When Mrs. Elizabeth Griffith had the temerity to call Dr. Johnson to her support and say in the same breath that Garrick was a better commentator than all the editors, she disregarded plot and missed the irony as she often did, but, being an actress, she did get the cast of characters right. In the war of Actor versus Scholar, Garrick indubitably was the Actor. If the Jubilee made Shakespeare perfect, no less did it make Garrick incomparable in the literal sense of the word. As it suited the satirists to enlarge upon Shakespeare’s perfection to make their own points, so it behooved them to praise Garrick’s acting to prove his duplicity. Boswell exhausted his vocabulary in Garrick’s praise; Dibdin in his dispraise cited Boswell and said it would all be true twenty times over. As man and manager Garrick was berated, but praise of his acting reached heights hitherto unheard of in England. And, although George Steevens declared war, although Johnson’s edition became Johnson and Steevens, the Scholar was not Steevens nor any lesser light, but Johnson. Through this period of idolatry and the decentralization of critical authority, Johnson’s work, sober, scholarly, authoritarian, held its pre-eminent place. The real war was undeclared.

Two forms of literature, the common man in the course of his life really reads. We have seen the evidence of popular periodicals; let us look at textbooks. The basic curriculum had not varied for centuries when Johnson went to school, when he taught for a few dismal months at Market Bosworth Grammar
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School, when at the age of twenty-six he taught the nineteen-year-old Garrick at Edial. Changes were to come, however, and there was a period when two schools of rhetoric existed side by side, one associated in the public mind with Johnson, one associated with Garrick.

Anthony Blackwall, the honored headmaster of Market Bosworth Grammar School, died before Johnson served his brief tenure there, but An Introduction to the Classics, first published in 1718, continued in use for more than a hundred years. With sound scholarship and humanistic spirit, Blackwall transmitted certain ideas about art, language, and human nature. Johnson, in assisting Robert Dodsley with The Preceptor and in compiling the prefatory matter for his Dictionary, transmitted the same ideas.

Art is imitation of nature. The end of rhetoric is persuasion to truth. Simple numerical values govern English versification which "admits of few licenses." Metaphors are devices for saying what is not true, rationally employed so as to adorn truth and arrive at the ends of truth. The passions are the winds that move the craft, and education develops seamanship. Man must understand the forces of passion and the oblique force of metaphor, so that both, under the control of reason, will serve the individual and society. Classic writings exemplify the desired ideals; study of those writings will inculcate that order, symmetry, and devotion to public good which result from imitation of noble works. Blackwall recommended reading the moderns because they provide "a completer Notion of the Perfections and Beauties of the Ancients," saying that England had "a glorious set of poets," notably Spenser, Shakespeare, and Milton, who "always have the Ancients in view, and write with their spirit and judgment."

The specific use made of modern literature in the rhetoric texts was for illustration of rhetorical devices. Blackwall illus-
trated three (comparison, lively description, exclamation) by passages from Shakespeare, but most authors made no use of Shakespeare. Seven popular rhetorics omit his name, except where that of John Lawson used him to illustrate faults. The extreme subtlety of analysis of rhetorical devices can be seen in *The Art of Rhetoric* by Holmes, where there are 250 subdivisions. The schoolboy defined and illustrated epanadiplosis, hirmos, epizeuxis, hypertyopsis, epanastrophe, and 245 others.

In the 1730's it was a punishable offense to speak English in school hours; Addison had ridiculed the system of education that required of the soap-boiler's apprentice a smattering of Greek, and Richardson ridiculed the ignorance of the young lord with regard to his native tongue, and gradually education both for the apprentice and the lord centered more on English. Textbooks for teaching oratory were based on the same general principles as the classical rhetorics, and used the vocabulary of mechanization that neoclassicism had added to classicism. *The Preceptor* (1748) was a large and expensive compendium of general knowledge inappropriate for use as a textbook but popular with teachers. The section on "Speaking" in the first edition is an anthology of selections. The general preface warned against theatricality; the voice could be adjusted in volume, but under no circumstances should a student assume a voice other than his own. The second edition and all subsequent editions reinforced the warning with John Mason's "Rules for Action." Action (gesture) was allowed when done by rule, but acting (any assumption of character) was forbidden. Textbooks with a section on "Theatrical Declamation" took care to repeat the warning in that section. Passions were codified and imitated as rigidly as the tropes. A textbook popular in England and America, James Burgh's *Art of Speaking* (1761), gives line-by-line notes in the margin specifying which passion is to be represented. The number of passions varies in the
several editions from 81 to 98, the cross-references in one edition numbering 300. Each passion had its proper mouth position, hand position, and in some cases elbow position.

As early as 1759 Garrick inadvertently became involved in pedagogic issues when John Mason offered him as an example to the clergy in a textbook for use in Nonconformist seminaries. Mason meant only to remedy the lack of inflection, the mumbling with nose in book, but for some of his readers rhetorical effects in the pulpit were linked with the preaching done by the Methodists outside the church edifice. Warburton (who was made bishop in 1759) denounced as "deceitful and vicious" even the use of any rhetorical devices in the pulpit, for language was of rational origin, its progress has been toward abstraction, and metaphor was a primitive and defective means of communication, as were gestures and voice alterations. Thomas Leland of Dublin retorted, Bishop Hurd answered for Warburton, and Leland printed the controversy with additional arguments.5

Many earnest men suspected something morally dubious in the idea of expressive art, and James Boswell brought the matter home to the actor. Shortly after the Jubilee, disappointed in his wish to extract from Garrick a satisfactory statement of theory, he printed his own as a stopgap until such time as Garrick could be persuaded to publish his own "Theatrical Testament." "On the Profession of a Player" appeared in three numbers of the London Magazine. The first dealt with the place of the actor in society, always low until the present, but now ranking with the learned professions. Boswell thought acting should rank highest of these, for acting "required a greater share of knowledge and accomplishments, than any other profession whatever." Garrick was his proof, one of Britain’s leading citizens, an ornament and a servant of the state. The third section was a very interesting critical bibliography of readings in dramatic theory.8 The whole closed with a meditation on death as abruptly introduced as
Garrick's close of the oration, and similar to his. The second installment of the series of articles argued the case. An attempt to define the part played by the sympathetic imagination, its real interest is a moral question. Does the actor become the character he portrays? Is acting an imitative or an expressive art? Is a man's integrity violated by the assumption of a role? These problems are more than "a matter of taste." They call for "philosophical inquiry."

Johnson and Garrick disagreed on these questions. Garrick had told Boswell that the actor "is indeed in a certain sense the character he represents." Dr. Johnson had often "exerted his eloquence against this proposition." Searching for grounds of reconciliation, the Scottish lawyer found a legal loophole in Garrick's phrase "in a certain sense." Boswell is sure that acting is "something more than an imitative art," and is sure that it need not force one to adopt Hume's radical empiricism if one views acting as an expressive art. Hume's thesis that man was "nothing but a bundle of perceptions" Boswell would not allow as generally true, but it was, he thought, a precise description of that segment of the actor's mind and personality which came under the influence of his acting. Social manners are a similar assumption of a character for the approval of some audience; if the process did not go on in social meetings, "the pleasures of social intercourse would be greatly contracted."

Boswell used a figure of speech from Locke (although he did not name Locke), and based his case on his interpretation of the metaphor. Sensations, Locke said, are conducted "from without to their audience of the brain—the mind's presence-room, as I may call it." Boswell says the perceptions of external character enter the mind as sensations, and take control, but not in the presence room. The perceptions are "in an antichamber [sic] of the mind, while his own character remains in the innermost recesses of the mind." "The player himself—his own
character—still remains entire and, in the warmest scenes of the drama, can in some measure pass conscious judgment on the character which he is representing." Acting involves some danger, and lesser men may disintegrate into Hume's estimate of man; but men of firm mind can "assume an external character without modifying their own." The exercise of the sympathetic imagination was voluntary. The danger lay in the abandonment of the critical sense.

The same year Denis Diderot printed the first form of *Le Paradoxe sur le Comédiens*. In France theoretical writing by Grimm, Marmontel, Mercier, Suard, Bonnet, Ducis, Morellet, and Beaumarchais testify to the serious consideration given to Garrick. Among these writings, Diderot's essay is the masterpiece. One of Garrick's pantomimes was known by legend before he visited France in 1765. In it he portrayed a father who in playing with his child let her fall to her death in a flagged area below the window where they had been romping. It was said that Garrick's picture of the father's shock and anguish was overwhelming in its effect. Arthur Murphy tells that he saw him many times rise in company, take the back of a chair for the window sill, and re-enact the scene. Diderot had used the story to argue his case for the bourgeois drama. The form of drama, he said, should have no rules, no set principles, but should embrace all human activities, even the marvelous and the burlesque. Play and actor, free from conventions, should portray the intense reaction of the common man to the great emergencies of life, should elevate to the central position of art the communicable emotions of Man faced with a crisis, and should accomplish these ends by the means of increased sensitivity of dramatist and actor. His *Essai sur la poesie dramatique* and *Entretiens sur Le Fils Naturel* urge a style of acting which yields to the impulse of the moment and lives with complete abandon the life represented in the work.
of art. In 1758 Mme Riccoboni tried to convince him that such was not Garrick’s method, but Diderot was persuaded that no thought of art, no measured gesture, no conscious rhythm of movement was needed, only a simple reliving of the bereaved father’s anguish.

When the two men met in 1765 Garrick told him he was mistaken; he had known the father, who lived near Goodman’s Fields, and had visited him often. Driven mad by grief, the father was indeed reliving the terrible accident. The actor was committing to memory the pattern of his movements, the precise lineaments of a face turned on its inward guilt, cut off from everything but his unending wonder at so great a loss from so little a crime. Assuredly Garrick the man felt the father’s sorrow; but Garrick the actor was learning to act King Lear by calculation and discipline. To make his point, Garrick stuck his head between a pair of folding doors so Diderot saw only his face, and ran a gamut of emotions completely convincing yet completely contradictory. Diderot knew no one could feel emotions in the rapid succession of violent change in which they were manifest. Feeling is not acting; something must be added to life before art is achieved; the sympathetic imagination cannot be the whole of art.

And this is the actor’s paradox. Technical excellence must be the mirror in which life is reflected. Art may discard conventions, but it will develop new ones and establish new techniques. All art is subservient to conventions, and the substance of art will partake of the substance of the corpus juris.

Francis Gentleman the same year and in 1774 cited Garrick as founder of a school of acting based almost entirely on the sympathetic imagination. Two phrases—to create sympathy, and to create by sympathy—describe the actor’s task. If creative power is lacking, “all the adventitious aids of theatrical decoration” are vain. Gesture, cadence, deportment are not treated
as means in any positive sense; they are important only in the negative sense that an impropriety will interfere with the creation of sympathy, or the creation by sympathy. The actor's union with the role is a creative act; the projection of the role is another part of the creative process. He calls to his support Adam Smith's *Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1759): “The passions may be transferred from one person to another, instantaneously, and antecedent to any knowledge of what excited them in the persons principally concerned.” The human voice is the real instrument; Gentleman foreshadows an art based on a study of the physical properties of sound as Impressionist painters based their art on the properties of light. False cadence will keep from the actor the true vibrations of character—which Gentleman conceived of as existing in its own right somewhere outside the actor. He used a metaphor typical of romanticism, a musical string which untouched by any hand vibrates in response to musical vibration. The actor does not so much become Richard III as he passes on from Shakespeare's Richard the vibrations of the sound. “Though nature has strings of sympathetic unison, when judiciously touched, yet her feelings are often checked or perverted by external prejudices, wherein the eye supersedes the heart.” The critical faculty had no part in the process except to prevent interference.10

David Williams, a young Welsh minister, had come to London with high moral principles and a great curiosity about the stage. He met Garrick, and met also Henry Mossop, an actor who was in prison because of pecuniary troubles which he attributed to Garrick’s neglect. Williams reacted in angry bewilderment to what he saw as the actor's paradox. His first literary publication was a denunciation of Garrick signed “The Devil upon Two Sticks.”11 The Jubilee, he said, was injurious to public ethics, and behind its empty show was Garrick’s moral vacuity, sign of a heartless being who was a stranger to
"the naivete or simplicity of nature." Great acting (and Garrick's was very great) was not a product of sympathy, and the fact indicated a grave moral flaw. "You act as well in a room as on a stage." "You never felt." "You are a mere mimic. You affect to feel where you do not, and you imitate tones, looks and gestures while your heart is at ease." "You speak to a post with the same feelings and expressions, as to the loveliest Juliet under heaven. This is a matter of notoriety. It is what you value yourself upon."

Garrick was not a propounder of theories; he was the proof of all theories. The men who made these four statements knew him personally and professionally, and felt that the divergent theories came from him. And so when the textbooks lifted the universal caveat against acting, which appeared in every textbook published before 1769, Garrick was proof of the new theories. When analysis of the "passions" was replaced by injunctions to become Mark Antony, when rhetoric was declared an expressive art, when power to sway emotion was set beside persuasion to truth as the end of rhetoric, Garrick was the living illustration.

As for the actual sources, a major one was the associational psychology of David Hartley, which entered the classroom by way of Joseph Priestley, who was teaching at Warrington Academy, "the Athens of the North." These were sterile times for the English universities. The best Scottish schools and the Nonconformist academies established during the time of the Test Acts had more liberal faculties, more flexible methods, and broader curricula. Priestley's conversion to Hartley was complete, and he employed the ideas in lectures on modern literature and class sessions where students spoke monologues and acted scenes from plays. He was urged to publish his lectures on rhetoric, and did so in Lectures on Oratory and Criticism (1777). It was a hasty and partial rewriting of lecture
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notes, but it applied associational psychology to classroom method, and the relation to drama is clear. Metaphor is treated as a dramatic entity rather than a literary trope. "Figurative expressions are scarcely attended to as words, but are viewed in the same light as attitudes, gestures, or looks, which are infinitely more expressive of sentiment and feelings than words can possibly be."

The book had only one edition, and I saw only one review (Monthly Review, LVII, 90), written by William Enfield. As rector of Warrington, Enfield was in a position to know what value there would have been in a careful and complete statement by Priestley, and he regretted the truncated form in which it appeared, especially the omission of the lecture on oral delivery. Enfield himself, however, had already given the ideas to the academic world in The Speaker, a textbook prepared at Priestley's request and under his guidance to meet the needs of classes at Warrington. Based on different principles from those of Blackwall, The Speaker, like An Introduction to the Classics, attains some pedagogical absolutes that survive shifting ideologies: clarity, energy, simplicity, firm and courteous tone. Shakespeare provided a fourth of the practice material. In later textbooks, the proportion of Shakespeare rose to 100 per cent in some cases.

George Campbell's Philosophy of Rhetoric (1776) was a more extended application of Hartley's psychology. He admitted four aims of rhetoric, and allowed that a discourse might have any one of the four as its chief aim: to enlighten the understanding, to please the imagination, to move the passions, to influence the will. Prophetically Campbell said the future development of rhetoric lay in the exploration of psychology. The work of John Ogilvie, Philosophical and Critical Observations on the Nature, Characters and Various Species of Composition (1774), had little influence compared to that of Campbell and Enfield,
but this Scottish clergyman of the Common Sense school moved closer to the romantic point of view, emphasizing the imagination as a mark of both the artist and the student, impressing upon the instructor his duty to foster the faculty. Ogilvie retained a firm pedagogical grip on the young imagination, and the young mind was not yet trailing clouds of glory; but in his actual classroom situation he saw the child as being nearer than its elders to the picturesque and the sublime.

In 1775 William Cockin of Lancaster Free School published *The Art of Delivering Written Language*, frankly announcing the book as radical, openly flouting the authority of Johnson. It was prepared with Garrick’s co-operation and dedicated to him. The author had distrusted his own judgment in offering so controversial a textbook, but Garrick had given him the needed authorization.

You have however removed all fears of this kind, by assuring him that the doctrine laid down in the following essay agrees exactly with your own sentiments, and that on more accounts than one it merits the notice of the ingenious. Regard for the delicacy of the public ear obliges him to suppress the rest of your acknowledgements in its favour.

The book presents the four interlocking ideas which made the new curriculum a radical departure from classical principles. The use of theatrical techniques shows that the stigma has been removed from classroom acting. Expressions of emotion will be governed by the sympathetic imagination rather than by marginal notations. The third change had to do with the study of accent; some of the ideas of the new curriculum were transient, but the studies of scansion made a permanent contribution to English rhetoric. Cockin’s book made the first attempt to teach the relation of verse to musical notation, an idea that was developed somewhat before 1769, but which before
that date had not affected pedagogy. It is obvious that Cockin, through Garrick, knew the work of Joshua Steele.

When Garrick had just made his debut at Goodman's Field, Johnson challenged him and Giffard, the manager, to read with proper emphasis even so familiar a sentence as the Ninth Commandment. Having proved to his own satisfaction that they could not, "Johnson put them right, and enjoyed his victory with great glee." "The players, Sir, have got a kind of rant, with which they run on, without any regard to accent or emphasis."14

Garrick at the time of the Jubilee considered offering direct proof that he stood no longer in statu pupillaris in matters of accent, and announced that he would give three lectures, one dealing entirely with accent and emphasis.15 For some reason he removed the lectures from the agenda and contented himself with a demonstration of his mastery in the ode. As spoken by him, the ode was overwhelming; but the ode on paper16 was derided by many critics, and modern critics still find it good for a laugh.17 We may safely conclude that he was better as an actor than as a serious poet, but there are other conclusions to be drawn. The ode was no worse than Havard's ode to Shakespeare, performed just before the Jubilee and printed (Public Advertiser, August 8) as part of publicity, and no worse than two odes to Shakespeare presented by Linley in 1776 when Garrick retired from the stage, efforts which escaped unscathed. Garrick's presumption in attempting a classical ode and the intimation in the ode itself that the universities did not pay enough attention to Shakespeare were annoying, but Garrick's ode got special treatment because he was trying to handle language itself in a manner different from most writers of odes of the time. This ode was not "classical," but "primitive." As he chose for his model for the Garland the medievalism of his fellow Club Member, Bishop Percy, so he chose as model for his ode the work of his friend and fellow worker John Brown.
The statement that Garrick aided Brown in his writing (made by Davies and denied by Johnson) applied to Brown's dramatic writing. Garrick directly worked with Steele and Cockin, but so far as I know he did not work directly with Brown when he wrote his dissertation on language theory. Locke had postulated a psychological rather than a rational origin of language, and Brown's work is a culmination of theories derived from Locke by various men.

Professor René Wellek's brilliant study of the language theories of the period has guided my reading, and I need only to call attention to this well-known study and to the high value he places on the work of Brown's "remarkable theory which in many ways anticipates the arguments of Nietzsche and Wagner." Brown postulated a process by which primitive gesture had developed into dance, voice into song, speech into poetry. The three forms of expression had been united in early tribal rites and gradually in the course of time had separated; he proposed that an effort be made to reverse the process, to reunite poetry and music in some closer union than was to be heard in opera and oratorio. Neither Brown in the ode he offers as exemplary ("The Curse of Saul") nor Garrick was destined to write the lyric poetry which later almost was able to absorb the drama. Opera, not poetry proper, gained from Garrick's experimenting and from the prominence given to his first use of the spoken recitative; but the ode is interesting for its place in an important controversy. The evolutionary and primitivist theories of language emphasized the development of metaphor from folk myth, the organic process of growth and decay in language. Their ideas affected the concept of the relation between genres, and propounded the thesis that language in its nature and man in his nature were emotional in essence in a way more important than the rational part of their makeup.

Garrick could not sing, and he meant to take the leading
role in the ode. Theatrical necessity was the mother of his inventions, and they were fathered by some very original minds. Those long-deferred grammatical climaxes of the ode were meant to have great emotional effect on the hearer, to hold sentence structure and listener in a state of suspense. Johnson didn’t like it. Warburton didn’t like it. Thomas Sheridan spoke for the insulted universities, a fresh honorary degree from Cambridge just added to the earlier one from Oxford. Under the name “Longinus” he made an extended analysis of the classical faults of the ode, and there was a great deal of comment pro and con in pamphlets and periodicals. The battle evoked one of the really delightful Jubilee reactions which has been attributed—erroneously, I think—to the young actor John Henderson: Ode on Dedicating a Building and Erecting a Statue to Le Stue, Cook to the Duke of Newcastle at Clermont: with notes by Martinus Scriblerus. To which are prefixed Testimonies to the Genius and Merits of Le Stue (1769). It is a close parody, several sections being identical, for Le Stew had many things in common with Shakespeare, included variant spellings of his name. “Longinus” had ruled that a composition of this length could contain no more than forty faults, and Scriblerus keeps careful count, enthusiastically noting beauties (his) and ruefully keeping tab on faults (Garrick’s). His neat jabs at Bishop Warburton, now bucking for archbishop (“Ye that have or sigh for Grace”) and his parodies of the scholars, his learned remarks on the scientific probability of the “little loves” climbing up Shakespeare’s legs manage to cover a wide range of Jubilee personalities in their multiple allusions. Walpole (who probably picked up allusions to the household at Newcastle which escape me) printed it at Strawberry Hill in elegant format.

Daniel Webb’s book, which extended the evolutionary concept to include the study of scansion, was printed serially in Lloyd’s Evening Post. William Mitford applied the principles of music
Musicians made contribution to the study—Sir John Hawkins and Dr. Burney. Scholars whose main concern was phonetics, Lord Monboddo among them, attempted to apply evolutionary concepts to that field. John Herries, in an early and important textbook on phonetics, rejected the mechanical principles of scansion, and tried to adopt a strictly scientific method for the study of the emotional bases of prosody. Hamlet’s speech to the ghost, he said, could not be scanned at all on mechanistic principles, for the quantity of syllable is governed by the emotion expressed, and Lear’s “Blow, winds” shows how syllabic length is related to the “tumult and frenzy” of passion. James Beattie’s Essay on Poetry and Music as They Affect the Mind (1776) attained wide circulation by being bound with the second edition and all subsequent editions of his Essay on Truth; although it made no technical advance in metrics, it placed in many hands a consolidation of the previously dispersed interests of philosophy, psychology, music, and metrics based on Shakespeare and Garrick as models of perfection.

From the trend of this theory, it seems that work might have begun with Shakespeare’s songs, but that was not the case. Nothing mattered but blank verse as Garrick spoke it. Until the end of the century the songs and the nondramatic poetry of Shakespeare were almost ignored. The Encyclopaedia Britannica (2nd ed.; 1778-83) reported the latter by hearsay only: “Besides his dramatic works, Shakespeare is said to have written several poems, which are published in a single 8vo volume.” George Steevens in his edition of 1793 (p. vii) excluded the poems and sonnets, saying “the strongest act of Parliament would fail to compel readers into their service.” Lord Kames, in Scotland far from Drury Lane, doubted that Shakespeare’s blank verse was poetry at all; it seemed to him “a sort of measured prose.” Within earshot of Drury Lane, the reverse was true to the point that amateur critics in the 70’s suspected any rhymed lines of
being spurious. The heroic couplet, wrote correspondents, was not good form for serious poetry. It, not Shakespeare, was now being called "gothic." No, said the public to the standard verse form of neoclassical poetry:

No, not in rhyme; I hate that iron chain,
Forg'd by the hand of some rude Goth, which cramps
The fairest feather in the Muse's wing,
And pins her to the ground.²⁸

The great work in metrics, published in 1775 by Joshua Steele and expanded in 1779, was based on Garrick's reading of blank verse. Garrick died in 1779, and Steele felt no incentive to continue his work. _An Essay toward Establishing the Melody and Measure of Speech_ and the expanded form, _Prosodia Rationalis_, were called the greatest work of the eighteenth century by rhetoricians of the next century. Thomas Stewart Omond in _English Metrists_ (1921) evaluates it thus: "No prosody based on the actual facts of language can neglect Steele's analysis. . . . The real student will have Steele as a master . . . and will pronounce his the first really living work in the evolution of prosody." (pp. 93-94)

It was Steele's intention to make a true recording of Garrick's voice. His work was given high commendation among the men of learning. Sir John Pringle, president of the Royal Society, of which Steele was a member, was enthusiastic, as was Lord Monboddo, though Steele's work refuted his own, his more conservative ideas of metrics which had recently been published. By means of symbols of his own devising (a combination of phonetic marks and musical notation) Steele recorded Garrick's reading of Shakespeare on a bass clef. Common discourse, he observed, ranged through thirteen tones, an octave and a fifth, with C natural below the bass clef as the lowest tone. We shift tones in speaking not only between syllables, but also within
a syllable, through at least as great an interval as a fifth, which compass was allowed by the Greeks. Greek accentuation in poetry had only a single proportion, long (2) and short (1). But English speech has several proportions: $2:1 \frac{1}{2}: \frac{1}{4}$; $3:1 \frac{1}{2}: \frac{1}{6}$, etc. Steele thought the variation in time should be as flexible in poetry as in music.

Variations in pitch on a single syllable could range through as much as a fifth, moving upward (marked by an acute accent) or downward (marked by a grave accent) or moving either way and then returning in the direction of the original pitch (marked by one or the other of the circumflexes). He observed the regional variations of the use of the circumflex, the Irish being commonly acute-grave, the Scottish grave-acute. Provincial speech used a greater variation in pitch than court speech, the exaggerations of the circumflex shifting in the various geographical regions. By means of these markings the variations of pitch could be accurately indicated on a clef, and by means of signs adopted from musical notation the duration of tone could be indicated for any one syllable.

To Garrick's question, Could another produce the sounds from the recording? Steele answered that the beauty of Garrick's voice, its clarity and power would not be equaled, but future students could study the sensuous rhythms and could have the ideal of perfect tone described for them as accurately as was then possible. The secret of Garrick's tone was this: pitch and duration varied—pitch, indeed, varied greatly, swept up and down by the rise and fall of passion—but Garrick preserved throughout the whole length of each syllable a perfectly uniform volume of tone. (I have never read anything that led me to think that Garrick had any unusual range of tone. What was unusual was his ability to use his entire range effectively on stage.) This perfect control distinguished Garrick's from all other voices. It was this unique control that made it possible for
him to vary other elements of the voice far beyond the normal, and yet remain uniformly powerful and audible through his entire range of both pitch and volume. He did not need a stage whisper; his low tones would carry. At top production of decibels, every syllable was audible and under control. Steele’s work is a splendid product of original thought, scientific analysis, and ear that could really hear. He united metrics with music, and English prosody since is indebted to his findings.

The new prosody, associationist psychology, acceptance of theatrical principles were three of the ideas upon which the new curriculum built. The fourth was the idea of good speech as self-betterment, not in the sense that all education is self-betterment, but in the specific meaning of better economic and social status achieved by education. The entire subject is so vast that one must define it sharply lest some theatrical men of the late eighteenth century appear to be the cause of such historic upheavals as the extension of education to lower social classes, the great enlargement of the reading public, and the French Revolution. Thomas Sheridan, William Kenrick, Francis Gentleman, and John Walker did not cause the French Revolution, but they lived in a time of great social change and deep unrest, and they were not unaware of the time. When a lot of people decide to rise in the world, some sort of Bastille looms on the horizon, even if the only question at stake is a rhetorical one. More and more people were in a mood to climb. More and more men and women were less and less content to remain in the estate to which they had been born. Beaumarchais came from France to ask Garrick’s help in writing his Barber of Seville. In England in the 1770’s and 80’s men hoped as never before that the gifted man might rise in the world, that the clever barber might really win, and that all might have a happy comic ending in peace and forgiveness.

Joseph Addison wanted the soap-boiler’s apprentice taught, but
taught as befit his station in life. Thomas Sheridan taught the power of excellent speech to cross social boundaries. He offered good speech almost as a panacea for all social ills with an enthusiasm that earned him a satire by Samuel Foote, *The Orator*. But in America, where no man was irrevocably born to be an apprentice or a lord, there was an apprentice who became a lord, as it were (one Benjamin Franklin), who heartily advocated Sheridan’s concepts and methods. Francis Gentleman also taught speech outside the schoolroom. By coincidence, both he and Sheridan were teaching oratory in Edinburgh when they inspired Boswell with a desire to meet their friend Samuel Johnson.

The movement to ascertain the language went forward, the major work in spelling and defining being done by Johnson’s dictionary, in grammar by Lindley Murray, and in pronunciation by three actors, Kenrick, Sheridan, and Walker. Two authorities, the court and the universities, had molded English speech, their influence varying with the cultural powers of the institutions. With a Hanover on the throne, the King’s English was not a model, and the universities were in a state of comparative defoliation; so in the late eighteenth century a third authority was added, the stage. It served as a sort of triangulation to steady English pronunciation, which has altered little since Walker wrote. He wrote with the voice of Garrick ringing in his ears. The prospectus for his pronouncing dictionary was prepared with Garrick’s aid. His first publication, a rhyming dictionary, was dedicated to Garrick, and it stands now, not in the stacks where his rhetoric texts are placed, but a standard reference work on the reference shelves in a new printing.

I spoke of a time when there existed two schools of rhetoric, one associated with Johnson, one associated with Garrick. It was John Walker who terminated this brief period. His early work was done under Garrick’s patronage; after Garrick’s death
Johnson became his patron, and Walker, in the course of time and in his own way, reconciled the two schools. In the name of Garrick, Johnson, and Shakespeare, he set up a monopoly in the field of rhetoric that lasted until his death in 1807. Until his death there were no important publications in the field except his own, and his sales depressed the sales of standard works already in the field. As for sales records, even Blair and Campbell did not come into their own until after 1807. Walker's life story is a complete vindication of Thomas Sheridan's faith in the power of rhetoric to raise a man in the world. By comparison with Walker, Eliza Doolittle pales; she only made one threat to teach correct pronunciation, and then dwindled into a wife. Walker had Burke for his pupil, taught the great and the wealthy and the noble, and rose so gracefully from poverty that he can truly claim the much-abused eighteenth-century phrase "universal approbation." For fifty-eight years he lived in the fierce white light that beats upon stage and academic rostrum, and in his entire career there is no word of dispraise. Moralists praised his morality, philanthropists praised his philanthropy, dignitaries praised his dignity. And yet in the field of rhetoric, I can discern in all his work no single new idea, try as I may. All the rhetors mentioned thus far involuntarily supplied his total subject matter. In his pages the old rhetoric and the new lie down like the lion and the lamb. He discerned no contradictions between them. All opinions were as indistinguishable as meum and tuum to Walker, but during his lifetime no one ever complained. He silenced the chatterers of his own day, and, awed by his probity, I will call him an eclectic. An eclectic who did not know a lion from a lamb.

In 1769 John Walker was thirty-seven years old. Nothing in his life up to that date presaged the fame that was to attend the career he launched in November of that year. He was born on March 18, 1732, in Colney Hatch, a hamlet on the eastern
The boy was reared in the Presbyterian faith. He went to school—just how long he did not say, but he always made it clear that his schooling was brief and meager. Family finances forced him to take up a trade, and he went from one to another with slight success, for he had, as he said, “a repugnance to the practice of any mechanical art.” About 1749 his mother died, and he was free to begin his real education.

John Ward was manager of the provincial theater in Gloucester at the time, and Walker went to him to begin his career as actor. He pleased Ward, who sent him to Garrick at Drury Lane. One night he was playing a role in Foote’s farce that satirized Sheridan’s teaching, and something about the boy’s manner struck Garrick. He singled him out, praised his work, raised his salary, and advanced him in the company. From that night dated Garrick’s friendship for Walker and Walker’s near idolatry of Garrick.

Walker was never a star, but he did well, playing the second roles in tragedies to Garrick’s leads, and in the comedies playing roles “of a grave and sententious cast.” In May of 1758 he married a Miss Myners (Genest spells the name Minors), an actress of comic roles who had been with the company at Drury Lane since 1750. She was a competent actress and a pleasant woman, noted both for her wit and for dignity of character. When Spranger Barry and Henry Woodward organized a company to open the Crow Street Theatre in Dublin, they engaged the Walkers. Walker was advanced in the company, and when Henry Mossop deserted the group to join the rival company in Smock Alley, Walker was given most of his roles. During the summers the Walkers played in Bristol and made many friends there. In June, 1762, Beard, manager of Covent Garden,
brought the Walkers to London, Walker to replace Ned Sparks. He performed the popular roles of Downright in *Every Man in His Humour*, Addison's Cato and Shakespeare's Brutus. Mrs. Walker had her outstanding success as Deborah Woodcock in Isaac Bickerstaffe's very popular operetta *Love in a Village.*

During the next five years there was a development which Walker always said was very important in his life. He joined the Robin Hood, a debating club, where he discovered his own eloquence and heard for the first time the applause for his "close and ingenious reasoning." In 1767 the patent of Covent Garden was bought by George Colman and his three associates, Powell, Harris, and Rutherford. For some reason they did not renew the Walkers' contracts. The two went to Dublin for a year and resumed their summer work in Bristol, but the Dublin theater was poorly organized and the arrangement was not satisfactory. In 1768 they left the stage, and events so transpired that they never returned.

The Reverend James Usher (so called, though several biographers doubt that he was ever ordained a clergyman) was a friend of Walker's. Under his influence, Walker became a Roman Catholic and joined Usher in a school for Catholic boys near Kensington Gravel Pits. Walker's attachment to the school was of brief duration; the men disagreed on school policies and severed their professional connections, remaining, however, close friends. In November, 1769, Walker opened his own school in London and became a teacher of speech. (I set this date because I find announcements in the papers that early.) His first notice in the *Public Advertiser* offered "to remove the common Timidity and Hesitation of Youth." Whatever timidity had depressed his own poverty-stricken and underprivileged youth was now removed. With exemplary absence of timidity and hesitation Walker went to his true calling with unwavering self-assurance, and for thirty-eight years moved from glory unto glory.
In an objective evaluation of a man's lifework, his handicaps should not be considered; but teaching was Walker's work, and the greatest testimonial to his teaching is the man himself. Self-taught, he became a learned man. He produced *A Key to the Classical Pronunciation of Greek and Latin Proper Names* that was included in Johnson's dictionary and in Noah Webster's. He became an authority on the religious wars, early ecclesiastical history, and the writings of the primitive fathers of his church. His biographers say that theology more than any other subject occupied his mind all his mature life.

He learned one hard lesson for a man born in poverty: how to handle money. Johnson attributed much of the criticism that fell to Garrick to the effect of his early poverty, saying that Garrick was not an avaricious man, but a very generous man who was subject to fits of irrational economy. Walker was neither embarrassed nor embittered by his early indigence. The fortune he made from his rhetoric books and lectures he spent with good sense or gave away with good judgment and Christian anonymity in his many works of charity. Only after his death was the record of his charities made known by those who gratefully received his help. His discerning and tactful advice, his endearing modesty had left his beneficiaries not humbled, but proud to have been beneficiaries, and when the bond of silence was lifted, they acknowledged their debts.

He learned how to use his early profession of actor. The very fact that he had been an actor might have damaged him in the eyes of the bishops and scholars who became his associates, but he made even Johnson forget his profound suspicion of the trade. Johnson and the bishops forgave him both his religious affiliations. He "quitted a religion degraded by humiliating exclusions . . . to adopt a mode of faith, the profession of which was subjected by laws then existing, to the most unjust and oppressive penalties." Neither Presbyterians nor Catholics
were admitted to the universities, even as students. Walker taught the new rhetoric at Oxford and Cambridge, introduced into those sacred halls by Johnson.

Burke was his friend and his pupil in oratory. Goldsmith was his friend, Arthur Murphy, Dugald Stewart, Henry Home, Andrew Kippis, William Richardson were his friends. In a time of great conversationalists, Walker was courted for the sake of his conversation. The prime minister of Russia was sent to England to study with him. Young princes from the Continent sat at his feet with English noblemen. An imaginary portrait was made of him surrounded by his famous pupils, and their eulogies are genuinely touching.

At the age of forty-seven Walker said in a published statement that he was ignorant of the very rudiments of music. At the age of fifty-five he published a book showing that he had acquired knowledge of music adequate to the needs of teaching the new rhetoric, an admirable accomplishment. After the age of forty-seven Walker achieved his greatest fame and fortune by teaching the subtleties of intonation, yet he said he had been born tone-deaf. He gave no clue as to how he performed this unparalleled feat, but in a lifetime of strenuous effort he said it was his greatest labor. This was the only subject on which he showed traces of irritable vanity; he wanted his miraculous accomplishment acknowledged. He never developed his ear-training to the point where he could tell when a singer was off key or off tune, but he came to enjoy simple melodies in a minor key. He was always unable to hear a tune in a major key, and any addition of harmony was so much noise and distraction. He said he was seriously handicapped in his career as an actor by his voice, which was nearly a monotone. And so this remarkable man made voice production his study and became the authority of his age on modulation, inflection, and
tonality. The two musical accomplishments were necessary for his new work.

Walker did not read the work of Joshua Steele until it was published in expanded form in 1779, Prosodia Rationalis. In 1781 Walker published the work on which his chief contemporary fame rested, Elements of Elocution, dedicated to Johnson. His biographers speak of it as his magnum opus because it was the first practical treatise of the art of speaking, previous writers having lacked the theory of voice. “They had not made that discovery which was reserved for Mr. Walker, and by means of which he attained the decided superiority he possessed over his predecessors and competitors, of the radical distinction of its tones into two inflections . . . etc.” It was a great discovery, and it made Walker famous—but it was not his discovery. In the first edition Walker described how he arrived at his “new and curious” plan of teaching. While his work was in its “early stages,” he met with a work called Prosodia Rationalis. His first statement of his debt is adequate, even flattering.

I never so much deplored my total want of knowledge in music, as I did in the perusal of this work; for though I could conceive the truth of this system, I had no means of understanding how it could be reduced to practice: I understood enough to find, that the author was a very ingenious and philosophical grammarian, but could go no further. . . . had that great actor and excellent citizen Mr. Garrick lived I should have exemplified [my adaptation of Steele] in some of his favorite speeches; but death, which deprived the stage of its greatest ornament, bereft me of a most valuable friend and patron; a loss I have the greater reason to lament, as his advice and assistance was open to the feeblest efforts of genius, and has been afforded to the beginning of this work.  

By the time Walker got to the end of Volume II of that edition, he was able to close the work with his own marking (Steele’s
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system) of Mrs. Yates's reading of R. B. Sheridan's "Monody to the Memory of David Garrick."

In 1787 Walker published The Melody of Speech Delineated: or Elocution Taught like Music by Visible Symbols. It is Steele's method, but there is no mention of Steele.

The second edition of Elements of Elocution claimed that Walker had invented the use of the circumflex in recording speech, and publicly rebuked William Enfield in the preface for using the word *inflexion* in a recent edition of The Speaker without crediting Walker with the discovery. The system—"Walker's System" now—was used in the teaching of French to show more accurately the English intonation, the work chosen for first delineation being *Rasselas*. During his life no one called Walker to task, but after his death Steele's honors were restored to the true originator. American rhetoricians took pleasure in calling attention to Walker's imposition.

Occasionally Walker did give credit for a borrowed idea, always some time after the idea has been fixed in the reader's mind as Walker's. This belated insertion of a phrase ("on so respectable an authority" as Priestley's, "much indebted to the Rev. Mr. Robertson," or to Dr. Bowles) forces the reader to reread the pages in an attempt to evaluate any possible originality, for what is owed to Priestley is not made clear, nor whether Walker had ever read Hartley, whose work Priestley was interpreting. Even these shadowy attributions are rare. In unacknowledged borrowings from Enfield and Cockin there are disturbing elisions of their injunctions to students to remember that the imagination and its fictions are not equivalent to reality, that the end of rhetoric is still wisdom, that it is wrong under any system to reduce communication to a parade of artificial eloquence. The work that made Walker famous was taken from Steele, but in it appear passages taken almost verbatim from Sheridan. Leland's instruction to the clergy, Blair's compromise
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between the two theories of language, Campbell's psychological theories—all are adapted in Walker. I know that other times had other modes; I know that John Wesley's "adaptation" of Johnson's *Taxation No Tyranny* was accepted calmly by Johnson as "flattering"; I know the men were alive to make complaint if they wanted to. Yet Walker's borrowings, excusable morally, were irresponsible ideologically. He was not aware that a passage taken from Anthony Blackwall contradicted a passage pre-empted from Joseph Priestley and set beside it.

Confronted with Steele's originality, he said at first, "I had no means of understanding how it could be reduced to practice." But he learned. Born tone-deaf, he learned to hear tone, an accomplishment that might be taken (along with those pebbles in the mouth of Demosthenes) as sign and token of a man determined to master rhetoric. He wrote the first textbook for teaching English composition, a great, though still imperfect, instrument for self-betterment. He took what he needed from classicist, primitivist, mechanician, evolutionist, from Nonconformist liberality and High Church austerity, and sold the amalgam wherever English was spoken, in the names of Garrick, Johnson, and Walker. Those three names always got their due attribution.

Perhaps his amazing degree of influence had something to do with the fact that these three men had reduced to practice the dearest language theory of the age. Conservatives as they were, they showed how a man might rise in the world. The victories they won with language were not sciomachies, but gave form and substance to the hope of station deriving from words fitly used, a hope in hard work, not in birth. Garrick answered Diderot truly that he worked like a beaver for those unstudied portrayals of pure passion, hour after hour for one perfect gesture. Even in 1774 Mrs. Griffith was speaking of criticism as something born in a man, a heritage of the blood,
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and Carlyle was to speak of it later as if it were a religious vocation; but the hard experience of life, the long study of the language that made Johnson the greatest critic of the age were not born in him. A poor man may rise to a throne, to the eminence of Elsinore and Dunsinane lit by footlights, to a chair at the Club many a real Grand Cham might envy if he took a long look, to the rostrum at Oxford for the outcast. The social system was not disrupted; Garrick "dearly loved a lord" and was loved in return; Johnson could rebuke an earl; titled lords sat at Walker's feet. They married their heroines. Their rule was benign. They had the happy ending of peaceful and honored age. It didn't quite work for Beaumarchais, but in England and America it was the most popular of all language theories, and Walker never lost faith in it.
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