not the offspring of refinement, subtilty and wit. Passion neither reasons, speculates, nor declaims; its language

is short, broken, and interrupted. The French tragedians deal too much in refinement and declamation. The Greek tragedians adhere most to nature, and are most pathetic. This too is the great excellency of Shakspeare. He exhibits the true language of nature and passion.

Moral sentiments and reflections ought not to recur very frequently in tragedy. When unseasonably crowded, they lose their effect, and convey an air of pedantry. When introduced with propriety, they give dignity to the composition. Cardinal Wolsey's soliloquy on his fall, is a fine instance of the felicity with which they may be employed. Much of the merit of Addison's Cato depends on that moral turn of thought which distinguishes it.

The style and versification of tragedy should be free, easy, and varied. English blank verse is happily suited to this species of composition. It has sufficient majesty, and can descend to the simple and familiar; it admits a happy variety of cadence, and is free from the constraint and monotony of rhyme. Of the French tragedies it is a great misfortune, that they are always in rhyme. For it fetters the freedom of the tragic dialogue, fills it with a languid monotony, and is fatal to the power of passion.

With regard to those splendid comparisons in rhyme, and those strings of couplets, with which it was some time ago fashionable to conclude the acts of tragedy, and sometimes the most interesting scenes; they are now laid aside, and regarded not only as childish ornaments, but as perfect barbarisms.

## QUESTIONS.

1. How many kinds are there of *dramatic poetry*?
2. Which of them is the most *dignified*?
3. On what does tragedy rest?
4. On what does comedy rest?
5. Of what is tragedy an *imitation*?
6. How does it exhibit characters?
7. What is the effect of tragedy upon virtue?
8. What does Dr. Blair consider the *object* of tragedy?
9. What are the *moral purposes* of tragedy?
10. What *machinery* does tragedy admit?
11. What was tragedy among the *Greeks*?
12. What was the *foundation* of tragedy?
13. What was the effect of the *chorus* upon tragedy?
14. What have been considered essential to the *proper conduct* of dramatic fable?
15. Which of *these three* is most important?
16. In what does the *unity of action* consist?
17. Are *unity of action* and *simplicity of plot* the same?
18. When is the *plot simple*?
19. How must *unity of action* be maintained?
20. Upon what is the division of every play into *five acts* founded?
21. What should the *first act* contain?
22. What is said of the plots during the second, third, and fourth acts?
23. What is said of the *fifth act*?
24. What is the *first requisite*?
25. How should the *catastrophe* be?
26. Must tragedy end *happily*?
27. How can the emotions of sorrow in tragedy afford gratification to the mind?
28. How should the *scenes* of a play be conducted?
29. What have critics added to the *unity of action*?
30. What does *unity of place* require?
31. What does *unity of time* require?
32. What *personages* should have place in tragedy?
33. How should *characters* be described?
34. Are *unmixed characters* fit for tragedy?
35. What passion has most occupied the *modern stages*?
36. Can any reason be assigned for the *predominancy* of love upon the stage?
37. What is the effect of it upon *tragedy*?
38. To what besides the arrangement of his subject must the *tragic poet* attend?
39. How must sentiments be managed?
40. How will a man, under the agitation of passion, make known his feelings?
41. How is the language of *real passion*?

42. What should be the *style* and *versification* of tragedy? 43. What kind of *verse* is best suited to tragedy?

### GREEK TRAGEDY.

THE plot of Greek tragedy was exceedingly simple; the incidents few; and the conduct very exact with regard to the unities of action, time and place. Machinery, or the intervention of gods, was employed; and what was very faulty, the final unravelling was sometimes made to turn upon it. Love, one or two instances excepted, was never admitted into Greek tragedy. A vein of morality and religion always runs through it; but they employed less than the moderns, the combat of the passions. Their plots were all taken from the ancient traditionary stories of their own nation.

(Eschylus, the father of Greek tragedy, exhibits both the beauties and defects of an early original writer. He is bold, nervous, and animated; but very obscure, and difficult to be understood.) His style is highly metaphorical, and often harsh and tumid. He abounds in martial ideas and descriptions, has much fire and elevation, and little tenderness. He also delights in the marvellous.

The most masterly of the Greek tragedians is (Sophocles.) He is the most correct in the conduct of his subjects; the most just and sublime in his sentiments. In descriptive talents he is also eminent. Eurypides is accounted more tender than Sophocles; he is fuller of moral sentiments; but he is less correct in the con-

duct of his plays.) His expositions of his subjects are less artful; and the songs of his chorus, though very poetic, are less connected with the principal action, than those of Sophocles. Both of them, however, have high merit, as tragic poets. Their style is elegant and beautiful; and their sentiments for the most part just. They speak with the voice of nature; and in the midst of simplicity they are touching and interesting.

Theatrical representation, on the stages of Greece and Rome, was in many respects very singular, and widely different from that of modern times. The songs of the chorus were accompanied by instrumental music; and the dialogue part had a modulation of its own, and might be set to notes. It has also been thought, that on the Roman stage, the pronouncing and gesticulating parts were sometimes divided, and performed by different actors. The actors in tragedy wore a long robe; they were raised upon cothurni, and played in masks; these masks were painted; and the actor by turning the different profiles, exhibited different emotions to the auditors. This contrivance, however, was attended by many disadvantages.

### QUESTIONS.

1. Who was the *father* of Greek tragedy? 2. What was his character in this species of composition? 3. How is his *style*? 4. In what does he *abound*? 5. In what does he *delight*? 6. Who is reckoned the most *masterly* of the Greek tragedians? 7. How do Eurypides and Sophocles compare? 8. What are their *merits* as tragic poets?

## FRENCH TRAGEDY.

IN the compositions of some French dramatic writers, tragedy has appeared with great lustre ; particularly (Corneille, Racine and Voltaire.) They have improved upon the ancients, by introducing more incidents, a greater variety of passions, and a fuller display of characters. Like the ancients, they excel (in regularity of conduct,) and their style is poetical and elegant. But, to an English taste, they want strength and passion, and are too declamatory and refined. They seem afraid of being too tragic ; and it was the opinion of Voltaire, that, to the perfection of tragedy, it is necessary to unite the vehemence and action of the English theatre, with the correctness and decorum of the French.

(Corneille, the father of French tragedy, is distinguished by majesty of sentiment, and fruitful imagination. His genius was rich, but more turned to the epic, than the tragic vein. He is magnificent and splendid, rather than touching and tender. He is full of declamation, impetuous and extravagant.

In tragedy, (Racine) is superior to Corneille. He wants, indeed, the copiousness of Corneille ; but he is free from his bombast, and excels him greatly in tenderness. The beauty of his language and versification is uncommon ; and he has managed his rhymes with superior advantage.

Voltaire is not inferior to his predecessors in the drama ; and in one article he has outdone them ; the delicate and interesting situations he has introduced. Here lies his chief strength. Like his predecessors, however, he is some-

times deficient in force and sometimes too declamatory. His characters, notwithstanding, are drawn with spirit, his events are striking, and his sentiments elevated.

### QUESTIONS.

1. What distinguished *French dramatic writers* have there been? 2. How have they *improved upon the ancients*? 3. In what do they *excel*? 4. Who was the father of *French tragedy*? 5. What was the *genius of Corneille*? 6. What was his character as a dramatic writer? 7. Who among the *French* is *superior to Corneille*? 8. How does *Racine* compare with *Corneille*? 9. What is his *language*? 10. How does *Voltaire* compare with the other *French dramatic writers* named? 11. How are his characters *drawn*?

### ENGLISH TRAGEDY.

IT has often been remarked of tragedy in Great Britain, that it is more ardent than that of France, but more irregular and incorrect. It has, therefore, excelled in the soul of tragedy. For (the pathetic) must be allowed to be the chief excellence of the tragic muse.

The first object on the English theatre, is the great Shakspeare. In extent and force of genius, both for tragedy and comedy, he is unrivalled. But, at the same time, it is genius shooting wild, deficient in taste, not always chaste, and unassisted by art and knowledge. Criticism has been exhausted in commentaries upon him; yet, to this day, it is undecided, whether his beauties or defects be greatest. In his writings there are admirable scenes and passages without num-



ber; but there is not one of his plays which can be pronounced a good one. Beside extreme irregularities in conduct, and grotesque mixtures of the serious and comic, we are frequently disturbed by unnatural thoughts, harsh expressions, and a certain obscure bombast, and play upon words. These faults are, however, compensated by two of the greatest excellencies a tragic poet can possess, his lively and diversified painting of character, and his strong and natural expressions of passion; On these two virtues his merit rests. In the midst of his absurdities, he interests and moves us; so great is his skill in human nature, and so lively his representations of it.

He possesses also the merit of having created for himself, a world of preternatural beings. His witches, ghosts, fairies, and spirits of all kinds, are so awful, mysterious, and peculiar, as strongly to affect the imagination. His two master-pieces are his Othello and Macbeth. With regard to his historical plays, they are neither tragedies, nor comedies; but a peculiar species of dramatic entertainment, in which he describes the characters, events, and manners of the times of which he treats.

(Since Shakspeare, there are few English dramatic writers, whose whole works are entitled to high praise. There are several tragedies, however, of considerable merit. (Lee's Theodosius has warmth and tenderness, though romantic in the plan, and extravagant in the sentiments. (Otway) is great in his Orphan and Venice Preserved. Perhaps, however, he is too tragic in these pieces. He had genius and strong passions, but was very indelicate.

The tragedies of (Rowe) abound in morality, and in elevated sentiments. His poetry is good, and his language pure and elegant. He is, notwithstanding, too cold and uninteresting; and flowery, rather than tragic. His best dramas are *Jane Shore*, and the *Fair Penitent*, which excel in the tender and pathetic.

(Dr. Young's *Revenge*, discovers genius and fire; but wants tenderness, and turns too much on the direful passions. In the *Mourning Bride* of Congreve, there are fine situations and much good poetry. The tragedies of (Thomson) are too full of a stiff morality, which renders them dull and formal. His *Tancred and Sigismunda* is his master-piece; and for the plot, characters, and sentiments, justly deserves a place among the best English tragedies. †

A Greek tragedy (is a simple relation of an interesting incident.) A French tragedy (is a series of artful and refined conversations.) An English tragedy (is a combat of strong passions, set before us in all their violence, producing deep disasters, and filling the spectators with grief. Ancient tragedies are more natural and simple; modern more artful and complex.)

### QUESTIONS.

1. How does English compare with French *tragedy*? 2. What is the chief excellence of the *tragic muse*? 3. Who was the *first object* on the English theatre? 4. What is said of Shakspeare, as it regards *tragedy* and *comedy*? 5. By what are the *faults* of Shakspeare *compensated*? 6. What are his principal faults? 7. Which of his plays are considered his *masterpieces*? 8. Who are some of the principal English tragic writers? 9. What is Greek

tragedy? 10. What is French tragedy? 11. What is English tragedy? 12. What is said of *ancient* and *modern* tragedies generally?

---

COMEDY.

THE strain and spirit of comedy, discriminate it sufficiently from tragedy. While pity, terror, and the other strong passions form the province of the latter, the sole instrument of the former is ridicule. (Follies and vices, and whatever in the human character is improper, or exposes to censure and ridicule, are objects of comedy. As a satirical exhibition of the improprieties and follies of men, it is useful and moral.) It is commendable by this species of composition, to correct, and to polish the manners of men. Many vices are more successfully exploded by ridicule, than by serious arguments. (It is possible, however, to employ ridicule improperly; and by its operation to do mischief instead of good.) For ridicule is far from being a proper test of truth.) Licentious writers therefore of the comic class, have often cast ridicule on objects and characters which did not deserve it. But this is not the fault of comedy, but of the turn and genius of certain writers. In the hands of loose men, comedy will mislead and corrupt; but in those of virtuous writers, it is not only a gay and innocent, but a laudable and useful entertainment. English comedy, however, is frequently a school of vice.

The rules of dramatic action, that were prescribed for tragedy, belong also to comedy. A comic writer must observe the unities of action,

time and place. He must attend to nature and probability.) The imitation of manners ought to be even more exact in comedy than in tragedy; for the subjects of comedy are more familiar and better known.

The subjects of tragedy are confined to no age nor country; but it is otherwise in comedy. For the decorums of behaviour, and the nice discriminations of character, which are the subjects of comedy, change with time and country; and are never so well understood by foreigners, as by natives. We weep for the heroes of Greece and Rome; but we are touched by the ridicule of such manners and characters only as we see and know. The scene therefore of comedy, should always be laid in the author's own country and age. The comic poet catches the manners living, as they rise.

It is true, indeed, that Plautus and Terence did not follow this rule. The scene of their comedies is laid in Greece, and they adopted the Greek laws and customs. But it is to be remembered, that comedy was in their age, a new entertainment in Rome, and that they were contented with the praise of translating Menander and other comic writers of Greece. In posterior times the Romans had the "Comedia Togata," or what was founded on their own manners, as well as the "Comedia Palliata," which was from the Greeks.

There are two kinds of comedy, that of character and that of intrigue. In the last, the plot or action of the play is the principal object. In the first, the display of a peculiar character is the chief point; and to this the action is subor-

dinate. The French abound most in comedies of character. Such are the capital pieces of Moliere. The English have inclined more to comedies of intrigue. Such are the plays of Congreve; and in general there is more story, action, and bustle in English, than in French comedy.

The perfection of comedy is to be found in a proper mixture of these two kinds. Mere conversation without an interesting story is insipid. There should ever be so much intrigue, as to excite both fears and wishes. The incidents should be striking, and afford a proper field for the exhibition of character. The piece, however, should not be overcharged with intrigue; for this would be to convert a comedy into a novel.

With respect to characters, it is a common error of comic writers to carry them much beyond real life; indeed it is very difficult to hit the precise point, where wit ends and buffoonery begins. The comedian may exaggerate; but good sense must teach him where to stop.

In comedy there ought to be a clear distinction in characters. The contrast of characters, however, by pairs, and by opposites, is too theatrical and affected. It is often the perfection of art to conceal art. A masterly writer gives us his characters, distinguished rather by such shades of diversity, as are commonly found in society, than marked by such oppositions as are seldom brought into actual contrast in any of the circumstances of life.

The style of comedy ought to be pure, lively, and elegant, generally imitating the tone of polite conversation, and never descending into

gross expressions. Rhyme is not suitable to comic composition: for, what has poetry to do with the conversation of men in common life? The current of the dialogue should be easy without pertness, and genteel without flippancy. The wit should never be studied, nor unseasonable.

### QUESTIONS.

1. What are *objects* of comedy? 2. In what is it *useful*? 3. Is ridicule ever used *improperly*? 4. Is it a proper *test* of truth? 5. What is said of *English comedy*? 6. What must a comic writer *observe*? 7. Where must the *scene* of comedy be *laid*? 8. Have all comic writers followed *this rule*? 9. How many *kinds* of comedy are there? 10. In what is the *perfection* of comedy to be *found*? 11. What is a *common error* with comic writers? 12. How does a *masterly* writer give us his characters? 13. In what *style* should comedy be written? 14. How should *wit* be introduced?

### ANCIENT COMEDY.

5 THE ancient comedy was an avowed satire against particular persons, brought upon the stage by name. Such are the plays of Aristophanes; and compositions of so singular a nature, illustrate well the turbulent and licentious state of Athens. (The most illustrious personages, generals, and magistrates, were then made the subjects of comedy. Vivacity, satire, and buffoonery, are the characteristics of Aristophanes. On many occasions he displays genius and force; but his performances give us no high idea of the attic taste for wit in his age. His

ridicule is extravagant ; his wit farcical ; his personal raillery cruel and biting ; and his obscenity intolerable.

Soon after the age of Aristophanes, the liberty of attacking persons by name, on the stage, was prohibited by law. The middle comedy then took its rise. Living persons were still attacked, but under fictitious names. Of these pieces we have no remains. They were succeeded by the new comedy ; when it became, as it is now, the business of the stage to exhibit manners and characters, but not those of particular persons. The author of this kind, most celebrated among the Greeks, was Menander ; but his writings are perished.

Of the new comedy of the ancients, the only remains are the plays of Plautus and Terence. The first (is eminent for the *vis comica*, and for an expressive phraseology.) He bears, however, many marks of the rudeness of the dramatic art, in his time. He has too much low wit and scurrility ; and is by far too quaint and full of conceit. He has more variety and force than Terence ; and his characters are strongly marked, though sometimes coarsely.

Terence is polished, delicate, and elegant. His style is a model of the most pure and graceful latinity.) His dialogue is always correct and decent ; and his relations have a picturesque and beautiful simplicity. His morality is in general unexceptionable ; his situations are interesting ; and many of his sentiments touch the heart. He may be considered as the founder of serious comedy. In sprightliness and strength he is deficient. There is a sameness in his character and plots ; and he is said to have

been inferior to Menander, whom he copied. To form a perfect comic author, (the spirit and fire of Plautus ought to be united with the grace and correctness of Terence.)

### QUESTIONS.

1. What was *ancient comedy*? 2. What were then made the *subjects* of comedy? 3. What are the *characteristics* of Aristophanes? 4. What prohibition was there upon the stage after the time of *Aristophanes*? 5. Who was *celebrated* among the Greeks as a writer of comedy? 6. What is said of Plautus? 7. What is said Terence? 8. What is reckoned necessary to form a *perfect comic* author?

### SPANISH COMEDY.

THE most prominent object in modern comedy is the Spanish theatre. The chief comedians of Spain are Lopez de Vega, Guillen, and Calderon. The first, who is the most famous of them, wrote (above a thousand) plays; and was infinitely more irregular than Shakspeare. He totally disregarded the three unities, and every established rule of dramatic writing. One play often includes many years, and even the whole life of a man. The scene, during the first act is in Spain; the next in Italy; and the third in Africa. His plays are chiefly historical; and are a mixture of heroic speeches, serious incidents, war and slaughter, ridicule and buffoonery. He jumbles together christianity and paganism, virtues and vices, angels and gods. Notwithstanding his faults, he possessed genius, and great force of imagination. Many of his characters are well painted; many of his situations are



happy; and from the source of his rich invention, dramatic writers of other nations have frequently drawn their materials. He was conscious himself of his extreme irregularities, and apologized for them from the prevailing taste of his countrymen.)

### QUESTIONS.

1. Who are the chief comedians of Spain? 2. How many *plays* did Lopez de Vega write? 3. What chiefly fill his plays? 4. Had he *genius*? 5. What apology did he make for his irregularities?

### FRENCH COMEDY.

THE comic theatre of France is allowed to be correct, chaste, and decent. The comic author in whom the French glory most, is Moliere. In the judgment of French critics, he has nearly reached the summit of perfection in his art. Nor is this the decision of mere partiality. Moliere is the satirist only of vice and folly. His characters were peculiar to his own times; and in general, his ridicule was justly directed. His comic powers were great; and his pleasantry is always innocent. His *Misanthrope*, and *Tartuffe* are in verse, and constitute a kind of dignified comedy, in which vice is exposed in the style of elegant and polite satire. In his prose comedies there is a profusion of ridicule; but the poet never gives alarm to modesty, nor casts contempt on virtue. With these high qualities, however, considerable defects are mingled. In unravelling his plots he is unhappy; as this is frequently brought on with too little preparation, and in an improbable

manner. (In his verse comedies he is not always sufficiently interesting; and he is too full of long speeches. In his risible pieces in prose he is too farcical.) But upon the whole it may be affirmed, that few writers ever attained so perfectly the true end of comedy. His *Tartuffe* and *Avare* are his two capital productions.

### QUESTIONS.

1. What is the character of the comic theatre in France? 2. Who is the most celebrated French comic author? 3. Was the praise bestowed on him by French critics just? 4. What defects has Moliere?

### ENGLISH COMEDY

FROM the English theatre is naturally expected a greater variety of original characters in comedy, and bolder strokes of wit and humor, than from any other modern stage. Humor is in some degree peculiar to England. The freedom of the government, and the unrestrained liberty of English manners, are favorable to humor and singularity of character. In France the influence of a despotic court spread uniformity over the nation. Hence comedy has a more amplified and a freer vein in Britain than in France. But it is to be regretted, that the comic spirit of Britain is often disgraced by indecency and licentiousness.

The first age, however, of English comedy was not infected by this spirit. The plays of Shakspeare and Ben Johnson have no immoral tendency. The comedies of the former display a strong, creative genius; but are irregular in

conduct. They are singularly rich in characters and manners; but often descend to please the mob.) Johnson is more regular, but stiff and pedantic; though not void of dramatic genius. Much fancy and invention, and many fine passages, are found in the plays of Beaumont and Fletcher. But, in general, they abound in dramatic incidents, unnatural characters, and coarse allusions.)

(Change of manners) has rendered the comedies of the last age obsolete. For it is the exhibition of prevailing modes and characters, that gives a charm to comedy. Thus Plautus was antiquated to the Romans in the days of Augustus. But to the honor of Shakspeare, his Falstaff is still admired, and his Merry Wives of Windsor read with pleasure.

After the restoration of Charles II. the licentiousness which polluted the court and nation, seized upon comedy. (The rake became the predominant character. Ridicule was thrown upon chastity and sobriety.) At the end of the play, indeed the rake becomes a sober man; but through the performance he is a fine gentleman, and exhibits a picture of the pleasurable enjoyments of life. This spirit of comedy had the worst effect on youth of both sexes, and continued to the days of George II.

In the comedies of Dryden, there are many strokes of genius; but he is hasty and careless. As his object was to please, he followed the current of the times, and gave way to indelicacy and licentiousness. His indecency was, at times, so gross, as to occasion a prohibition of his plays on the stage.

After Dryden, flourished (Cibber, Vanburgh, Farquhar, and Congreve.) Cibber has sprightliness and a pert vivacity; but his incidents are so forced and unnatural, that his performances have all sunk into obscurity, excepting *The Careless Husband*, and *The Provoked Husband*. Of these the first is remarkable for the easy politeness of the dialogue; and it is tolerably moral in its conduct. The latter, in which Cibber was assisted by Vanburgh, is perhaps the best comedy in the English language; and even to this it may be objected, that it has a double plot. Its characters, however, are natural, and it abounds with fine painting and happy strokes of humor.

Wit, spirit, and ease, characterize Sir John Vanburgh; but he is the most indelicate and immoral of all our comedians. Congreve undoubtedly possessed genius. He is witty and sparkling, and full of character and action. Indeed he overflows with wit; for, it is often introduced unseasonably; and, in general, there is too much of it for well bred conversation. Farquhar is a light and gay writer; less correct and less brilliant than Congreve; but he has more ease, and much of the *vis comica*. Like Congreve he is licentious; and modesty must turn from them both with abhorrence. The French boast with justice of the superior decency of their stage, and speak of the English theatre with astonishment. Their philosophical writers ascribe the profligate manners of London to the indelicacy and corruption of English comedy.

Of late years a sensible reformation has taken place in English comedy. Our writers of com-

edy now appear ashamed of the indecency of their predecessors.) They may be inferior to Farquhar and Congreve in spirit, ease and wit ; but they have the merit of being far more innocent and moral.

To the French stage we are much indebted for this reformation. The introduction within a few years of a graver comedy in France, called the serious or tender comedy, has attracted the attention and approbation of our writers. Gaiety and ridicule are not excluded from this species of comedy ; but it lays the chief stress on tender and interesting situations. It is sentimental, and touches the heart. It pleases not so much by the laughter it excites, as by the tears of affection and joy which it draws forth.

This form of comedy was opposed in France, as an unjustifiable innovation. It was objected by critics that it was not founded on laughter and ridicule ; but it is not necessary that all comedies be formed on one precise model. Some may be gay ; some serious ; and some may partake of both qualities. Serious and tender comedy has no right to exclude gaiety and ridicule from the stage. There are materials for both ; and the stage is richer for the innovation. (In general, it may be considered as a mark of increasing politeness and refinement, when these theatrical exhibitions become fashionable, which are free from indelicate sentiment and an immoral tendency.)

### QUESTIONS.

1. What is *naturally expected* from the English theatre ?
2. Why is it expected ?
3. What is to be *regretted* in English comedy ?
4. Was this the case

in the *first* age of English comedy? 5. What is said of Shakspeare's *comedies*? 6. What is said of *Johnsons* as compared with Shakspeare? 7. What is said of Beaumont and Fletcher? 8. What has rendered the comedies of the last age *obsolete*? 9. What gives a *charm* to comedy? 10. What evil was there to *comedy* on the restoration of Charles II.? 11. What is said of Dryden's *comedies*? 12. Who *flourished* after Dryden? 13. How do the present English writers of comedy view their *predecessors*? 14. What may be considered a mark of *increasing* politeness and refinement?



## CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
INTRODUCTION	5
On Taste	7
Criticism. Genius. Pleasures of Taste. Sublimity in Objects.	12
Sublimity in Writing	23
Beauty and other Pleasures of Taste	33
Origin and Progress of Language	42
Rise and Progress of Language and of Writing	52
Structure of Language	59
Structure of Language. English Tongue	64
Style. Perspicuity and Precision	73
Structure of Sentences	77
The same Subject	84
Structure of Sentences. Harmony	91
Origin and Nature of Figurative Language	98
Metaphor	104
Hyperbole	109
Personification and Apostrophe	111
Comparison, Antithesis, Interrogation, Exclamation, and other Figures of Speech	116
Antithesis	119
Interrogation and Exclamation	120
Vision	121
Climax	121
General characters of Style. Diffuse, Concise—Feeble, Nervous—Dry, Plain, Neat, Elegant, Flowery	123
Style. Simple, Affected, Vehement. Directions for forming a proper Style	130
Critical Examination of Mr. Addison's Style in No. 411 of the Spectator	138
Eloquence. Origin of Eloquence. Grecian Eloquence. Demosthenes	149
Roman Eloquence. Cicero. Modern Eloquence	155
Eloquence of Popular Assemblies	162
Eloquence of the Bar	173
Eloquence of the Pulpit	175
Conduct of a Discourse in all its Parts. Introduction, Division, Narration, and Explication	179
The Argumentative Part of a Discourse, the Pathetic Part, and the Peroration	187

	PAGE.
Pronunciation or Delivery	192
Means of Improving in Eloquence	202
Comparative Merit of the Ancients and Moderns	209
Historical Writing	213
Philosophical Writing and Dialogue	218
Epistolary Writing	220
Fictitious History	221
Nature of Poetry. Its Origin and Progress—Versification	223
English Versification	225
Pastoral Poetry	228
Lyric Poetry	232
Didactic Poetry	235
Descriptive Poetry	238
The Poetry of the Hebrews	242
Epic Poetry	247
Homer's Iliad and Odyssey	253
The Æneid of Virgil	257
Lucan's Pharsalia	260
Tasso's Jerusalem	262
The Lusiad of Camoens	265
The Telemachus of Fenelon	267
The Henriade of Voltaire	269
Milton's Paradise Lost	271
Dramatic Poetry. Tragedy	274
Greek Tragedy	287
French Tragedy	289
English Tragedy	290
Comedy	293
Ancient Comedy	296
Spanish Comedy	298
French Comedy	299
English Comedy	300