ELEMENTS

OF

RHETORIC.

COMPRISING THE

SUBSTANCE OF THE ARTICLE

IN THE

ENCYCLOPÆDIA METROPOLITANA

WITH ADDITIONS, &c.

BY RICHARD WHATELY, D. D.
ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN.

Ὁ γὰρ γνοὺς, καὶ μὴ σαφῶς διδάξας, ἴσον τί καὶ οὐκ ἐνθυμήθη.

BOSTON:
JAMES MUNROE AND COMPANY.
1843.

Educ T 768.43.880

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
GIFT OF THE
CONGREGATIONAL LIBRARY OF BOSTON
DEC 11 1935

PREFACE.

A BRIEF outline of the principal part of the following Work was sketched out several years ago for the private use of some young friends; and from that MS. chiefly, the Article "Rhetoric" in the Encyclopædia Metropolitana was afterwards drawn up. I was induced to believe that it might be more useful if published in a separate form; and I have accordingly, with the assistance of some friends, revised the treatise, and made a few additions and other alterations which suggested themselves; besides dividing it in a manner more convenient for reference.

The title of "Rhetoric," I have thought it best on the whole to retain, as being that by which the Article in the Encyclopædia is designated; though it is in some respects open to objection. Besides that it is rather the more commonly employed in reference to public *Speaking* alone, it is also apt to suggest to many minds an associated idea of empty declamation, or of dishonest artifice.

The subject indeed stands perhaps but a few degrees above Logic in popular estimation; the one being generally regarded by the vulgar as the Art of bewildering the learned by frivolous subtleties; the other, that of deluding the multitude by specious falsehood. And if a treatise on Composition be itself more favourably received than the work of a Logician, the *Author* of it must yet labour under still greater disadvantages. He may be thought to challenge criticism; and his own performances may be condemned by a reference to his own precepts; or, on the other hand, his precepts may be undervalued, through his own failures in their application. Should this take place in the present instance, I have only to urge, with Horace in his Art of Poetry, that a whetstone, though itself incapable of cutting, is yet useful in sharpening steel. No system of instruction will completely equalize natural powers; and yet it may be of service towards their improvement. The youthful Achilles acquired skill in hurling the javelin under the instruction of Chiron, though the master could not compete with the pupil in vigor of arm.

It may perhaps be hardly necessary to observe, that the following pages are designed principally for the instruction of *unpractised* writers. Of such as have long been in the habit of writing or

speaking, those whose procedure has been conformable to the rules I have laid down, will of course have anticipated most of my observations: and those again who have proceeded on opposite principles, will be more likely to censure, as it were in self-defence, than laboriously to unlearn what they have perhaps laboriously acquired, and to set out afresh on a new system. But I am encouraged, partly by the result of experiments, to entertain a hope that the present System may prove useful to such as have their method of composition, and their style of writing and of delivery to acquire. And an author ought to be content if a work be found in some instances not unprofitable, which cannot, from its nature, be expected to pass completely uncensured.

Whoever indeed, in treating of any subject, recommends (whether on good or bad grounds) a departure from established practice, must expect to encounter opposition. This opposition does not indeed imply that his precepts are *right;* but neither does it prove them *wrong;* it only implies that they are *new;* since few will readily acknowledge the plans on which they have long been proceeding, to be mistaken. If a treatise therefore on the present subject were received with immediate, universal, and unqualified approbation, this circumstance would not indeed prove

it to be *erroneous*, (since it is conceivable that the methods commonly pursued may be altogether right,) but would afford a presumption that there was not much to be *learnt* from it.

On the other hand, the more deep-rooted and generally prevalent any error may be, the less favourably, at first, will its refutation (though proportionably the more important) be for the most part received.

With respect to what are commonly called Rhetorical Artifices—contrivances for "making the worse appear the better reason,"—it would have savoured of pedantic morality to give solemn admonitions against employing them, or to enter a formal disclaimer of dishonest intention; since, after all, the generality will, according to their respective characters, make what use of a book they think fit, without waiting for the Author's permission: but what I have endeavoured to do, is, *clearly to set forth*, as far as I could, (as Bacon does in his Essay on Cunning,) these sophistical tricks of the Art; and as far as I may have succeeded in this, I shall have been providing the only effectual check to the employment of them. The adulterators of food or of drugs, and the coiners of base money, keep their processes a secret, and dread no one so much as him who

detects, describes, and proclaims their contrivances, and thus puts men on their guard; for "every one that doeth evil hateth the *light*, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be made manifest."

To the prevailing association of the term "Rhetoric," with the idea of these delusive contrivances, may be traced the opinion (which I believe is also common) that the power of eloquence is lost on those who themselves possess it; or at least that a critical knowledge of the art of Composition fortifies any one, in proportion to his proficiency, against being affected by the persuasive powers of another. This is undoubtedly true, as far as *Sophistical* skill is concerned. The better acquainted one is with any kind of rhetorical trick, the less liable he is to be misled by it. The *Artifices*, strictly so called, of the Orator, are,

> ——— like tricks by sleight of hand,
> Which to admire, one should not understand:

and he who has himself been behind the scenes of a puppet-show, and pulled the strings by which the figures are moved, is not likely to be much affected by their performance. This is indeed one great recommendation of the study of Rhetoric, that it furnishes the most effectual antidote against deception of this kind. But it is by no

means true that acquaintance with an Art—in the nobler sense of the word,—not as consisting in juggling tricks,—tends to diminish our sensibility to the most excellent productions of Art. The greatest proficients in music are usually the most enthusiastic admirers of good music: the best Painters and Poets, and such as are best versed in the principles of those arts, are in general (when rivalry is out of the question) the most powerfully affected by paintings and by poetry, of superior excellence. And none I believe are more open to the impression of sound, honest, manly eloquence, than those who display it in their own compositions, and are capable of analyzing critically the mode in which its effects are produced.

A few passages will be found in the following pages which presuppose some acquaintance with Logic; but the greatest part will, I trust, be intelligible to those who have not this knowledge. At the same time, it is implied by what I have said of that Science, and indeed by the very circumstance of my having written on it, that I cannot but consider him as undertaking a task of unnecessary difficulty, who endeavours, without studying Logic, to become a thoroughly good argumentative writer

It may be thought that some apology is necessary for the frequent reference made to the treatise just mentioned, and occasionally, to some other works of my own. It appeared to me, however, that either of the other two alternatives would have been more objectionable; viz. either to omit entirely much that was needful for the elucidation of the subject in hand; or, to repeat, in the same or in other words, what had been already published.

Perhaps some apology may also be thought necessary for the various illustrations, selected from several authors, or framed for the occasion, which occur both in the present treatise, and in that on Logic; and in which opinions on various subjects are incidentally conveyed; in all of which, it cannot be expected that every one of my readers will concur. And some may accordingly be disposed to complain that they cannot put these works into the hands of any young person under their care, without a risk of his imbibing notions which they think erroneous. This objection, I have reason to believe, has been especially felt, though not always explicitly stated, by the most decidedly anti-christian writers of the present day. But it should be remembered, that Logic and Rhetoric having no proper subject-matter of their own, it was necessary to

resort to other departments of knowledge for exemplifications of the principles laid down; and it would have been impossible, without confining myself so the most insipid truisms, to avoid completely all topics on which there exists any difference of opinion. If, in the course of either work, I have advocated any erroneous tenet, the obvious remedy is, to refute it. I am utterly unconscious of having in any instance resorted to the employment of fallacy, or substituted declamation for argument; but if any such faults exist, it is easy to expose them. Nor is it necessary that when any book is put into the hands of a young student, he should understand that he is to adopt implicitly every doctrine contained in it, or should not be cautioned against any erroneous principles which it may inculcate: otherwise, indeed, it would be impossible to give young men what is called a classical education, without making them Pagans.

That I have avowed an assent to the evidences of Christianity, (*that*, I believe, is the point on which the greatest soreness is felt,) and that this does incidentally imply some censure of those who reject it, is not to be denied. But they again are at liberty, and they are not backward in using their liberty, to repel the censure, by refuting, if they can, those evidences. And as

long as they confine themselves to calm argumentation, and abstain from insult, libellous personality, and falsification of facts, I earnestly hope no force will ever be employed to silence them, except force of argument. I am not one of those jealous lovers of freedom who would fain keep it all to themselves; nor do I dread ultimate danger to the cause of truth from fair discussion.

It may be objected by some, that in the foregoing words I have put forth a challenge which cannot be accepted; inasmuch as it has been declared by the highest legal authorities, that "Christianity is part of the Law of the Land;" and consequently any one who impugns it, is liable to prosecution. What is the precise meaning of the above legal maxim, I do not profess to determine; having never met with any one who could explain it to me: but evidently the mere circumstance, that we have a Religion by Law established, does not, of itself, imply the illegality of arguing against that Religion. The regulations of Trade and of Navigation, for instance, are unquestionably part of the Law of the Land; but the question of their expediency is freely discussed, and frequently in no very measured language; nor did I ever hear of any one's being menaced with prosecution for censuring them.

I presume not however to decide what steps might, legally, be taken; I am looking only to facts and probabilities; and I feel a confident trust, as well as hope, (and that, founded on experience of the past,) that no legal penalties will, in fact, be incurred by temperate, decent, argumentative maintainers even of the most erroneous opinions.

I have only to add my acknowledgements to those friends for whose kind and judicious suggestions I am so much indebted; and to assure them, that whatever may be the public reception of the work, I shall never cease to feel flattered and obliged by the diligent attention they have bestowed on it.

ELEMENTS OF RHETORIC.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1.

Various definitions of Rhetoric.

Of Rhetoric various definitions have been given by different writers; who, however, seem not so much to have disagreed in their conceptions of the nature of the same thing, as to have had different things in view while they employed the same term. Not only the word Rhetoric itself, but also those used in defining it, have been taken in various senses; as may be observed with respect to the word "Art" in Cic. *de Orat.* where a discussion is introduced as to the applicability of that term to Rhetoric; manifestly turning on the different senses in which "Art" may be understood.

To enter into an examination of all the definitions that have been given, would lead to much uninteresting and uninstructive verbal controversy. It is sufficient to put the reader on his guard against the common error of supposing that a general term has some real object, properly corresponding to it, independent of our conceptions:—that, consequently, some one definition is to be found which will comprehend every thing that is rightly designated by that term;—and

that all others must be erroneous: whereas, in fact, it will often happen, as in the present instance, that both the wider, and the more restricted sense of a term, will be alike sanctioned by use, (the only competent authority,) and that the consequence will be a corresponding variation in the definitions employed; none of which perhaps may be fairly chargeable with error, though none can be framed that will apply to every acceptation of the term.

It is evident that in its primary signification, Rhetoric had reference to public *Speaking* alone, as its etymology implies: but as most of the rules for speaking are of course applicable equally to Writing, an extension of the term naturally took place; and we find even Aristotle, the earliest systematic writer on the subject whose works have come down to us, including in his Treatise rules for such compositions as were not intended to be publicly recited.* And even as far as relates to Speeches, properly so called, he takes, in the same Treatise, at one time, a wider, and at another, a more restricted view of the subject; including under the term Rhetoric, in the opening of his work, nothing beyond the finding of topics of Persuasion, as far as regards the *matter* of what is spoken; and afterwards embracing the consideration of Style, Arrangement, and Delivery.

The invention of Printing,† by extending the

* Aristot. *Rhet.* book iii.

† Or rather of *Paper*: for the invention of printing is too obvious not to have speedily followed, in a literary nation, the introduction of a paper sufficiently cheap to make the art available. Indeed the seals of the ancients seem to have been a kind of stamps, with which they in fact printed their names.

sphere of operation of the Writer, has of course contributed to the extension of those terms which, in their primary signification, had reference to Speaking alone. Many objects are now accomplished through the medium of the Press, which formerly came under the exclusive province of the Orator; and the qualifications requisite for success are so much the same in both cases, that we apply the term "Eloquent" as readily to a Writer as to a Speaker; though, etymologically considered, it could only belong to the latter. Indeed "Eloquence" is often attributed even to such compositions, e. g. Historical works, as have in view an object entirely different from any that could be proposed by an Orator; because *some part* of the rules to be observed in Oratory, or rules analogous to these, are applicable to such compositions. Conformably to this view therefore, some writers have spoken of Rhetoric as the Art of Composition, universally; or, with the exclusion of Poetry alone, as embracing all Prose-composition.

A still wider extension of the province of Rhetoric has been contended for by some of the ancient writers; who, thinking it necessary to include, as belonging to the Art, every thing that could conduce to the attainment of the object proposed, introduced into their systems Treatises on Law, Morals, Politics, &c. on the ground that a knowledge of these subjects was requisite to enable a man to speak well on them: and even insisted on Virtue* as an essential qualification of a perfect Orator; because a good character, which

* See Quinctilian.

can in no way be so surely established as by deserving it, has great weight with the audience.

These notions are combated by Aristotle; who attributes them either to the ill-cultivated understanding (ἀπαιδευσία) of those who maintained them, or to their arrogant and pretending disposition, ἀλαζονεία; i. e. a desire to extol and magnify the Art they professed. In the present day, the extravagance of such doctrines is so apparent to most readers, that it would not be worth while to take much pains in refuting them. It is worthy of remark however, that the very same erroneous view is, even now, often taken of Logic;* which has been considered by some as a kind of system of universal knowledge, on the ground that Argument may be employed on all subjects, and that no one can argue well on a subject which he does not understand; and which has been complained of by others for not supplying any such universal instruction as its unskilful advocates have placed within its province; such as in fact no one Art or System can possibly afford.

Aristotle's censure of his predecessors.

The error is precisely the same in respect of Rhetoric and of Logic; both being *instrumental* arts; and, as such, applicable to various kinds of subject-matter, which do not properly come under them.

So judicious an author as Quinctilian would not have failed to perceive, had he not been carried away by an inordinate veneration for his own Art, that as the possession of building materials is no part of the art of Architecture, though it is impossible to build without material, so, the knowledge of the subjects on which

* Elements of Logic, Introd.

the Orator is to speak, constitutes no part of the art of Rhetoric, though it be essential to its successful employment; and that though virtue, and the good reputation it procures, add materially to the Speaker's influence, they are no more to be, for that reason, considered as belonging to the Orator, as such, than wealth, rank, or a good person, which manifestly have a tendency to produce the same effect.

In the present day however, the province of Rhetoric, in the widest acceptation that would be reckoned admissible, comprehends all "Composition in Prose;" in the narrowest sense, it would be limited to "Persuasive Speaking."

Extremes in the limitation and extension of the province of Rhetoric.

I propose in the present work to adopt a middle course between these two extreme points; and to treat of ***Argumentative Composition***, generally, and exclusively; considering Rhetoric (in conformity with the very just and philosophical view of Aristotle) as an off-shoot from Logic.

Object of the present Treatise.

I remarked in treating of that Science, that Reasoning may be considered as applicable to two purposes, which I ventured to designate respectively by the terms "Inferring," and "Proving;" i. e. the *ascertainment* of the truth by investigation, and the *establishment* of it to the satisfaction of *another*: and I there remarked, that Bacon, in his *Organon*, has laid down rules for the conduct of the former of these processes, and that the latter belongs to the province of Rhetoric: and it was added, that to *infer* is to be regarded as the proper office of the Philosopher, or the Judge;—to *prove*, of

Philosophy and Rhetoric compared.

the Advocate. It is not however to be understood that Philosophical works are to be excluded from the class to which Rhetorical rules are applicable; for the Philosopher who undertakes, by writing or speaking, to convey his notions to others, assumes, for the time being, the character of Advocate of the doctrines he maintains. The process of *investigation* must be supposed completed, and certain conclusions arrived at by that process, before he begins to impart his ideas to others in a treatise or lecture; the object of which must of course be to *prove* the justness of those conclusions. And in doing this, he will not always find it expedient to adhere to the same course of reasoning by which his own discoveries were originally made; other arguments may occur to him afterwards, more clear, or more concise, or better adapted to the understanding of those he addresses. In explaining therefore, and establishing the truth, he may often have occasion for rules of a different kind from those employed in its discovery. Accordingly, when I remarked, in the work above alluded to, that it is a common fault, for those engaged in Philosophical and Theological inquiries, to forget their own peculiar office, and assume that of the Advocate, improperly, this caution is to be understood as applicable to the process of *forming their own opinions*; not, as excluding them from advocating by all fair arguments, the conclusions at which they have arrived by candid investigation. But if this candid investigation do not take place in the first instance, no pains that they may bestow in searching for arguments, will have any tendency to promote their attainment of truth. If a man

begins (as is too plainly a frequent mode of proceeding) by hastily adopting, or strongly leaning to some opinion, which suits his inclination, or which is sanctioned by some authority that he blindly venerates, and then studies with the utmost diligence, not as an Investigator of Truth, but as an Advocate labouring to prove his point, his talents and his researches, whatever effect they may produce in making converts to his notions, will avail nothing in enlightening his own judgment, and securing him from error.

Composition however, of the Argumentative kind, may be considered (as has been above stated) as coming under the province of Rhetoric. And this view of the subject is the less open to objection, inasmuch as it is not likely to lead to discussions that can be deemed superfluous, even by those who may choose to consider Rhetoric in the most restricted sense, as relating only to "Persuasive Speaking;" since it is evident that *Argument* must be, in most cases at least, the basis of Persuasion.

I propose then to treat, first and principally, of the Discovery of Arguments, and of their Arrangement; secondly, to lay down some Rules respecting the excitement and management of the Passions, with a view to the attainment of any object proposed, — principally, Persuasion, in the strict sense, i. e. the influencing of the Will; thirdly, to offer some remarks on Style; and fourthly, to treat of Elocution.

Present Treatise.

§ 2.

History of Rhetoric.

It may be expected that, before I proceed to treat of the Art in question, I should present the reader with a sketch of its history. Little however is required to be said on this head, because the present is not one of those branches of study in which we can trace with interest a progressive improvement from age to age. It is one, on the contrary, to which more attention appears to have been paid, and in which greater proficiency is supposed to have been made, in the earliest days of Science and Literature, than at any subsequent period. Among the ancients, Aristotle, the earliest whose works are extant, may safely be pronounced to be also the best, of the systematic writers on Rhetoric. Cicero is hardly to be reckoned among the number; for he delighted so much more in the practice than in the theory of his art, that he is perpetually drawn off from the rigid Philosophical analysis of its principles, into discursive declamations, always eloquent indeed, and often highly interesting, but adverse to regularity of system, and frequently as unsatisfactory to the practical student as to the Philosopher. He abounds indeed with excellent practical remarks, though the best of them are scattered up and down his works with much irregularity; but his precepts, though of great weight, as being the result of experience, are not often traced up by him to first principles; and we are frequently left to guess, not only on what basis his rules are grounded, but in what cases they are applicable. Of this latter defect a remarkable instance will be hereafter cited.

Aristotle.

Cicero.

Quinctilian *is* indeed a systematic writer; but cannot be considered as having much extended the Philosophical views of his predecessors in this department. He possessed much good sense, but this was tinctured with pedantry; — with that *ἀλαζονεία* as Aristotle calls it, which extends to an extravagant degree the province of the Art which he professes. A great part of his work indeed is a Treatise on education generally; in the conduct of which he was no mean proficient; for such was the importance attached to public speaking, even long after the downfall of the Republic had cut off the Orator from the hopes of attaining, through the means of this qualification, the highest political importance, that he who was nominally a Professor of Rhetoric, had in fact the most important branches of instruction intrusted to his care.

Quinctilian.

Many valuable maxims however are to be found in this author; but he wanted the profundity of thought and power of analysis which Aristotle possessed.

The writers on Rhetoric among the ancients whose works are lost, seem to have been numerous: but most of them appear to have confined themselves to a very narrow view of the subject; and to have been occupied, as Aristotle complains, with the minor details of style and arrangement, and with the sophistical tricks and petty artifices of the Pleader, instead of giving a masterly and comprehensive sketch of the essentials.

Among the moderns, few writers of ability have turned their thoughts to the subject; and but little has been added, either in respect of matter, or of system, to what the ancients have left us. It were most unjust however to leave unnoticed Dr. Campbell's *Philosophy of Rhetoric*: a work which

Campbell.

does not enjoy indeed so high a degree of popular favour as Dr. Blair's, but is incomparably superior to it, not only in depth of thought and ingenious original research, but also in practical utility to the student. The title of Dr. Campbell's work has perhaps deterred many readers, who have concluded it to be more abstruse and less popular in its character than it really is. Amidst much however that is readily understood by any moderately intelligent reader, there is much also that calls for some exertion of thought, which the indolence of most readers refuses to bestow. And it must be owned that he also in some instances perplexes his readers by being perplexed himself, and bewildered in the discussion of questions through which he does not clearly see his way. His great defect, which not only leads him into occasional errors, but leaves many of his best ideas but imperfectly developed, is his ignorance and utter misconception of the nature and object of Logic; on which some remarks were made in my treatise on that Science. Rhetoric being in truth an off-shoot of Logic, that Rhetorician must labour under great disadvantages who is not only ill-acquainted with that system, but also utterly unconscious of his deficiency.

§ 3.

From a general view of the history of Rhetoric, two questions naturally suggest themselves, which on examination will be found very closely connected together: first, what is the cause of the careful and extensive cultivation, among the ancients, of an Art which the moderns have comparatively neglected; and secondly, whether the former or the latter are to be regarded as

the wiser in this respect; — in other words, whether Rhetoric be *worth* any diligent cultivation.

Assiduous cultivation of Rhetoric by the ancients.

With regard to the first of these questions, the answer generally given is, that the nature of the Government in the ancient democratical States caused a demand for public speakers, and for such speakers as should be able to gain influence not only with educated persons in dispassionate deliberation, but with a promiscuous multitude; and accordingly it is remarked, that the extinction of liberty brought with it, or at least brought after it, the decline of Eloquence; as is justly remarked (though in a courtly form) by the author of the dialogue on Oratory, which passes under the name of Tacitus: "***Quid enim opus est longis in Senatu sententiis, cum optimi cito consentiant? quid, multis apud populum concionibus, cum de Republicâ non imperiti et multi deliberent, sed sapientissimus, et unus?***"

This account of the matter is undoubtedly correct as far as it goes; but the importance of public-speaking is so great, in our own, and all other countries that are not under a despotic Government, that the apparent neglect of the study of Rhetoric seems to require some further explanation. Part of this explanation may be supplied by the consideration, that the difference in this respect between the ancients and ourselves is not so great in reality as in appearance. When the *only* way of addressing the public was by orations, and when all political measures were debated in popular assemblies, the characters of Orator, Author, and Politician, almost entirely coincided; he who would communicate his ideas to the world, or would gain political power, and carry his legislative schemes in-

The ancients hearers rather than readers.

to effect, was necessarily a Speaker; since, as Pericles is made to remark by Thucydides, "one who forms a judgment on any point, but cannot explain himself clearly to the people, might as well have never thought at all on the subject."* The consequence was, that almost all who sought, and all who professed to give, instruction, in the principles of Government, and the conduct of judicial proceedings, combined these, in their minds and in their practice, with the study of Rhetoric, which was necessary to give effect to all such attainments; and in time the Rhetorical writers (of whom Aristotle makes that complaint) came to consider the Science of Legislation and of Politics in general, as a part of their own Art.

Much therefore of what was formerly studied under the name of Rhetoric, is still, under other names, as generally and as diligently studied as ever.

It cannot be denied however that a great difference, though less, as I have said, than might at first sight appear, does exist between the ancients and the moderns in this point; — that what is strictly and properly called Rhetoric, is much less studied, at least less systematically studied, now, than formerly. Perhaps this also may be in some measure accounted for from the circumstances which have been just noticed. Such is the distrust excited by any suspicion of Rhetorical artifice, that every speaker or writer who is anxious to carry his point, endeavours to disown or to keep out of sight any superiority of skill; and wishes to be considered as relying rather on the strength of his cause, and the soundness of his views, than on his ingenuity and expertness as an advocate. Hence it is, that even those who have paid the greatest and the most successful attention to the study of Composition and of Elocution, are so far from encouraging others by example or recommendation to engage in the same pursuit, that they labour rather to conceal and disavow their own proficiency; and thus, theoretical rules are decried, even by those who owe the most to them. Whereas among the ancients, the same cause did not, for the reasons lately mentioned, operate to the same extent; since, however careful any speaker might be to disown the artifices of Rhetoric properly so called, he would not be ashamed to acknowledge himself, generally, a student, or a proficient, in an Art which was understood to include the elements of Political wisdom.

Discouragement of rhetorical studies among the moderns.

* Thucydides, book ii.

§ 4.

With regard to the other question proposed, viz. concerning the utility of Rhetoric, it is to be observed that it divides itself into two; first, whether Oratorical skill be, on the whole, a public benefit, or evil; and secondly, whether any artificial system of Rules is conducive to the attainment of that skill. The former of these questions was eagerly debated among the ancients: on the latter but little doubt seems to have existed. With us, on the contrary, the state of these questions seems nearly reversed. It seems generally admitted that skill in Composition and in Speaking, liable as it evidently is to abuse, is to be considered, on the whole, as advantageous to the public: because that liability to abuse is neither in this, nor in any other case, to be considered as conclusive against the utility of

Two parts of Rhetoric.

any kind of art, faculty, or profession; — because the evil effects of misdirected power, require that equal powers should be arrayed on the opposite side; — and because truth, having an intrinsic superiority over falsehood, may be expected to prevail when the skill of the contending parties is equal; which will be the more likely to take place, the more widely such skill is diffused. But many, perhaps most persons, are inclined to the opinion that Eloquence, either in writing or speaking, is either a natural gift, or, at least, is to be acquired by mere practice, and is not to be attained or improved by any system of rules. And this opinion is favoured not least by those (as has been just observed) whose own experience would enable them to decide very differently; and it certainly seems to be in a great degree practically adopted. Most persons, if not left entirely to the disposal of chance in respect of this branch of education, are at least left to acquire what they can by *practice*, such as school or college exercises afford, without much care being taken to initiate them systematically into the principles of the Art; and that, frequently, not so much from negligence in the conductors of education, as from their doubts of the utility of any such regular system.

It certainly must be admitted, that rules not constructed on broad Philosophical principles, are more likely to cramp than to assist the operations of our faculties; — that a pedantic display of technical skill is more detrimental in this than in any other pursuit, since by exciting distrust, it counteracts the very purpose of it; — that a system of rules imperfectly comprehended, or not familiarized by practice, will (while that continues to be the case) prove rather an impediment than a help; as

indeed will be found in all other Arts likewise; — and that no system can be expected to equalize men whose natural powers are different: but none of these concessions at all invalidate the positions of Aristotle; that some succeed better than others in explaining their opinions, and bringing over others to them; and that, not merely by superiority of natural gifts, but by acquired habit; and that consequently if we can discover the causes of this superior success,—the means by which the desired end is attained by all who *do* attain it,—we shall be in possession of rules capable of general application: ὅπερ ἐστὶ, says he, τέχνης ἔργον.* Experience so plainly evinces, what indeed we might naturally be led antecedently to conjecture, that a right judgment on any subject is not necessarily accompanied by skill in effecting conviction, — nor the ability to discover truth, by a facility in explaining it, — that it might be matter of wonder how any doubt should ever have existed as to the possibility of devising, and the utility of employing, a System of Rules for "Argumentative Composition," generally, distinct from any system conversant about the subject-matter of each Composition.

It is probable that the existing prejudices on this subject may be traced in great measure to the imperfect or incorrect notions of some writers, who have either confined their attention to trifling minutiæ of style, or at least have in some respect failed to take a sufficiently comprehensive view of the principles of the Art. One distinction especially is to be clearly laid down and carefully borne in mind by those who would form a correct idea of these principles; viz. the distinction already noticed

* Rhet. Book I. ch. 1.

in the Elements of Logic, between *an* Art, and *the* Art. "*An* Art of Reasoning" would imply, "a Method or System of Rules by the observance of which one may Reason correctly;" "*the* Art of Reasoning" would imply a System of Rules to which every one *does* conform (whether knowingly or not) who reasons correctly: and such is Logic, considered as an Art. In like manner "*an* Art of Composition" would imply "a System of Rules by which a good Composition may be produced;" "*the* Art of Composition,"—"such rules as *every* good Composition must conform to," whether the author of it had them in his mind or not. Of the former character appear to have been (among others) many of the Logical and Rhetorical Systems of Aristotle's predecessors in those departments: he himself evidently takes the other and more Philosophical view of both branches: as appears (in the case of Rhetoric) both from the plan he sets out with, that of investigating the causes of the success of all who do succeed in effecting conviction, and from several passages occurring in various parts of his Treatise, which indicate how sedulously he was on his guard to conform to that plan. Those who have not attended to the important distinction just alluded to, are often disposed to feel wonder, if not weariness, at his reiterated remarks, that "*all* men effect persuasion either in this way or in that;" "it is *impossible* to attain such and such an object in any other way;" &c. which doubtless were intended to remind his readers of the nature of his design; viz. not to teach *an* Art of Rhetoric, but *the* Art;—not to instruct them merely how conviction *might* be produced, but how it *must*.

A rightly formed system does not cramp the natural powers.

If this distinction were carefully kept in view by the teacher and by the learner of Rhetoric, we should no longer hear complaints of the natural powers being fettered by the formalities of a System; since no such complaint can lie against a System whose Rules are drawn from the invariable practice of all who succeed in attaining their proposed object.

No one would expect that the study of Sir Joshua Reynolds's lectures would cramp the genius of the painter. No one complains of the rules of Grammar as fettering Language; because it is understood that correct use is not founded on Grammar, but Grammar on correct use. A just system of Logic or of Rhetoric is analogous, in this respect, to Grammar.

§ 5.

The chief reason probably for the existing prejudice against technical systems of Composition, is to be found in the cramped, meagre, and feeble character of most of such essays, &c. as are *avowedly* composed according to the rules of any such system. It should be remembered however, in the first place, that these are almost invariably the productions of *learners*; it being usual for those who have attained proficiency, either to write without thinking of any rules, or to be desirous, (as has been said,) and by their increased expertness, able, to conceal their employment of art. Now it is not fair to judge of the value of any system of rules, those of a drawing-master for instance, from the first awkward sketches of tyros in the art.

Exercises in Composition.

Still less would it be fair to judge of one system, from the ill-success of another, whose rules were framed (as

is the case with those ordinarily laid down for the use of students in Composition) on narrow, unphilosophical, and erroneous principles.

Difficulty in the composition of exercises.

But the circumstance which has mainly tended to produce the complaint alluded to, is, that in this case, the reverse takes place of the plan pursued in the learning of other arts; in which it is usual to begin, for the sake of practice, with what is *easiest;* here, on the contrary, the tyro has usually a *harder* task assigned him, and one in which he is less likely to succeed, than he will meet with in the actual business of life. For it is undeniable that it is much the most difficult to find either propositions to maintain, or arguments to prove them—to know, in short, what to say, or how to say it—on any subject on which one has hardly any information, and no interest; about which he knows little, and cares still less.

Now the subjects usually proposed for School or College exercises are (to the learners themselves) precisely of this description. And hence it commonly happens, that an exercise composed with diligent care by a young student, though it will have cost him far more pains than a *real* letter written by him to his friends, on subjects that interest him, will be very greatly inferior to it. On the *real occasions* of after life, (I mean, when the object proposed is, not to fill up a sheet, a book, or an hour, but to communicate his thoughts, to convince, or persuade,)—on these real occasions, for which such exercises were designed to prepare him, he will find that he writes both better and with more facility, than on the *artificial* occasion, as it may be called, of composing a declamation;—that he has been attempting to learn the

easier, by practising the harder. But what is worse, it will often happen that such exercises will have formed a habit of stringing together empty common-places, and vapid declamations,—of multiplying words and spreading out the matter thin,—of composing in a stiff, artificial, and frigid manner: and that this habit will more or less cling through life to one who has been thus trained, and will infect all his future compositions.

Ill effects resulting from exercises.

So strongly, it should seem, was Milton impressed with a sense of this danger, that he was led to condemn the use altogether of exercises in Composition. In this opinion he stands perhaps alone among all writers on education. I should perhaps agree with him, if there were absolutely no other remedy for the evil in question; for I am inclined to think that this part of education, if conducted as it often is, does in general more harm than good.

But I am convinced, that practice in Composition, both for boys and young men, may be so conducted as to be productive of many and most essential advantages.

Selection of subjects.

The obvious and the only preventive of the evils which I have been speaking of is, a most scrupulous care in the selection of such *subjects* for exercises as are likely to be *interesting* to the student, and on which he has, or may (with pleasure, and without much toil) acquire, sufficient information. Such subjects will of course vary, according to the learner's age and intellectual advancement; but they had better be rather below, than much above him; that is, they should never be such as to induce him to string together vague general expressions, conveying no distinct ideas to his own

mind, and second-hand sentiments which he does not feel. He may freely transplant indeed from other writers such thoughts as will take root in the soil of his own mind; but he must never be tempted to collect dried specimens. He must also be encouraged to express himself (in correct language indeed, but) in a free, natural, and simple style; which of course implies (considering who and what the writer is supposed to be) such a style as, in itself, would be open to severe criticism, and certainly very unfit to appear in a book.

Compositions on such subjects, and in such a style, would probably be regarded with a disdainful eye, as puerile, by those accustomed to the opposite mode of teaching. But it should be remembered that the compositions of boys *must* be puerile, in one way or the other: and to a person of unsophisticated and sound taste, the truly contemptible kind of puerility would be found in the other kind of exercises. Look at the letter of an intelligent youth to one of his companions, communicating intelligence of such petty matters as are interesting to both — describing the scenes he has visited, and the recreations he has enjoyed, during a vacation; and you will see a picture of the youth himself — boyish indeed in looks and in stature — in dress and demeanour; but lively, unfettered, natural, giving a fair promise for manhood, and, in short, what a boy should be. Look at a theme composed by the same youth, on "Virtus est medium vitiorum," or "Natura beatis omnibus esse dedit," and you will see a picture, of the same boy, dressed up in the garb, and absurdly aping the demeanour, of an elderly man. Our ancestors (and still more recently, I believe, the continental nations) were guilty of the absurdity of dressing up children in wigs, swords, huge buckles, hoops, ruffles, and all the elaborate full-dressed finery of grown up people of that day.* It is surely reasonable that the analogous absurdity in greater matters also, among the rest in that part of education I am speaking of, should be laid aside; and that we should in all points consider what is appropriate to each different period of life.

The subjects for Composition to be selected on the principle I am recommending, will generally fall under one of three classes: first, subjects drawn from the studies the learner is engaged in; relating, for instance, to the characters or incidents of any history he may be reading: and sometimes, perhaps, leading him to forestall by conjecture, something which he will hereafter come to, in the book itself: secondly, subjects drawn from any conversation he may have listened to *with interest*, from his seniors, whether addressed to himself, or between each other: or, thirdly, relating to the amusements, familiar occurrences, and every-day transactions, which are likely to have formed the topics of easy conversation among his familiar friends. The student should not be confined too exclusively to any one of these three classes of subjects. They should be intermingled in as much variety as possible. And the teacher should frequently recall to his own mind these two considerations; first, that since the benefit proposed does not consist in the intrinsic value of the composition, but in the *exercise* to the pupil's mind, it matters not how insignificant the subject may be, if it will

Classes of subjects for exercises.

* See "Sandford and Merton," passim

but interest him, and thereby afford him such exercise; secondly, that the younger and backwarder each student is, the more unfit he will be for *abstract* speculations; and the less remote must be the subjects proposed from those *individual* objects and occurrences which always form the first beginnings of the furniture of the youthful mind.*

If the system which I have been recommending be pursued, with the addition of sedulous care in correction—encouragement from the teacher — and inculcation of such general rules as each occasion calls for; then, *and not otherwise*, Exercises in Composition will be of the most important and lasting advantage, not only in respect of the object *immediately* proposed, but in producing clearness of thought, and in giving play to all the faculties. And if this branch of education be thus conducted, then, *and not otherwise*, the greater part of the present treatise will, it is hoped, be found, not much less adapted to the use of those who are writing for practice-sake, than of those engaged in meeting the occasions of real life.

* For some further observations bearing on the same point, see Part iv. ch. vi. § 2. See also some valuable remarks on the subject in Mr. Hill's ingenious work on Public Education.

PART I.

OF THE INVENTION, ARRANGEMENT, AND INTRODUCTION OF PROPOSITIONS AND ARGUMENTS.

CHAP. I.

Of Propositions.

§ 1.

Inquiry after Truth and after Arguments distinguished.

It was remarked in the Treatise on Logic, that in the process of *Investigation* properly so called, viz. that by which we endeavour to discover Truth, it must of course be uncertain to him who is entering on that process, what the conclusion will be, to which his researches will lead; but that in the process of *conveying truth* to others, by reasoning, (i. e. that which according to the view I have at present taken may be termed the Rhetorical process,) the conclusion or conclusions which are to be established must be present to the mind of him who is conducting the Argument, and whose business is to find *Proofs* of a given proposition.

It is evident therefore, that the first step to be taken by him is to lay down distinctly in his own mind the proposition or propositions to be proved. It might indeed at first sight appear superfluous even to mention so obvious a rule; but experience shews that it is by no means uncommon for a young or ill-instructed writer to

content himself with such a vague and indistinct view of the point he is to aim at, that the whole train of his reasoning is in consequence affected with a corresponding perplexity, obscurity, and looseness. It may be worth while therefore to give some hints for the conduct of this preliminary process, — the choice of propositions. Not, of course, that I am supposing the author to be in doubt what opinion he shall adopt: the process of Investigation (which does not fall within the province of Rhetoric) being supposed to be concluded; but still there will often be room for deliberation as to the form in which an opinion shall be stated, and, when several propositions are to be maintained, in what order they shall be placed.

Conviction and Instruction.

On this head therefore I shall proceed to propose some rules; after having premised (in order to anticipate some objections or doubts which might arise) one remark relative to the object to be effected. This is, of course, what may be called, in the widest sense of the word, Conviction: but under that term are comprehended, first, what is strictly called *Instruction;* and, secondly, *Conviction* in the narrower sense; i. e. the Conviction of those who are either of a *contrary opinion* to the one maintained, or who are *in doubt* whether to admit or deny it. By Instruction, on the other hand, is commonly meant the conviction of those who have neither formed an opinion on the subject, nor are deliberating whether to adopt or reject the proposition in question, but are merely desirous of ascertaining *what* is the truth in respect of the case before them. The former are supposed to have before their minds the terms of the proposition maintained, and are called upon to consider *whether that particular proposition* be true or false;

the latter are not supposed to know the terms of the conclusion, but to be enquiring *what proposition* is to be received as true. The former may be described in logical language, as doubting respecting the *Copula;* the latter, respecting the *Predicate.* It is evident that the speaker or writer is, relatively to these last, (though not to himself,) conducting a process of Investigation; as is plain from what has been said of that subject, in the treatise on LOGIC.

The distinction between these two objects gives rise in some points to corresponding differences in the mode of procedure, which will be noticed hereafter; these differences however are not sufficient to require that Rhetoric should on that account be divided into two distinct branches; since, generally speaking, though not universally, the same rules will be serviceable for attaining each of these objects.

§ 2.

The first step is, as I have observed, to lay down (in the author's mind) the proposition or propositions to be maintained, clearly, and in a suitable form.

He who strictly observes this rule, and who is thus brought to view steadily the point he is aiming at, will be kept clear, in a great degree, of some common faults of young writers; viz. entering on too wide a field of discussion, and introducing many propositions not sufficiently connected; an error which destroys the unity of the composition. This last error those are apt to fall into, who place before themselves a *Theme* instead of a *Proposition;* and imagine that because they are *treating of one thing*, they

are *discussing one question*. In an Ethical work, for instance, one may be *treating of virtue*, while discussing all or any of these questions; "Wherein virtue consists?" "Whence our notions of it arise?" "Whence it derives its obligation?" &c. but if these questions were confusedly blended together, or if all of them were treated of, within a short compass, the most just remarks and forcible arguments would lose their interest and their utility, in so perplexed a composition.

Nearly akin to this fault is the other just mentioned, that of entering on too wide a field for the length of the work; by which means the writer is confined to barren and uninteresting generalities; as e. g. general exhortations to virtue (conveyed, of course, in very general terms) in the space of a discourse only of sufficient length to give a characteristic description of some one branch of duty, or of some one particular motive to the practice of it. Unpractised composers are apt to fancy that they shall have the greater abundance of matter, the wider extent of subject they comprehend; but experience shews that the reverse is the fact: the more general and extensive view will often suggest nothing to the mind but vague and trite remarks, when, upon narrowing the field of discussion, many interesting questions of detail present themselves. Now a writer who is accustomed to state to himself precisely, in the first instance, the conclusions to which he is tending, will be the less likely to content himself with such as consist of very general statements; and will often be led, even where an extensive view is at first proposed, to distribute it into several branches, and, waiving the discussion of the rest, to limit

Copiousness of matter for minds by a restricted view.

himself to the full developement of one or two; and thus applying, as it were, a microscope to a small space, will present to the view much that a wider survey would not have exhibited.

§ 3.

It may be useful for one who is about thus to lay down his propositions, to ask himself these three questions: first, What is the fact? secondly, Why (i. e. from what Cause) is it so? or, in other words, how is it accounted for? and thirdly, What Consequence results from it?

Inquiries after Cause & Consequence.

The last two of these questions, though they will not in every case suggest such answers as are strictly to be called the Cause and the Consequence of the principal truth to be maintained, may, at least, often furnish such propositions as bear a somewhat similar relation to it.

It is to be observed, that in recommending the writer to begin by laying down in his own mind the propositions to be maintained, it is not meant to be implied that they are always to be *stated* first; that will depend upon the nature of the case; and rules will hereafter be given on that point.

It is to be observed also, that by the words "Proposition" or "Assertion," throughout this Treatise, is to be understood some *conclusion* to be established *for itself*; not with a view to an ulterior conclusion: those propositions which are intended to serve as premises, being called, in allowable conformity with popular usage, *Arguments*; it being customary to argue in the enthymematic form, and to call, for brevity's sake, the expressed premiss of an enthymeme, the argument by which the conclusion of it is proved.

CHAP. II.

Of Arguments.

§ 1.

THE finding of suitable arguments to prove a given point, and the skilful arrangement of them, may be considered as the immediate and proper province of Rhetoric, and of that alone. The business of Logic is, as Cicero complains, to *judge* of arguments, not to *invent* them: ("in inveniendis argumentis nulla nimium est; in judicandis, nimium loquax." Cic. de Orat.) The knowledge again, in each case, of the subject in hand, is essential; but it is evidently borrowed from the science or system conversant about that subject-matter, whether Politics, Theology, Law, Ethics, or any other. The art of addressing the feelings again, does not belong exclusively to Rhetoric; since Poetry has at least as much to do with that branch. Nor are the considerations relative to Style and Elocution confined to argumentative and persuasive composition. The art of *inventing* and *arranging Arguments* is, as has been said, the only province that Rhetoric can claim entirely and exclusively.

Proper province of Rhetoric.

Arguments are divided according to several different principles; i. e. logically speaking, there are *several divisions* of them. And these *cross-divisions* have proved a source of endless perplexity to the Logical and Rhetorical student, because the writers on those subjects have not been aware of them. Hardly any thing perhaps has contributed so much to

Various divisions of Arguments.

lessen the interest and the utility of systems as the indistinctness hence resulting. When in any subject the members of a division are not *opposed*, but are in fact members of different divisions crossing each other, it is manifestly impossible to obtain any clear notion of the Species treated of; nor will any labour or ingenuity bestowed on the subject be of the least avail, till the original source of perplexity is removed; — till, in short, the cross-division is detected and explained.

Arguments then may be divided,

First, into Irregular, and Regular, i. e. Syllogisms; these last into Categorical and Hypothetical; and the Categorical, into Syllogisms in the first Figure, and in the other Figures, &c. &c.

Secondly, They are frequently divided into "Moral," (or "Probable,") and "Demonstrative," (or "Necessary.")

Thirdly, into "Direct" and "Indirect," (or *reductio ad absurdum*,) the Deictic and Elenctic of Aristotle.

Fourthly, into Arguments from "Example," from "Testimony," from "Cause to Effect," from "Analogy," &c. &c.

It will be perceived, on attentive examination, that several of the different species just mentioned will occasionally *contain* each other: e. g. a Probable Argument may be at the same time a Categorical Argument, a Direct Argument, and an Argument from Testimony, &c.: this being the consequence of Arguments having been divided on several different principles; a circumstance so obvious the moment it is distinctly stated, that I apprehend such of my readers as have not been conversant in these studies will hardly be disposed to believe that it

could have been (as is the fact) generally overlooked, and that eminent writers should in consequence have been involved in inextricable confusion. I need only remind them however of the anecdote of Columbus breaking the egg. That which is perfectly obvious to any man of common sense, as soon as it is mentioned, may nevertheless fail to occur, even to men of considerable ingenuity.

Division of Forms of Arguments.

It will also be readily perceived, on examining the principles of these several divisions, that the last of them alone is properly and strictly a division of *Arguments as such*. The first is evidently a division of the *Forms of stating them*; for every one would allow that the *same* Argument may be either stated as an enthymeme, or brought into the strict syllogistic form; and that, either categorically or hypothetically, &c., e. g. "Whatever has a beginning has a cause; the earth had a beginning, therefore it had a cause;" or, "*If* the earth had a beginning, it had a cause: it had a beginning," &c. every one would call the *same* Argument, differently stated. This, therefore, evidently is not a division of Arguments *as such*.

Subject-matter of Arguments.

The second is plainly a division of Arguments according to their *subject-matter*, whether Necessary or Probable, certain or uncertain. In Mathematics, e. g. every proposition that can be stated is either an immutable truth, or an absurdity and self-contradiction: while in human affairs the propositions which we assume are only true for the most part, and as general rules; and in Physics, though they must be true as long as the laws of nature remain undisturbed, the contradiction of them does not imply an absurdity; and the

conclusions of course, in each case, have the same degree and kind of certainty with the premises. This therefore is properly a division, not of *Arguments* as such, but of the *Propositions* of which they consist.

Purposes of Arguments.

The third is a division of Arguments according to the purpose for which they are employed; according to the *intention* of the reasoner; whether that be to establish "directly" (or "ostensively") the conclusion drawn, or ("indirectly") by means of an absurd conclusion to disprove one of the premises: (i. e. to prove its contradictory:) since the alternative proposed in every valid Argument is, either to admit the conclusion, or to deny one of the premises. Now it may so happen that in some cases, one person will choose the former, and another the latter, of these alternatives. It is probable, e. g. that many have been induced to admit the doctrine of Transubstantiation, from its clear connexion with the infallibility of the Romish Church; and many others, by the very same Argument, have surrendered their belief in that infallibility. Again, Berkeley and Reid seem to have alike admitted that the non-existence of matter was a necessary consequence of Locke's Theory of Ideas: but the former was hence led, *bonâ fide*, to admit and advocate that non-existence; while the latter was led by the very same Argument to reject the Ideal Theory. Thus, we see it is possible for the very same Argument to be Direct to one person, and Indirect to another; leading them to different results, according as they judge the original conclusion, or the contradictory of a premiss, to be the more probable. This, therefore, is not properly a division of Arguments as such, but a division of the purposes for which they are employed.

Division of Arguments as such.

The fourth, which alone is properly a division of Arguments *as such*, and accordingly will be principally treated of, is a division according to the "relation of the subject-matter of the premises to that of the conclusion." I say, "of the subject-matter," because the *logical* connexion between the premises and conclusion is independent of the meaning of the terms employed, and may be exhibited with letters of the alphabet substituted for the terms; but the relation I am now speaking of between the premises and conclusion, (and the varieties of which form the several species of Arguments,) is in respect of their subject-matter: as e. g. an "Argument from Cause to Effect" is so called and considered, in reference to the relation existing between the premiss, which is the Cause, and the conclusion, which is the Effect; and an "Argument from Example," in like manner, from the relation between a known and an unknown instance, both belonging to the same class. And it is plain that the present division, though it has a reference to the subject-matter of the premises, is yet not a division of *propositions* considered by themselves, (as in the case with the division into "probable" and "demonstrative,") but of *Arguments* considered as such; for when we say, e. g. that the premiss is a Cause, and the conclusion the Effect, these expressions are evidently relative, and have no meaning, except in reference to each other; and so also when we say that the premiss and the conclusion are two *parallel* cases, that very expression denotes their relation to each other.

§ 2.

Two classes of Arguments.

In distributing, then, the several kinds of Arguments, according to this division, it will be found convenient to lay down first two great classes, under one or other of which all can be brought; viz. first, such Arguments as might have been employed to *account for* the fact or principle maintained, supposing its truth granted: secondly, such as could *not* be so employed. The former class (to which in this Treatise the name of "*A priori*" Argument will be confined) is manifestly Argument from *Cause* to Effect: since to *account* for any thing, signifies, to assign the Cause of it. The other class, of course, comprehends all other Arguments; of which there are several kinds, which will be mentioned hereafter.

The two sorts of proof which have been just spoken of, Aristotle seems to have intended to designate by the titles ὅτι for the latter, and διότι for the former; but he has not been so clear as could be wished in observing the distinction between them. The only decisive test by which to distinguish the Arguments which belong to the one and to the other, of these classes, is, to ask the question, "Supposing the proposition in question to be admitted, would this Argument serve to *account* for the truth, or not?" It will then be readily referred to the former or to the latter class, according as the answer is in the affirmative or the negative, as, e. g. if a murder were imputed to any one on the grounds of his "having a hatred to the deceased, and an interest in his death," the Argument would belong to the former class; because, *supposing* his guilt to be *admitted*, and an inquiry to be made how he came to commit the murder, the circum-

stances just mentioned would serve to *account* for it; but not so, with respect to such an Argument as his "having blood on his clothes;" which would therefore be referred to the other class.

And here let it be observed, once for all, that when I speak of arguing from Cause to Effect, it is not intended to maintain the real and proper efficacy of what are called Physical Causes to produce their respective Effects, nor to enter into any discussion of the controversies which have been raised on that point, which would be foreign from the present purpose. The word "Cause," therefore, is to be understood as employed in the popular sense; as well as the phrase of "accounting for" any fact.

Argument from cause to effect.

As far, then, as any Cause, popularly speaking, has a tendency to produce a certain Effect, so far its existence is an Argument for that of the Effect. If the Cause be fully *sufficient*, and no *impediments* intervene, the Effect in question follows certainly; and the nearer we approach to this, the stronger the Argument.

Plausibility.

This is the kind of Argument which produces (when short of absolute certainty) that species of the Probable which is usually called the Plausible. On this subject Dr. Campbell has some valuable remarks in his *Philosophy of Rhetoric*, (book i. § 5 ch. vii.) though he has been led into a good deal of perplexity, partly by not having logically analyzed the two species of probabilities he is treating of, and partly by departing, unnecessarily, from the ordinary use of terms, in treating of the Plausible as something

distinct from the Probable, instead of regarding it as a *species* of Probability.*

This is the chief kind of Probability which poets, or other writers of fiction, aim at; and in such works it is often designated by the term "natural."† Writers of this class, as they aim not at producing belief, are allowed to take their "Causes" for granted, (i. e. to assume any hypothesis they please,) provided they make the Effects follow naturally; representing, that is, the personages of the fiction as acting, and the events as resulting, in the same manner as might have been expected, supposing the assumed circumstances to have been real. And hence, the great Father of Criticism establishes his paradoxical maxim, that impossibilities which appear probable, are to be preferred to possibilities which appear improbable. For, as he justly observes, the impossibility of the hypothesis, as e. g. in Homer, the familiar intercourse of gods with mortals, is no bar to the kind of Probability (i. e. Verisimilitude) required, if those mor-

* I do not mean, however, that *every thing* to which the term "plausible" would apply, would be in strict propriety called "probable," as e. g. if we had fully ascertained some story that had been told us to be an imposition, we might still say, it was a plausible tale, though, subsequent to the detection, the word "probable" would not be so properly applied. But certainly common usage warrants the use of "probable" in many cases, on the ground of this plausibility alone; viz. the adequacy of some cause, known, or likely to exist, to produce the effect in question.

† It is also important for them, though not so essential, to keep clear of the improbable air produced by the introduction of events, which, though not unnatural, have a great *preponderance of chances* against them. The distinction between these two kinds of faults is pointed out in a passage in the Quarterly Review, for which see Appendix, [A.]

tals are represented as acting in the manner men naturally would have done under those circumstances.

The Probability, then, which the writer of fiction aims at, has, for the reason just mentioned, no tendency to produce a *particular*, but only a *general*, belief; i. e. not that these particular events actually took place, but that *such* are likely, generally, to take place under such circumstances :* this kind of belief (unconsciously entertained) being necessary, and all that is necessary, to produce that sympathetic feeling which is the writer's object. In Argumentative Compositions however, as the object of course is to produce conviction as to the particular point in question, the Causes from which our Arguments are drawn must be such as are either admitted, or may be proved, to be actually existing, or likely to exist.

Employment of the phrase *A priori.*

On the appropriate use of this kind of Argument, (which is probably the *τόπος* of Aristotle, though unfortunately he has not furnished any example of it,) some Rules will be laid down hereafter; my object at present having been merely to ascertain the nature of it. And here it may be worth while to remark, that though I have applied to this mode of Reasoning the title of "*a priori*," it is not meant to be maintained that all such Arguments as have been by other writers so designated correspond precisely with what has been just described.† The phrase, "*a priori*,"

* On which ground Aristotle contends that the end of Fiction is more Philosophical than that of History, since it aims at general, instead of particular, Truth.

† Some Rhetorical students, accordingly, partly with a view to keep clear of any ambiguity that might hence arise, and partly for the sake of brevity, have found it useful to adopt, in drawing up an outline or analysis of any composition, certain arbitrary symbols, to denote, respectively, each class of Arguments and of Propositions; viz. A, for the former of the two classes of Arguments just described, (to denote "*A priori*," or "Antecedent," probability,) and B, for the latter, which, as consisting of several different kinds, may be denominated "the *Body* of evidence." Again, they designate the proposition, which *accounts for* the principal and original assertion, by a small "a," or Greek α, to denote its identity *in substance* with the *Argument* bearing the symbol "A," though employed for a different purpose; viz. not to *establish* a fact that is doubtful, but to *account for* one that is admitted. The proposition, again, which results as a Consequence or Corollary from the principal one, they designate by the symbol C. There seems to be the same convenience in the use of these symbols as Logicians have found in the employment of A, E, I, O, to represent the four kinds of Propositions according to quantity and quality.

Argument, is not, indeed employed by all in the same sense; it would however generally be understood to extend to any argument drawn from an *antecedent* or *forerunner*, whether a *Cause* or not; e. g. "the mercury sinks, therefore it will rain." Now this Argument being drawn from a circumstance which, though an antecedent, is in no sense a Cause, would fall not under the former, but the latter, of the classes laid down; since when rain comes, no one would *account* for the phenomenon by the falling of the mercury; which they would call a *Sign* of rain; and yet most, perhaps, would class this among "*a priori*" Arguments. In like manner the expression, "*a posteriori*" Arguments, would not in its ordinary use coincide precisely, though it would very nearly, with the second class of Arguments. The division however which has here been adopted, appears to be both more philosophical, and also more precise, and conse-

quently more practically useful, than any other; since there is so easy and decisive a test by which an Argument may be at once referred to the one or to the other of the classes described.

§ 3.

The second, then, of these classes, (viz. "Arguments which could not be used to account for the fact in question, supposing it granted,") may be subdivided into two kinds; which will be designated by the terms "Sign" and "Example."

Sign.

By "Sign," (so called from the Σημεῖον of Aristotle,) is meant a species of Argument of which the analysis is as follows; As far as any circumstance is, what may be called, a *Condition* of the existence of a certain effect or phenomenon, so far it may be inferred from the existence of that Effect: if it be a Condition *absolutely essential*, the Argument is, of course, demonstrative; and the Probability is the stronger in proportion as we approach to that case.

Of this kind is the Argument in the instance lately given: a man is suspected as the perpetrator of the supposed murder, from the circumstance of his clothes being bloody; the murder being considered as in a certain degree a probable *condition* of that appearance; i. e. it is presumed that his clothes would *not otherwise* have been bloody. Again, from the appearance of ice, we infer, decidedly, the existence of a temperature not above freezing point, that temperature being an essential Condition of the crystallization of water.

Power of a cause.

Among the circumstances which are conditional to any Effect, must evidently come

the Cause or Causes; and if there be only one possible Cause, this being absolutely essential, may be demonstratively proved from the Effect: if the same Effect might result from other Causes, then the Argument is, at best, but probable. But it is to be observed, that there are also many circumstances which have no tendency to *produce* a certain Effect, though it cannot exist *without* them, and from which Effect, consequently, they may be inferred, as Conditions, though not Causes; e. g. a man's "being alive one day," is a circumstance necessary, as a Condition, to his "dying the next;" but has no tendency to produce it; his having been alive, therefore, on the former day, may be proved from his subsequent death, but not *vice versâ*.*

It is to be observed therefore, that though it is very common for the Cause to be proved from its Effect, it is never so proved, *so far forth as* [ἧ] it is a *Cause*, but so far forth as it is a *condition*, or necessary circumstance.

A Cause, again, may be employed to prove an Effect, (this being the first class of Arguments already described,) so far as it *has a tendency* to produce the Effect, even though it be not at all *necessary* to it; (i. e. when

* It is however very common, in the carelessness of ordinary language to mention, as the Causes of phenomena, circumstances which every one would allow, on consideration, to be not Causes, but only conditions of the Effects in question; e. g. it would be said of a tender plant, that it was destroyed in consequence of not being covered with a mat; though every one would mean to imply that the *frost* destroyed it; this being a Cause too well known to need being mentioned; and that which is spoken of as the Cause, viz. the absence of a covering, being only the Condition, without which the real Cause could not have operated.

other Causes may produce the same Effect;) and in this case, though the Effect may be inferred from the Cause, the Cause cannot be inferred from the Effect; e. g. from a mortal wound you may infer death, but not *vice versâ*.

Lastly, when a Cause is also a necessary or probable *condition*, i. e. when it is the *only* possible or only likely Cause, then we may argue both ways; e. g. we may infer a General's success from his known skill, or, his skill from his known success: these two Arguments belonging, respectively, to the two classes originally laid down. And it is to be observed, that, in such Arguments from Sign as this last, the conclusion which *follows*, *logically*, from the premiss, being the Cause from which the premiss *follows*, physically, (i. e. as a natural Effect,) there are in this case two different kinds of *Sequence* opposed to each other; e. g. "With many of them God was not well-pleased; for they were overthrown in the wilderness." In Arguments of the first class, on the contrary, these two kinds of Sequence are combined; i. e. the Conclusion which follows logically from the premiss, is also the Effect following physically from it as a Cause; a General's skill, e. g. being both the Cause and the Proof of his being likely to succeed.

Logical and physical sequence.

It is most important to keep in mind the distinction between these two kinds of Sequence, which are, in Argument, sometimes *combined*, and sometimes *opposed*. There is no more fruitful source of confusion of thought than that ambiguity of the language employed on these subjects, which tends to confound together these two things, so entirely distinct in their nature. There is

hardly any argumentative writer on subjects involving a discussion of the Causes or Effects of any thing, who has clearly perceived and steadily kept in view the distinction I have been speaking of, or who has escaped the errors and perplexities thence resulting. The wide extent accordingly, and the importance of the mistakes and difficulties arising out of the ambiguity complained of, is incalculable. To dilate upon this point as fully as might be done with advantage, would exceed my present limits; but it will not be irrelevant to offer some remarks on the origin of the ambiguity complained of, and on the cautions to be used in guarding against being misled by it.

The premiss by which any thing is proved, is not necessarily the Cause of the fact's *being such* as it is; but it is the Cause of our *knowing* or being convinced that it is so; e. g. the wetness of the earth is not the Cause of rain, but it is the Cause of our knowing that it has rained. These two things, the premiss which produces *our conviction*, and the Cause which produces that *of which* we are convinced, are the more likely to be confounded together, in the looseness of colloquial language, from the circumstance that (as has been above remarked) they frequently coincide; as, e. g. when we *infer* that the ground will be wet, from the fall of rain which *produces* that wetness. And hence it is that the same words have come to be applied, in common, to each kind of Sequence; e. g. an Effect is said to "follow" from a Cause, and a Conclusion to "follow" from the Premises; the words "Cause" and "Reason," are each applied indifferently, both to a Cause, properly so called, and to the premiss of an Ar-

Logical sequence.

gument; though "Reason," in strictness of speaking, should be confined to the latter. "Therefore," "hence," "consequently," &c., and also, "since," "because," and "why," have likewise a corresponding ambiguity.

Ambiguity of "Cause," "therefore," &c.

The multitude of the words which bear this double meaning (and that, in all languages) greatly increases our liability to be misled by it; since thus the very means men resort to for ascertaining the sense of any expression, are infected with the very same ambiguity; e. g. if we enquire what is meant by a "Cause," we shall be told that it is that from which something "follows;" or, which is indicated by the words "therefore," "consequently," &c. all which expressions are as equivocal and uncertain in their signification as the original one. It is in vain to attempt ascertaining by the balance the true amount of any commodity, if false weights are placed in the opposite scale. Hence it is that so many writers, in investigating the Cause to which any fact or phenomenon is to be attributed, have assigned that which is not a *Cause*, but only a *Proof* that the fact is so; and have thus been led into an endless train of errors and perplexities.

Several, however, of the words in question, though employed indiscriminately in both significations, seem (as was observed in the case of the word "Reason") in their primary and strict sense to be confined to one "Δή," in Greek, and "ergo," * or "itaque," in Latin, seem originally and properly to denote the Sequence

* Most Logical writers seem not to be aware of this, as they generally, in Latin Treatises, employ "ergo" in the other sense. It is from the Greek ἔργον, i. e. "in fact."

and Effect from Cause; "ἄρα," * and "igitur," that of conclusion from premises. The English word "accordingly," will generally be found to correspond with the Latin "itaque."

The interrogative "why" is employed to enquire, either, first, the "Reason," (or "Proof;") secondly, the "Cause;" or thirdly, the "object proposed," or Final-Cause: e. g. first, Why are the angles of a triangle equal to two right angles? secondly, Why are the days shorter in winter than in summer? thirdly, Why are the works of a watch constructed as they are? †

Ambiguity of "Why."

It is to be observed that the discovery of *Causes* belongs properly to the province of the Philosopher; that of "Reasons," strictly so called, (i. e. Arguments,) to that of the Rhetorician; and that, though each will have frequent occasion to assume the character of the other, it is most important that these two objects should not be confounded together.

§ 4.

Of Signs then there are some which, from a certain Effect or phenomenon, infer the "Cause" of it; and others which, in like manner, infer some "Condition" which is not the Cause. Of these last, one species is the Argument from Testimony; the premiss being the existence of the Testimony, the Conclusion, the truth of what is attested; which is considered as a "Condition" of the Testimony having been

Testimony a kind of sign.

* Ἄρα having a signification of *fitness* or *coincidence*; whence ἄρμα.

† See the article Why in the Appendix to the Treatise on Logic.

given; since it is evident that so far only as this is allowed, (i. e. so far only as it is allowed, that the Testimony would not have been given, had it not been true,) can this Argument have any force.

Testimony is of various kinds; but the distinction between them is so obvious, as well as the various circumstances which add to, or diminish the weight of, any Testimony, that it is not necessary to enter into any detailed discussion of the subject. It may be worth remarking, however, that one of the most important distinctions is between Testimony to matters of *Fact*, and to *Doctrines* or opinions: in estimating the weight of the former, we look chiefly to the *honesty* of the witness, and his means of obtaining information; in the latter, his *ability* to judge is equally to be taken into consideration.

With respect however to the credibility of witnesses, it is evident that when many coincide in their testimony, (where no previous concert can have taken place,) the probability resulting from this concurrence does not rest on the supposed veracity of each considered separately, but on the improbability of such an agreement taking place by chance. For though in such a case, each of the witnesses should be considered as unworthy of credit, and even much more likely to speak falsehood than truth, still the chances might be infinite against their all agreeing in the *same* falsehood.* This

Concurrent testimony.

* "It deserves likewise to be attended to on this subject, that in a number of concurrent testimonies, (in cases wherein there could have been no previous concert,) there is a probability distinct from that which may be termed the sum of the probabilities resulting from the testimonies of the witnesses, a probability which would remain even though the witnesses were of such a character as to merit no faith at all. This probability arises purely from the concurrence itself. That such a concurrence should spring from chance, is as one to infinite; that is, in other words, morally impossible. If therefore concert be excluded, there remains no other cause but the reality of the fact." *Campbell's Philosophy of Rhetoric*, c. v. b. i. Part 3. p. 125.

remark is applied by Dr. Campbell to the Argument from Testimony; but he might have extended it to other Arguments also, in which a similar calculation of chances will enable us to draw a Conclusion, sometimes even amounting to moral certainty, from a combination of data which singly would have had little or no weight; e. g. if any one out of a hundred men throw a stone which strikes a certain object,* there is but a slight probability, from that fact alone, that he aimed at that object; but if all the hundred threw stones which struck the *same* object, no one would doubt that they aimed at it. It is from such a combination of Argument that we infer the existence of an intelligent Creator from the marks of contrivance visible in the Universe, though many of these are such as, taken singly, might well be conceived undesigned and accidental; but that they should *all* be such, is morally impossible. Great care is requisite in setting forth clearly, especially in any popular discourse, Arguments of this nature; the generality of men being better qualified for understanding (to use Lord Bacon's word) "particulars, one by one," than for taking a comprehensive view of the whole; and therefore in a *Galaxy* of evidence, as it may be called, in which the brilliancy of no single star can be pointed out, the lustre of the combination is often lost on them. Hence it is, as was remarked in the Treatise on Fallacies, that the sophism of

* If I recollect rightly, these are the words of Mr Dugald Stewart

"Composition," as it is called, so frequently misleads men: it is not improbable, (in the above example,) that *each* of the stones, considered *separately*, may have been thrown at random: and therefore the same is concluded of *all*, considered in *conjunction*. Not that in such an instance as this, any one would reason so weakly; but that a still greater absurdity of the very same kind is involved in the rejection of the evidences of our religion, will be plain to any one who considers, not merely the individual force, but the *number* and *variety* of those evidences.*

What is meant by the chances against any supposition.

And here it may be observed, that though the easiest and most popular way of practically refuting the Fallacy just mentioned (or indeed any Fallacy) is, by bringing forward a parallel case, where it leads to a manifest absurdity, a metaphysical objection may still be urged against many cases in which we thus reason from calculation of chances; an objection not often perhaps likely practically to influence any one, but which may afford the Sophist a triumph over those who are unable to find a solution, and which may furnish an excuse for the rejection of evidence which one is previously resolved not to admit. If it were answered then to those who maintain that the universe, which exhibits so many marks of design might be the work of non-intelligent causes, that no one would believe it possible for such a work as the Iliad, e. g. to be produced by a fortuitous shaking together of the letters of the alphabet, the Sophist might

* Mr. Davison in the introduction to his work on prophecy states strongly the cumulative force of a multitude of small particulars. See ch. iii. § 4. of this Treatise.

challenge us to explain why even this last supposition should be regarded as less probable than any other; since the letters of which the Iliad is composed, if shaken together at random, must fall in *some* form or other; and though the chances are millions of millions to one against that, or any other *determinate* order, *there are precisely as many chances against one, as against another*, whether more or less regular: and in like manner, astonished as we should be, and convinced of the intervention of artifice, if we saw any one draw out all the cards in a pack in regular sequences, it is demonstrable that the chances are not more against that order, than against any one determinate order we might choose to fix upon; against that one, for instance, in which the cards are at this moment actually lying in any individual pack. The multitude of the chances, therefore, he would say, against any series of events, does not constitute it improbable; since the like happens to every one every day; e. g. a man walking through London streets on his business, meets accidentally hundreds of others passing to and fro on theirs; and he would not say at the close of the day that any thing *improbable* had occurred to him; yet it would almost baffle calculation to compute the Chances against his meeting precisely those very persons, in the order, and at the times and places of his meeting each. The paradox thus seemingly established, though few might be practically misled by it, many would be at a loss to solve.

The truth is, that any supposition is justly called improbable, not from the number of chances against it, considered *independently*, but from the number of chances against it *compared* with those which lie against some

other supposition: we call the drawing of a prize in the lottery improbable, though there be but five to one against it, because there are *more* chances of a blank; on the other hand, if any one were cast on a desert island under circumstances which warranted his believing that the chances were a hundred to one against any one's having been there before him, yet if he found on the sand pebbles so arranged as to form distinctly the letters of a man's name, he would not only conclude it probable, but absolutely certain, that some human being had been there; because there would be millions of chances against those forms having been produced by the fortuitous action of the waves. Yet if again I should find some tree on the island such that the chances appeared to me five to one against its having grown there spontaneously, still, if, as before, I conceived the chances a hundred to one against any man's having planted it there, I should at once reckon this last as the more unlikely supposition. So also, in the instance above given, any *unmeaning* form into which a number of letters might fall, would not be called improbable, countless as the chances are against that particular order, because there are just as many against each one of all other unmeaning forms; but if the letters formed a coherent poem, it would then be called incalculably improbable that this form should have been fortuitous, though the chances against it remain the very same; because there must be much *fewer* chances against the supposition of its having been the work of *design*. The probability in short, of any supposition, is estimated from a *comparison* with each of its alternatives. The inclination of the balance cannot be ascertained from knowing the weights in one scale, unless we know what is in the opposite scale.

The foregoing observations however, as was above remarked, are not confined to Arguments from Testimony, but apply to all cases in which the degree of probability is estimated from a calculation of chances.

§ 5.

Before I dismiss the consideration of Signs, it may be worth while to notice another case of combined Argument different from the one lately mentioned, yet in some degree resembling it. The combination just spoken of is where several Testimonies or other Signs, singly perhaps of little weight, produce jointly, and by their coincidence, a degree of probability far exceeding the *sum* of their several forces, taken separately; in the case I am now about to notice, the combined force of the series of Arguments results from the *order* in which they are considered, and from their *progressive* tendency to establish a certain conclusion. E. g. one part of the law of nature called the "vi inertiæ," is established by the Argument alluded to; viz. that a body set in motion will eternally continue in motion with uniform velocity in a right line, so far as it is not acted upon by any causes which retard or stop, accelerate or divert, its course. Now, as in every case which can come under our observation, some such causes do intervene, the assumed supposition, is practically impossible, and we have no opportunity of verifying the law by direct experiment; but we may *gradually approach* indefinitely near to the case supposed: and on the result of such experiments our conclusion is founded. We find that when a body is projected along a rough surface, its motion is speedily retarded and soon stopped: if along a smoother

Progressive approach.

surface, it continues longer in motion; if upon ice, longer still; and the like with regard to wheels, &c. in proportion as we gradually lessen the friction of the machinery; if we remove the resistance of the air, by setting a wheel or pendulum in motion under an air-pump, the motion is still longer continued. Finding then that the effect of the original impulse is more and more protracted, in proportion as we more and more remove the impediments to motion from friction and resistance of the air, we reasonably conclude that if this could be *completely* done, (which is out of our power,) the motion would never cease, since what appear to be the only causes of its cessation, would be absent.*

Again, in arguing for the existence and moral attributes of the Deity from the authority of men's opinions, great use may be made of a like progressive course of Argument, though it has been often overlooked. Some have argued for the being of a God from the universal, or at least, general, consent of mankind; and some have appealed to the opinions of the wisest and most cultivated portion, respecting both the existence and the moral excellence of the Deity. It cannot be denied that there is a presumptive force in each of these Arguments; but it may be answered that it is conceivable, an opinion common to almost all the species, may possibly be an error resulting from a constitutional infirmity of the human intellect; that if we are to acquiesce in the belief of the majority, we shall be led to Polytheism; such being the creed of the greater part:—and that though more

* See the argument in Butler's Analogy to prove the advantage which Virtue, if perfect, might be expected to obtain.

weight may reasonably be attached to the opinions of the wisest and best-instructed, still, as we know that such men are not exempt from error, we cannot be perfectly safe in adopting the belief they hold, unless we are convinced that they hold it *in consequence* of their being the wisest and best instructed;—*so far forth* as they are such. Now this is precisely the point which may be established by the above-mentioned progressive Argument. Nations of Atheists, if there are any such, are confessedly among the rudest and most ignorant savages: those who represent their God or Gods as malevolent, capricious, or subject to human passions and vices, are invariably to be found (in the present day at least) among those who are brutal and uncivilized; and among the most civilized nations of the ancients, who professed a similar creed, the more enlightened members of society seem either to have rejected altogether, or to have explained away, the popular belief. The Mahometan nations, again, of the present day, who are certainly more advanced in civilization than their Pagan neighbours, maintain the unity and the moral excellence of the Deity; but the nations of Christendom, whose notions of the Divine goodness are more exalted, are undeniably the most civilized part of the world, and possess, generally speaking, the most cultivated and improved intellectual powers. Now if we would ascertain, and appeal to, the sentiments of Man *as* a rational Being, we must surely look to those which not only prevail most among the *most* rational and cultivated, but towards which also a *progressive* tendency is found in men in proportion to their degrees of rationality and cultivation. It would be most extravagant to suppose that man's advance towards a more improved and

exalted state of existence should tend to obliterate true and instil false notions. On the contrary we are authorized to conclude, that those notions would be most correct, which men would entertain, whose knowledge, intelligence, and intellectual cultivation should have reached comparatively the highest pitch of perfection; and that those consequently will approach the nearest to the truth which are entertained more or less, by various nations *in proportion as* they have advanced towards this civilized state.

Many other instances might be adduced, in which truths of the highest importance may be elicited by this process of Argumentation; which will enable us to decide with sufficient probability what consequence would follow from an hypothesis which we have never experienced. It might, not improperly, be termed the Argument from Progressive Approach.

§ 6.

Example. The third kind of Arguments to be considered, being the other branch of the second of the two classes originally laid down, may be treated of under the general name of Example, taking that term in its widest acceptation, so as to comprehend the Arguments designated by the various names of Induction, Experience, Analogy, Parity of Reasoning, &c. all of which are essentially the same, as far as regards the fundamental principles I am here treating of; for in all the Arguments designated by these names, it will be found, that we consider one or more, known, individual objects or instances, of a certain Class, as fair *specimens*, in respect of some point or other, of that class; and consequently

draw an inference from them respecting either the whole Class, or other, less known, individuals of it.

In Arguments of this kind then it will be found, that, universally, we assume as a major premiss, that what is true (in regard to the point in question) of the individual or individuals which we bring forward and appeal to, is true of the whole Class to which they belong; the minor premiss next asserts something of that individual; and the same is then inferred respecting the whole Class; whether we stop at that general conclusion, or descend from thence to another, unknown, individual; in which last case, which is the most usually called the Argument from Example, we generally omit, for the sake of brevity, the intermediate step, and pass at once, in the expression of the Argument, from the known, to the unknown, individual. This ellipsis however does not, as some seem to suppose, make any essential difference in the mode of Reasoning; the reference to a common Class being always, in such a case, understood, though not expressed; for it is evident that there can be no reasoning from one individual to another, unless they come under some common genus, and are considered in that point of view; e. g.

"Astronomy was decried at its first introduction, as adverse to religion: | Geology is likely to be decried, &c.

therefore | therefore

every Science is likely to be decried at its first introduction, as adverse to religion."

This kind of Example, therefore, appears to be a compound Argument, consisting of two enthymemes; and when (as often happens) we infer from a known Effect a certain Cause, and again, from that Cause, another, unknown Effect, we then unite in this example, the argument from Effect to Cause, and that from Cause to Effect, e. g. we may from the marks of Divine benevolence in this world argue, that "the like will be shewn in the next;" through the intermediate conclusion, that "God is benevolent." This is not indeed always the case; but there seems to be in every Example, a *reference* to some Cause, though that Cause may frequently be unknown; e. g. we suppose, in the instance above given, that there is some Cause, though we may be at a loss to assign it, which leads men generally to decry a new Science.

The term "Induction" is commonly applied to such Arguments as stop short at the *general* conclusion; and is thus contradistinguished, in common use, from Example. There is also this additional difference, that when we draw a general conclusion from *several* individual cases, we use the word Induction in the singular number; while each one of these cases, if the application were made to another individual, would be called a distinct Example. This difference, however, is not essential: since whether the inference be made from one instance or from several, it is equally called an Induction, if a general conclusion be legitimately drawn. And this is to be determined by the nature of the subject-matter. In the investigation of the laws of nature, a single experiment, fairly and carefully made, is usually allowed to be conclusive, because we

Induction.

can then pretty nearly ascertain all the circumstances operating: a Chemist who had ascertained, in a single specimen of gold, its capability of combining with mercury, would not think it necessary to try the same experiment with several other specimens, but would draw the conclusion concerning those metals universally, and with certainty. In human affairs on the contrary, our uncertainty respecting many of the circumstances that may affect the result, obliges us to collect many coinciding instances to warrant even a probable conclusion. From one instance, e. g. of the assassination of an Usurper, it would not be allowable to infer the certainty, or even the probability, of a like fate attending all Usurpers.*

Experience, in its original and proper sense, is applicable to the *premises* from which we argue, not to the *inference* we draw. Strictly speaking, we know by Experience only the *past*, and what has passed under our own observation; thus, we know by *Experience* that the tides *have* daily ebbed and flowed, during such a time; and from the Testimony of others as to their own Experience, that they have formerly done so; and *from* this Experience, we conclude, *by* Induction, that the same Phenomenon will continue.†

Experience.

The word Analogy again is generally employed in the case of Arguments in which the instance adduced is somewhat more remote from that to which it is applied; e. g. a physician would be said to know by Experience the noxious effects of a certain drug on the human constitution, if he had frequently seen men poisoned by it; but

* See Logic, "On the Province of Reasoning."

† See the article "Experience" in the Appendix to the Treatise on Logic.

if he thence conjectured that it would be noxious to some other species of animal, he would be said to reason from *analogy*; the only difference being that the resemblance is less, between a man and a brute, than between one man and another; and accordingly it is found that many brutes are not acted upon by some drugs which are pernicious to man. But more strictly speaking, Analogy ought to be distinguished from *direct* resemblance, with which it is often confounded in the language even of eminent writers (especially on Chemistry and Natural History) in the present day. Analogy being a "resemblance of ratios," * that should strictly be called an Argument from Analogy, in which the two things (viz. the one *from* which, and the one *to* which, we argue) are not themselves alike, but stand in similar *relations* to some other things; or, in other words, that the common genus which they both fall under, consists in a relation. Thus an egg and a seed are not in themselves alike, but bear a like relation to the parent bird and to her future nestling, on the one hand, and to the old and young plant on the other, respectively; this *relation* being the genus which both fall under: and many Arguments might be drawn from this Analogy. Again, the fact that from birth different persons have different bodily constitutions, in respect of complexion, stature, strength, shape, liability to particular disorders, &c. which constitutions, however, are capable of being, to a certain degree, modified by regimen, medicine, &c. affords an analogy by which we may form a presumption, that the like takes place in respect of mental qualities

Analogy.

* *Λογῶν ὁμοιότης*, Aristotle.

also; though it is plain that there can be no direct resemblance either between body and mind, or their respective attributes.

In this kind of Argument, one error, which is very common, and which is to be sedulously avoided, is that of concluding the *things* in question to be *alike*, because they are *Analogous*;—to resemble each other in themselves, because there is a resemblance in the relation they bear to certain other things; which is manifestly a groundless inference. Another caution is applicable to the whole class of Arguments from Example; viz. not to consider the Resemblance or Analogy to extend further (i. e. to more particulars) than it does. The resemblance of a picture to the object it represents, is direct; but it extends no further than the one sense of seeing is concerned. In the Parable of the unjust steward, an Argument is drawn from Analogy, to recommend prudence and foresight to Christians in spiritual concerns; but it would be absurd to conclude that fraud was recommended to our imitation; and yet mistakes very similar to such a perversion of that Argument are by no means rare.*

* "Thus, because a just Analogy has been discerned between the metropolis of a country, and the heart of the animal body, it has been sometimes contended that its increased size is a disease,—that it may impede some of its most important functions, or even be the cause of its dissolution." See Copleston's *Inquiry into the Doctrines of Necessity and Predestination*, note to Disc. iii. q. v. for a very able dissertation on the subject of Analogy, in the course of an analysis of Dr. King's *Discourse on Predestination*. (See Appendix [B.].) In the preface to the last edition of that Discourse I have offered some additional remarks on the subject; and I have again adverted to it (chiefly in reply to some popular objections to Dr. King) in the Dis-

Important and unimportant Resemblances and differences of cases.

Sound judgment and vigilant caution are no where more called for than in observing what differences (perhaps seemingly small) do, and what do not, nullify the analogy between two cases. And the same may be said in regard to the applicability of Precedents, or acknowledged *Decisions* of any kind, such as Scripture-precepts, &c.; all of which indeed are, in their essence, of the nature of Example: since every recorded declaration, e. g. of admitted authority or injunction, may be regarded (in connexion with the persons to whom, and the occasion on which, it was delivered) as a *known case*; from which consequently we may reason to any other *parallel* case: and the question which we must be careful in deciding will be, to whom, and to what, it is *applicable*. For, as I have said, a seemingly small circumstance will often destroy the analogy, and make a precedent —precept, &c.— inapplicable: and often, on the other hand, some difference, in itself important, may be pointed out between two cases, which shall not at all weaken the analogy in respect of the argument in hand. And thus there is a danger both of being misled by specious arguments of this description, which have no real force, and also of being staggered by plausible objections against such examples or appeals to authority, &c. as are perfectly valid. Hence Aristotle observes, that an opponent, if he cannot shew that the majority of instances is on his side, or that those adduced by his adversary are inapplicable, contends that they, *at any rate*, *differ in something* from the case in question: διαφορὰν γέ τινα ἔχει.*

sertation on the province Reasoning, subjoined to the Elements of Logic. Ch. v. § 1. p. 231.

* Rhet. b. ii. ch. 23.

Many are misled, in each way, by not estimating aright the degree, and the kind, of difference between two cases. E. g. It would be admitted that a great and permanent diminution in the quantity of some useful commodity, such as corn, or coal, or iron, throughout the world, would be a serious and lasting loss; and that if the fields and mines yielded regularly double quantities, with the same labour, we should be so much the richer: hence it might be inferred, that if the quantity of gold and silver in the world were diminished one half, or were doubled, like results would follow; the utility of these metals, for the purposes of coin, being very great. Now there are many points of resemblance, and many of difference, between the precious metals on the one hand, and corn, coal, &c. on the other; but the *important* circumstance to the supposed argument, is, that the *utility* of gold and silver (as coin, which is far the chief) *depends on their value*, which is regulated by their scarcity; whereas if corn and coal were ten times more abundant, a bushel of either would still be as useful as now. But if there were twice as much gold in the world as there is, a sovereign would be twice as large; if only half as much, it would be of the size of a half-sovereign: and this (besides the trifling circumstance of the cheapness or dearness of gold-ornaments) would be all the difference. The analogy therefore fails in the point essential to the argument.

Again, the Apostle Paul recommends to the Corinthians celibacy as preferable to marriage: hence the Romanists, and others, have inferred that this holds good in respect of all Christians. Now in many most important points, Christians of the present day are in the same

condition as the Corinthians; but *they* were liable to plunder, exile, and many kinds of bitter persecutions from their fellow-citizens, and it appears that this was *the very ground* on which celibacy was recommended to them, as exempting them from many afflictions and temptations which in such troublous times a family would entail; since, as Bacon observes, "He that hath a wife and children hath given pledges to Fortune." Now it is not, be it observed, on the *intrinsic importance* of this difference between them and us that the question turns; but on its importance in reference to the advice given.

On the other hand, suppose any one had, at the opening of the French Revolution, or at any similar conjuncture, expressed apprehensions, grounded on a review of history, of the danger of anarchy, bloodshed, destruction of social order, general corruption of morals, and the long train of horrors so vividly depicted by Thucydides, as resulting from civil discord, especially in his account of the sedition at Corcyra; it might have been answered, that the example does not apply, because there is a great difference between the Greeks in the time of Thucydides, and the nations of modern Europe. Many and great, no doubt, are the differences that might be enumerated: the ancient Greeks had not the use of fire-arms, nor of the mariner's compass; they were strangers to the art of printing; their arts of war and of navigation, and their literature, were materially influenced by these differences: they had domestic slaves; they were inferior to us in many manufactures; they excelled us in sculpture, &c. &c. The historian himself, while professing to leave a legacy of instruction for future ages * in the examples of

* Κτῆμα ἐς ἀεί.

the past, admits that the aspect of political transactions will vary from time to time in their particular forms and external character, as well as in the *degrees* in which the operation of each principle will, on different occasions, be displayed; * but he contends, that "as long *as human nature remains the same*," like causes will come in to play, and produce, substantially, like effects.

In Corcyra, and afterwards in other of the Grecian states, such enormities, he says, were perpetrated as were the *natural result* — of pitiless oppression, and inordinate thirst for revenge on the oppressors; — of a craving desire, in some, to get free from their former poverty, and still more, in others, to gratify their avarice by unjust spoliation;—and of the removal of legal restraints from "the natural character of man," ξὺν ἀνθρωπείᾳ φύσει, which, in consequence, "eagerly displayed itself as too weak for passion, too strong for justice, and hostile to every superior." † Now the question, *important to the argument*, is, Are the differences between the ancient Greeks, and modern nations, of such a character as to make the remarks of Thucydides, and the examples he sets before us, inapplicable? or are they (as he seems to have ex-

* Γιγνόμενα μὲν, καὶ ἀεὶ ἐσόμενα, ἕως ἂν ἡ ΑΥΤΗ ΦΥΣΙΣ ἀνθρώπων ᾖ, μᾶλλον δὲ, καὶ ἡσυχαίτερα, καὶ τοῖς ἰδίοισι διηλλαγμένα, ὡς ἂν, &c. B. iii. § 82.

† Ἐν δ' οὖν τῇ Κερκύρᾳ τὰ πολλὰ αὐτῶν πρωτα ἐμήνθη, καὶ ἐπέσχε ξβρις μὲν ἀρχόμενος τὸ πλέον ἡ σωφροσύνη, ὑπὸ τῶν τὴν τιμωρίαν πλεονεκτούντων, οἱ ἀνταμυνόμενοι δράσειαν· πενίας δὲ τῆς ἐμφυλίας ἀπαλλαξάντές τινες. μάλιστα δ' ἂν διὰ πάθους ἐπιθυμοῦντες τὰ τῶν πέλας ἔχειν, καὶ ἐς δίκην γιγνώσκειν· * * * * ξυνταραχθέντος τε τοῦ βίου, ἐς τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον, τῇ πόλει, καὶ τῶν νόμων κρατήσασα ἡ ἀνθρωπεία φύσις, ἡδονῆς καὶ παρὰ τοὺς νόμους ἀδικεῖν, ἀσμένη ἐδήλωσεν ἀκρατὴς μὲν ἐοῦσα, κρείσσων δὲ τοῦ δικαίου, πολεμία ἐὸν τῷ ὑπερέχοντος. Thucyd. book iii. sec. 84.

pected) merely such as to alter the external shape (εἶδος) of the transactions springing from similar human passions? Surely no mere external differences in customs, or in the arts of life, between the ancient Greeks and the French (our supposed disputant might have urged) can produce an *essential* and *fundamental* difference of results from any civil commotion: for *this*, some new vital principle of Action must be introduced and established in the heart; — something capable of over-ruling (ἡ ἀνθρωπεία φύσις) man's natural character. "As long as this remains the same," (ἕως ἡ αὐτὴ ᾖ, as the historian himself remarks,) substantially the same results may be looked for.

Again, to take an instance from another class of Political affairs; the manufacture of beet-sugar in France, instead of importing West-Indian sugar at a fourth of the price, and the prohibition, by the Americans, of British manufactures, in order to encourage home-production, (i. e. the manufacture of inferior articles at a much higher cost,) &c. are reprobated as unwise by some politicians, from the analogy of what takes place in private life; in which every man of common prudence prefers buying wherever he can get them cheapest and best, many commodities which he could make at home, but of inferior quality, and at a greater expense; and confines his own labour to that department in which he finds he can labour to the best advantage. To this it is replied, that there is a great difference between a Nation and an Individual. And so there is in many circumstances: a little parcel of sugar or cloth from a shop, is considerably different from a ship-load of either; and again, a Nation is an object more important, and which fills the mind with a grander idea, than a private individual; it is also a more

complex and artificial Being; and of indefinite duration of existence; and moreover, the transactions of each man, as far as he is left free, are regulated by the very person who is to be a gainer or loser by each, — the individual himself; who, though his vigilance is sharpened by interest, and his judgment by exercise in his own department, may yet chance to be a man of confined education, possessed of no general principles, and not pretending to be versed in philosophical theories; whereas the affairs of a State are regulated by a Congress, Chamber of Deputies, &c. consisting perhaps of men of extensive reading and speculative minds. Many other striking differences might be enumerated: but the question *important to the argument*, is, does the expediency, in private life, of obtaining each commodity at the least cost, and of the best quality we can, depend on any of the circumstances in which an individual differs from a community?

These instances may suffice to illustrate the importance of considering attentively in each case, not, what differences or resemblances are intrinsically the greatest, but, what are those that do, or that do not, affect the argument. Those who do not fix their minds steadily on this question, when arguments of this class are employed, will often be misled in their own reasonings, and may easily be deceived by a skilful sophist.

Arguments from Contraries.

The argument from *Contraries*, (ἐξ ἐναντίων,) noticed by Aristotle, falls under the class I am now treating of; as it is plain that Contraries must have something in common; and it is so far forth only as they *agree*, that they are thus employed in Argument. Two things are called "Contrary," which, coming under the same class, are the *most dissimilar* in

that class. Thus, virtue and vice are called Contraries, as being, *both* "*moral habits*," and the most *dissimilar* of moral habits. Mere dissimilarity, it is evident, would not constitute Contrariety; for no one would say that virtue is contrary to a mathematical problem; the two things having nothing in common. In this then, as in other arguments of the same class, we may infer that the two Contrary terms have a similar relation to the *same* third, or, respectively, to two *corresponding* (i. e. in this case, Contrary) terms: we may conjecture, e. g. that since virtue may be acquired by education, so may vice; or again, that since virtue leads to happiness, so does vice to misery.

The phrase, "Parity of Reasoning," is commonly employed to denote Analogical Reasoning.

§ 7.

Aristotle, in his *Rhetoric*, has divided Examples into ***Real*** and ***Invented:*** the one being drawn from actual matter of fact; the other, from a supposed case. And he remarks, that though the latter is more easily adduced, the former is more convincing. If however due care be taken, that the fictitious instance, — the supposed case, adduced, — be not wanting in *probability*, it will often be no less convincing than the other. For it may so happen, that one, or even several, historical facts may be appealed to, which, being nevertheless exceptions to a general rule, will not prove the probability of the conclusion. Thus, from several known instances of ferocity in black tribes, we are not authorized to conclude, that blacks are universally, or generally, ferocious; and in fact, many instances may be brought

Real and Invented Examples.

forward on the other side. Whereas in the supposed case, (instanced by Aristotle, as employed by Socrates,) of mariners choosing their steersman by lot, though we have no reason to suppose such a case ever occurred, we see so plainly the *probability*, that if it did occur, the lot might fall on an unskilful person, to the loss of the ship, that the argument has considerable weight against the practice, so common in the ancient republics, of appointing magistrates by lot.

There is, however, this important difference; that a fictitious case which has not this intrinsic probability, has absolutely *no* weight whatever; so that of course such arguments might be multiplied to any amount without the smallest effect: whereas any matter of fact which is well established, however ***unaccountable*** it may seem, has *some* degree of weight in reference to a parallel case; and a sufficient number of such arguments may fairly establish a general rule, even though we may be unable, after all, to account for the alleged fact in any of the instances. E. g. no satisfactory reason has yet been assigned for a connexion between the absence of upper cutting teeth, or of the presence of horns, and rumination; but the instances are so numerous and, constant of this connexion, that no Naturalist would hesitate, if on examination of a new species he found those teeth absent, and the head horned, to pronounce the animal a ruminant. Whereas, on the other hand, the fable of the countryman who obtained from Jupiter the regulation of the weather, and in consequence found his crops fail, does not go one step towards proving the intended conclusion; because that consequence is a mere gratuitous

assumption without any probability to support it.* There is an instance of a like error in a tale of Cumberland's, intended to prove the advantage of a public over a private education; he represents two brothers educated, on the two plans respectively; the former turning out very well, and the latter very ill: and had the whole been matter of fact, a sufficient number of such instances would have had weight as an Argument; but as it is a fiction, and no reason is shewn why the result should be such as represented, except the supposed superiority of a public education, the Argument involves a manifest *petitio principii*; and resembles the appeal made, in the well-known fable, to the picture of a man conquering a lion; a result which might just as easily have been reversed, and which would have been so, had lions been painters. It is necessary, in short, to be able to maintain, either that such and such an event *did* actually take place, or that, under a certain hypothesis, it would be *likely* to take place.

Supposed cases assert nothing.

On the other hand it is important to observe, with respect to any imaginary case, whether introduced as an argument, or merely for the sake of explanation, that, as it is requisite (according to what I have just said) that the hypothesis should be *conceivable*, and that the result supposed should follow *naturally* from it, so, *nothing more* is to be required. Nothing being *asserted*, it is not fair that any thing should be *denied*. Yet it is very common to find persons,

* In fact, the assumption there is not only gratuitous, but is in direct contradiction to experience; for a gardener *has*, to a certain degree, the command of rain and sunshine, by the help of his watering-pots, glasses, hotbeds, and flues; and the result is not the destruction of his crops.

"either out of ignorance and infirmity, or out of malice and obstinacy," joining issue on the question whether this or that ever actually took place; and representing the whole controversy as turning on the literal truth of something that had never been affirmed. [See treatise on Fallacies, ch. iii. § "Irrelevant conclusion:" of which this is a case.] To obviate this mistake, more care must be taken than would at first sight seem necessary, to remind the hearers that you are merely *supposing* a case, and not *asserting* any fact, especially when (as it frequently happens) the supposed case is one which might actually occur, and perhaps does occur.

I can well sympathize with the contempt mingled with indignation expressed by Cicero against certain philosophers who found fault with Plato for having alluded to the fabulous ring of Gyges, which had the virtue of making the wearer invisible. They had found out, it seems, that there *never was* any such ring.*

It is worth observing, that Arguments from Example, whether real or invented, are the most easily comprehended by the young and the uneducated; because they

* Atque hoc loco, philosophi quidam, minime mali illi quidem, sed non satis acuti, fictam et commenticiam fabulam prolatam dicunt a Platone: quasi vero ille, aut factum id esse, aut fieri potuisse defendat. Hæc est vis hujus annuli et hujus exempli, si nemo sciturus, nemo ne suspicaturus quidem sit, cum aliquid, divitiarum, potentiæ, dominationis, libidinis, caussa feceris, — si id diis hominibusque futurum sit semper ignotum, sisne facturus. Negant id fieri posse. Quamquam potest id quidem; sed quæro, quod negant posse, id si posset, quidnam facerent? Urgent rustice sane: negant enim posse, et in eo perstant. Hoc verbum quid valeat, non vident. Cum enim quærimus, si possint celare, quid facturi sint, non quærimus, possint-ne celare, &c. (Cic. de Off. b. iii. c. 9.)

facilitate the exercise of Abstraction; a power which in such hearers is usually the most imperfect. This mode of reasoning corresponds to a *geometrical* demonstration by means of a diagram; in which the figure placed before the learner is an ***individual***, employed, as he soon comes to perceive, as a ***sign***, though not an ***arbitrary*** sign,* representing the whole class. The ***algebraic*** signs, again, are arbitrary; each character not being itself an individual of the class it represents. These last therefore correspond to the ***abstract*** terms of a language.

Under the head of Invented Example, a distinction is drawn by Aristotle, between παραβολὴ and λόγος: from the instances he gives, it is plain that the former corresponds (not to Parable, in the sense in which we use the word, derived from that of παραβολὴ in the Sacred Writers, but) to Illustration; the latter to Fable or Tale. In the former, an *allusion* only is made to a case easily supposable; in the latter a fictitious story is *narrated*. Thus, in his instance above cited, of Illustration, if any one, instead of a mere allusion, should relate a tale, of mariners choosing a steersman by lot, and being wrecked in consequence, Aristotle would evidently have placed that under the head of Logos. The other method is of course preferable, from its brevity, whenever the allusion can be readily understood: and accordingly it is common, in the case of ***well-known*** fables, to allude to, instead of narrating, them. That, e. g. of the horse and the stag, which he gives, would, in the present day,

Fable and Illustration.

* The words, written or spoken, of any language, are *arbitrary* signs; the characters of Picture-writing or Hieroglyphic, are *natural* signs.

be rather alluded to than told, if we wished to dissuade a people from calling in a too powerful auxiliary. It is evident that a like distinction might have been made in respect of historical examples; those cases which are well-known, being often merely alluded to, and not recited.

The word "Fable" is at present generally limited to those fictions in which the resemblance to the matter in question is not direct, but analogical; the other class being called Novels, Tales, &c. Those resemblances are (as Dr. A. Smith has observed) the most ***striking***, in which the things compared are of the most ***dissimilar*** nature; as is the case in what we call Fables; and such accordingly are generally preferred for argumentative purposes, both from that circumstance itself, and also on account of the greater *brevity* which is, for that reason, not only allowed but required in them.* For a Fable spun out to a great length becomes an Allegory, which generally satiates and disgusts; on the other hand, a fictitious tale, having a more direct, and therefore less striking resemblance to reality, requires that an interest in the events and persons should be created by a longer detail, without which it would be insipid. The Fable of the Old Man and the Bundle of Sticks, compared with the Iliad, may serve to exemplify what has been said; the moral conveyed by each being the same, viz. the strength acquired by union, and the weakness resulting from division; the latter fiction would be perfectly insipid if conveyed in a few lines; the former, in twenty-four books, insupportable.

* A Novel or Tale may be compared to a Picture; a Fable, to a Device.

Of the various uses, and of the real or apparent refutation, of Examples, (as well as of other Arguments,) I shall treat hereafter; but it may be worth while here to observe, that I have been speaking of Example as a kind of *Argument*, and with a view therefore to that purpose alone; though it often happens, that a resemblance, either direct, or analogical, is introduced for other purposes; viz. not to *prove* any thing, but either to illustrate and *explain* one's meaning, (which is the strict etymological use of the word Illustration,) or to amuse the fancy by ornament of language. It is of course most important to distinguish, both in our own compositions and those of others, between these different purposes. I shall accordingly advert to this subject in the course of the following chapter.

CHAP. III.

Of the various use and order of several kinds of Propositions and of Arguments in different cases.

§ 1.

Arguments of Confutation and of satisfaction.

The *first rule* to be observed is, that it should be considered, whether the principal object of the discourse be, to give *satisfaction to a candid mind*, and convey *instruction* to those who are ready to receive it, or to *compel* the assent, or silence the objections, of an opponent. The former of these purposes is, in general, principally to be accomplished by the former of those two great classes into which

arguments were divided; (viz. by those from Cause to Effect,) the other, by the latter.

To whatever class, however, the Arguments we resort to may belong, the general tenour of the reasoning will, in many respects, be affected by the present consideration. The distinction in question is nevertheless in general little attended to. It is usual to call an Argument, simply, *strong* or *weak*, without reference to the purpose for which it is designed; whereas the Arguments which afford the most *satisfaction* to a candid mind, are often such as would have less weight in *controversy* than many others, which again would be less suitable for the former purpose.* E. g. the internal evidence of Christianity in

* My meaning cannot be better illustrated than by an instance referred to in that incomparable specimen of reasoning, Dr. Paley's *Horæ Paulinæ*. "When we take into our hands the letters," (viz. St. Paul's Epistles,) "which the suffrage and consent of antiquity hath thus transmitted to us, the first thing that strikes our attention is the air of reality and business, as well as of seriousness and conviction, which pervades the whole. Let the skeptic read them. If he be not sensible of these qualities in them, the argument can have no weight with him. If he be; if he perceive in almost every page the language of a mind actuated by real occasions, and operating upon real circumstances; I would wish it to be observed, that the proof which arises from this perception is not to be deemed occult or imaginary, because it is incapable of being drawn out in words, or of being conveyed to the apprehension of the reader in any other way, than by sending him to the books themselves." p. 403.

There is also a passage in Dr. A. Smith's *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, which illustrates very happily one of the applications of the principle in question. "Sometimes we have occasion to defend the propriety of observing the general rules of justice by the consideration of their necessity to the support of Society. We frequently hear the young and the licentious ridiculing the most sacred rules of morality, and professing, sometimes from the corruption, but more

general proves the most satisfactory to a believer's mind, but is not that which makes the most shew in the refutation of infidels; the Arguments from Analogy on the other hand, which are the most *unanswerable*, are not so pleasing and consolatory.

It may serve to illustrate what has been just said to remark, that our judgment of the character of any individual is often not originally derived from such circumstances as we should assign, or *could* adequately set forth in language, in justification of our opinion. When we undertake to give our reasons for thinking that some individual, with whom we are personally acquainted, is, or is not, a gentleman,—a man of taste,—humane,—public-spirited, &c. we of course appeal to his conduct, or his distinct avowal of his own sentiments; and if these furnish sufficient proof of our assertions, we are admitted to have

frequently from the vanity of their hearts, the most abominable maxims of conduct. Our indignation rouses and we are eager to refute and expose such detestable principles. But though it is their intrinsic hatefulness and detestableness which originally inflames us against them, we are unwilling to assign this as the sole reason why we condemn them, or to pretend that it is merely because we ourselves hate and detest them. The reason, we think, would not appear to be conclusive. Yet, why should it not; if we hate and detest them because they are the natural and proper objects of hatred and detestation? But when we are asked why we should not act in such or such a manner, the very question seems to suppose that, to those who ask it, this manner of acting does not appear to be for its own sake the natural and proper object of those sentiments. We must shew them, therefore, that it ought to be so for the sake of something else. Upon this account we generally cast about for other arguments, and the consideration which first occurs to us, is the disorder and confusion of society which would result from the universal prevalence of such practices. We seldom fail, therefore, to insist upon this topic." (Part ii. sec. ii. p. 151, 152 vol. i ed. 1812.)

given *good reasons* for our opinion: but it may be still doubted whether these were, in the first instance at least, *our* reasons, which led us to form that opinion. If we carefully and candidly examine our own mind, we shall generally find that our judgment was, originally, (if not absolutely decided,) at least strongly influenced, by the person's looks — tones of voice — gestures — choice of expressions, and the like; which, if stated as reasons for forming a conclusion, would in general appear frivolous, merely because no language is competent adequately to describe them; but which are not necessarily insufficient grounds for beginning at least to form an opinion; since it is notorious that there are many acute persons who are seldom deceived in such indications of character.

In all subjects indeed, persons unaccustomed to writing or discussion, but possessing natural sagacity, and experience in particular departments, have been observed to be generally unable to give a satisfactory reason for their judgments, even on points on which they are actually very good judges. This is a defect which it is the business of education (especially the present branch of it) to surmount or diminish. After all however, in some subjects, no language can adequately convey (to the inexperienced at least) all the indications which influence the judgment of an acute and practised observer. And hence it has been justly and happily remarked, that, "he must be an indifferent physician, who never takes any step for which he cannot assign a satisfactory reason."

§ 2.

Presumption and Burden of proof.

It is a point of great importance to decide in each case, at the outset, in your own mind, and

clearly to point out to the hearer, as occasion may serve, on which side the *Presumption* lies, and to which belongs the 'onus probandi' *Burden of proof*. For though it may often be expedient to bring forward more proofs than can fairly be demanded of you, it is always desirable, when this is the case, that it should be *known*, and that the strength of the cause should be estimated accordingly.

According to the most correct use of the term, a "Presumption" in favour of any supposition, means, not (as has been sometimes erroneously imagined) a preponderance of antecedent probability in its favour, but, such a *pre-occupation* of the ground, as implies that it must stand good till some sufficient reason is adduced against it; in short, that the *Burden of proof* lies on the side of him who would dispute it.

Thus, it is a well-known principle of the Law, that every man (including a prisoner brought up for trial) is to be *presumed* innocent till his guilt is established. This does not, of course, mean that we are to *take for granted* he is innocent; for if that were the case, he would be entitled to immediate liberation; nor does it mean that it is antecedently *more likely than not* that he is innocent; or, that the majority of those brought to trial are so. It evidently means only that the "burden of proof" lies with the accusers;—that he is not to be called on to prove his innocence, or to be dealt with as a criminal till he has done so; but that they are to bring their charges against him, which if he can repel, he stands acquitted.

Thus again, there is a "presumption" in favour of the right of any individuals or bodies-corporate to the

property of which they are in actual possession: this does not mean that they are or are not *likely* to be the rightful owners; but merely, that no man is to be disturbed in his possessions till some claim against him shall be established. He is not to be called on to prove his right; but the claimant, to disprove it; on whom consequently the "burden of proof" lies.

Importance of deciding on which side lies the onus probandi

A moderate portion of common sense will enable any one to perceive, and to shew, on which side the Presumption lies, when once his attention is called to this question: though, for want of attention, it is often overlooked: and on the determination of this question the whole character of a discussion will often very much depend. A body of troops may be perfectly adequate to the defence of a fortress against any attack that may be made on it; which yet, if, ignorant of the advantage they possess, they sally forth into the open field to encounter the enemy, may suffer a repulse. At any rate, even if strong enough to act on the offensive, they ought still to keep possession of their fortress. In like manner, if you have the "Presumption" on your side, and can but *refute* all the arguments brought against you, you have, for the present at least, gained a victory: but if you abandon this position, by suffering this Presumption to be forgotten, which is in fact *leaving out one of, perhaps, your strongest arguments*, you may appear to be making a feeble attack, instead of a triumphant defence. Such an obvious case as one of those just stated, will serve to illustrate this principle. Let any one imagine a perfectly unsupported accusation of some offence to be brought against himself; and then let him imagine himself, instead of replying (as of course

he would do) by a simple denial, and a defiance of his accuser to prove the charge, setting himself to establish a negative, — taking on himself the burden of proving his own innocence, by collecting all the circumstances indicative of it that he can muster: and the result would be, in many cases, that this evidence would fall far short of establishing a certainty, and might even have the effect of raising a suspicion against him; he having in fact kept out of sight the important circumstance, that these probabilities in one scale, though of no great weight perhaps in themselves, are to be weighed against absolutely nothing in the other scale.

The following are a few of the cases in which it is important, though very easy, to point out where the Presumption lies.

There is a Presumption in favour of every *existing* institution. Many of these (we will suppose the majority) may be susceptible of alteration for the better; but still the "Burden of proof" lies with him who proposes an alteration; simply, on the ground that since a change is not a good in itself, he who demands a change should shew cause for it. No one is *called on* (though he may find it advisable) to defend an existing institution, till some argument is adduced against it: and that argument ought in fairness to prove, not merely an actual inconvenience, but the possibility of a change for the better.

Every book again, as well as person, ought to be presumed harmless (and consequently the copy-right protected by our courts) till something is proved against it. It is a hardship to require a man to prove, either of his book, or of his private life, that there is no ground for any accusation; or else to be denied the protection of his

country. The Burden of proof, in each case, lies fairly on the accuser.

There is a "Presumption" against any thing *paradoxical*, i. e. contrary to the prevailing opinion: it may be true; but the Burden of proof lies with him who maintains it; since men are not to be expected to abandon the prevailing belief till some reason is shewn. Presumption against a Paradox.

Hence it is probably that many are accustomed to apply "Paradox" as if it were a term of reproach, and implied absurdity or falsity. But correct use is in favour of the etymological sense. If a Paradox is unsupported, it can claim no attention; but if false, it should be censured on *that* ground: not for being *new*: if true, it is the more important, for being a truth not generally admitted. "Interdum vulgus rectum videt; est ubi peccat." Yet one often hears a charge of "paradox and nonsense" brought forward, as if there were some close connexion between the two. And indeed, in one sense this is the case; for to those who are too dull, or too prejudiced to admit any notion at variance with those they have been used to entertain (*ἀηθίσασι*), that may appear nonsense, which to others is sound sense. Thus "Christ crucified" was "to the Jews, a stumbling-block, (paradox) and to the Greeks, foolishness;" because the one "required a sign" of a different nature from any that appeared, and the others "sought after wisdom" in their schools of philosophy.

Accordingly there was a Presumption against the Gospel in its first announcement. A Jewish peasant claimed to be the promised Deliverer, in whom all the nations of the Earth were to be blessed. The Burden

of proof lay with Him. No one could be fairly called on to admit his pretensions till He shewed cause for believing in Him. If He "had not done among them the *works* which none other man did, they had not had sin."

Now, the case is reversed. Christianity *exists*; and those who deny the divine origin attributed to it, are bound to shew some reasons for assigning to it a human origin: not indeed to prove that it *did* originate in this or that way, without supernatural aid; but to point out some conceivable way in which it *might* have so arisen.

It is indeed highly expedient to bring forward evidences to establish the divine origin of Christianity: but it ought to be more carefully kept in mind than is done by most writers, that all this is an argument "ex abundanti," as the phrase is,—over and above what can fairly be called for, till some hypothesis shall be framed, to account for the origin of Christianity by human means. The Burden of proof *now* lies plainly on him who rejects the Gospel: which, if it were not established by miracles, demands an explanation of the greater miracle, its having been established, in defiance of all opposition, by human contrivance.

The Burden of proof, again, lay on the authors of the Reformation: they were bound to shew cause for every *change* they advocated; and they admitted the fairness of this requisition, and accepted the challenge. But they were *not* bound to shew cause for *retaining* what they left unaltered. The Presumption was, in those points, on their side; and they had only to reply to objections. This important distinction is often lost sight of, by those who look at the "doctrines &c. of

the Church of England as constituted at the Reformation," in the mass, without distinguishing the altered from the unaltered parts. The framers of the Articles kept this in mind in their expression respecting infant-baptism, that it "ought by all means to be *retained*." They did not introduce the practice, but left it as they found it; considering the burden to lie on those who denied its existence in the primitive church, to shew *when* it did arise.

The case of Episcopacy is exactly parallel: but Hooker seems to have overlooked this advantage: he sets himself to *prove* the apostolic origin of the institution, as if his task had been to *introduce* it. Whatever force there may be in arguments so adduced, it is plain they must have far *more* force if the important Presumption be kept in view, that the institution had notoriously existed many ages, and that consequently, even if there had been no direct evidence for its being coeval with Christianity, it might fairly be at least supposed to be so, till some other period should be pointed out at which it had been introduced as an innovation.

It is worth remarking, that a Presumption may be *rebutted* by an opposite Presumption, so as to shift the Burden of proof to the other side. E. g. Suppose you had advised the removal of some *existing* restriction: you might be, in the first instance, called on to take the Burden of proof, and allege your reasons for the change, on the ground that there is a Presumption against every Change. But you might fairly reply, "true, but there is another Presumption which rebuts the former; every *Restriction* is in itself an evil; and therefore there is a Presumption

'Transferring the Burden of proof.

in favour of its removal, unless it can be shewn necessary for prevention of some greater evil: I am not bound to allege any *specific* inconvenience; if the restriction is *unnecessary*, that is reason enough for its abolition: its defenders therefore are fairly called on to prove its necessity."

Thus much may suffice to shew the importance of taking this preliminary view of the state of each question to be discussed.

§ 3.

Matters of Opinion, (as they are called; i. e. where we are not said properly to *know*, but to *judge*,) are established chiefly by Antecedent-probability: (Arguments of the first class, viz. from Cause to Effect,) though the testimony (i. e. authority) of wise men is also admissible; past Facts, chiefly by Signs, of various kinds; (that term, it must be remembered, including Testimony;) and future events, by Antecedent-probabilities, and Examples.

Matters of Fact and of Opinion.

Example, however, is not excluded from the proof of matters of opinion; since a man's judgment in one case may be aided or corrected by an appeal to his judgment in another similar case. It is in this way that we are directed, by the highest authority, to guide our judgment in those questions in which we are most liable to deceive ourselves; viz. what, on each occasion, ought to be our conduct towards another; we are directed to frame for ourselves a similar supposed case, by imagining ourselves to change places with our neighbor, and then considering how, in that case, we should in fairness expect to be treated.

It happens more frequently, however, that, when in the discussion of matters of opinion, an Example is introduced, it is designed, not for Argument, but, strictly speaking, for *Illustration*;—not to *prove* the proposition in question, but to make it more *clearly understood*; e. g. the Proposition maintained by Cicero, (*de Off.* book iii.) is what may be accounted a matter of opinion; viz. that "nothing is expedient which is dishonourable;" when then he adduces the Example of the supposed design of Themistocles to burn the allied fleet, which he maintains, in contradiction to Aristides, would have been inexpedient, because unjust, it is manifest, that we must understand the instance brought forward as no more than an Illustration of the general principle he intends to establish; since it would be a plain begging of the question to *argue* from a particular assertion, which could only be admitted by those who assented to the general principle.

Explanatory Examples.

It is important to distinguish between these two uses of Example; that, on the one hand we may not be led to mistake for an Argument such a one as the foregoing; and that on the other hand, we may not too hastily charge with sophistry him who adduces such a one simply with a view to explanation.

It is also of the greatest consequence to distinguish between Examples (of the invented kind) properly so called, i. e. which have the force of Arguments, and Comparisons introduced for the ornament of Style, in the form, either of Simile, as it is called, or Metaphor. Not only is an ingenious Comparison often mistaken for a proof, though it be such as, when tried by the rules laid down here

Illustration and Simile distinguished.

and in the treatise on LOGIC, affords no proof at all;* but also on the other hand, a real and valid argument is not unfrequently considered merely as an ornament of Style, if it happen to be such as to produce that effect; though there is evidently no reason why that should not be fair Analogical Reasoning, in which the new idea introduced by the Analogy chances to be a sublime or a pleasing one. E. g. "The efficacy of penitence, and piety, and prayer, in rendering the Deity propitious, is not irreconcileable with the immutability of his nature, and the steadiness of his purposes. It is not in man's power to alter the course of the sun; but it is often in his power to cause the sun to shine or not to shine upon him; if he withdraws from its beams, or spreads a curtain before him, the sun no longer shines upon him; if he quits the shade, or removes the curtain, the light is restored to him; and though no change is in the mean time effected in the heavenly luminary, but only in himself, the result is the same as if it were. Nor is the immutability of God any reason why the returning sinner, who tears away the veil of prejudice or of indifference, should not again be blessed with the sunshine of divine favour." The image here introduced is ornamental, but the Argument is not the less perfect; since the case adduced fairly establishes the general principle required, that "a change effected in one of two objects having a certain relation to each other, may

* The pleasure derived from taking in the author's meaning, when an ingenious Comparison is employed, (referred by Aristotle to the pleasure of the act of learning,) is so great, that the reader or hearer is apt to mistake his apprehension of *this* for a perception of a just and convincing analogy. See part iii. ch. 2. § 3.

have the same practical result as if it had taken place in the other."*

The mistake in question is still more likely to occur when such an Argument is conveyed in a single term employed metaphorically; as is generally the case where the allusion is common and obvious; e. g. "we do not receive as the genuine doctrines of the primitive Church what have passed down the *polluted stream* of Romish tradition." The Argument here is not the less valid for being conveyed in the form of a Metaphor.

The employment, in questions relating to the future, both of the Argument from Example, and of that from Cause to Effect, may be explained from what has been already said concerning the connexion between them; some Cause, whether known or not, being always *supposed*, whenever an Example is adduced.

§ 4.

Arguments from Cause to Effect have the precedence.

When Arguments of each of the two formerly-mentioned classes are employed, those from Cause to Effect (Antecedent-probability) have usually the precedence.

Men are apt to listen with prejudice to the Arguments adduced to prove any thing which appears *abstractedly* improbable; i. e. according to what has been above laid down, *unnatural*, or (if such an expression might be allowed) *unplausible*; and this prejudice is to be removed by the Argument from Cause to Effect,

* For an instance of a highly beautiful, and at the same time argumentative comparison, see Appendix, [C.] It appears to me that the passage printed in Italics affords a *reason* for thinking it probable that the causes of the Apostles' conduct are rightly assigned.

which thus prepares the way for the reception of the other Arguments; e. g. if a man who bore a good character were accused of corruption, the strongest evidence against him might avail little; but if he were proved to be of a covetous disposition, this, though it would not alone be allowed to substantiate the crime, would have great weight in inducing his judges to lend an ear to the evidence. And thus, in what relates to the future also, the *a priori* Argument and Example, support each other, when thus used in conjunction, and in the order prescribed. A sufficient cause being established, leaves us still at liberty to suppose that there may be circumstances which will prevent the Effect from taking place; but Examples subjoined shew that these circumstances do not, at least always, prevent that effect; and on the other hand, Examples introduced at the first, may be suspected of being exceptions to the general rule, (unless they are very numerous,) instead of being instances of it; which an adequate cause previously assigned will shew them to be. E. g. if any one had argued, from the temptations and opportunities occurring to a military commander, that Buonaparte was likely to establish a despotism on the ruins of the French Republic, this Argument, by itself, would have left men at liberty to suppose that such a result would be prevented by a jealous attachment to liberty in the citizens, and a fellow-feeling of the soldiery with them: then, the Examples of Cæsar, and of Cromwell, would have proved, that such preventives are not to be trusted.

Aristotle accordingly has remarked on the expediency of not placing Examples in the foremost rank of Arguments; in which case, he says, a considerable number would be requisite; whereas, in *confirmation*, even one will have much weight. This observation, however, he omits to extend, as he might have done, to Testimony and every other kind of Sign, to which it is no less applicable.

Another reason for adhering to the order here prescribed is, that if the Argument from Cause to Effect were placed after the others, a doubt might often exist, whether we were engaged in *proving* the point in question, or (assuming it as already proved) in seeking only to *account* for it; that Argument being, by the very nature of it, such as *would* account for the truth contended for, supposing it were granted. Constant care, therefore, is requisite to guard against any confusion or indistinctness as to the object in each case proposed: whether that be, when a proposition is admitted, to assign a cause which *does* account for it, (which is one of the classes of *Propositions* formerly noticed,) or, when it is *not* admitted, to *prove* it by an *Argument* of that kind which *would* account for it, if it *were* granted.

With a view to the Arrangement of Arguments, no rule is of more importance than the one now under consideration; and Arrangement is a more important point than is generally supposed; indeed it is not perhaps of less consequence in Rhetoric than in the Military Art; in which it is well known, that with an equality of forces, in numbers, courage, and every other point, the manner in which they are drawn up, so as either to afford mutual support, or, on the other hand, even to impede and annoy each other, may make the difference of victory or defeat.

E. g. in the statement of the Evidences of our Religion, so as to give them their just weight, much depends on the Order in which they are placed. The Antecedent probability that a Revelation should be given to man, and that it should be established by miracles, all would allow to be, considered by itself, in the absence of strong direct testimony, utterly insufficient to establish the Conclusion. On the other hand, miracles, considered abstractedly, as represented to have occurred without any occasion or reason for them being assigned, carry with them such a strong intrinsic improbability as could not be wholly surmounted even by such evidence as would fully establish any other matters of fact. But the evidences of the former class, however inefficient alone towards the establishment of the Conclusion, have very great weight in preparing the mind for receiving the other Arguments; which again, though they would be listened to with prejudice if not so supported, will then be allowed their just weight. The writers in defence of Christianity have not always attended to this principle; and their opponents have often availed themselves of the knowledge of it, by combating in detail, Arguments, the combined force of which would have been irresistible.* They argue respecting the credibility of the Christian miracles, abstractedly, as if they were insulated occurrences, without any known or conceivable purpose; as e. g. "what testimony is sufficient to establish the belief that a dead man was restored to life?" and then they proceed to shew that the probability of a Revelation, abstractedly considered, is not such at

See § 4. ch. 2.

least as to establish the fact that one *has* been given. Whereas, if it were *first* proved (as may easily be done) merely that there is no such abstract improbability of a Revelation as to exclude the evidence in favour of it, and that if one were given, it might be expected to be supported by miraculous evidence, then, just enough reason would be assigned for the occurrence of miracles, not indeed to establish them, but to allow a fair hearing for the Arguments by which they are proved.*

Importance of Arrangement.

The importance attached to the Arrangement of Arguments by the two great rival orators of Athens, may serve to illustrate and enforce what has been said. Æschines strongly urged the judges (in the celebrated contest concerning the crown) to confine his adversary to the same order, in his reply to the charges brought, which he himself had observed in bringing them forward. Demosthenes however was fa too skilful to be thus entrapped; and so much importance does he attach to this point, that he opens his speech, with a most solemn appeal to the Judges for an impartial hearing: which implies, he says, not only a rejection of prejudice, but no less, also, a permission for each speaker to adopt whatever *Arrangement* he should think fit. And accordingly he proceeds to adopt one very different from that which his antagonist had laid down; for he was no less sensible than his rival, that the same Arrangement which is the most favourable to one side, is likely to be the least favourable to the other.

* See Paley's Evidences, Introd.

It is to be remembered however, that the rules which have been given respecting the Order in which different kinds of Argument should be arranged, relate only to the different kinds of Arguments adduced in support of each separate Proposition; since of course the refutation of an opposed assertion, effected by means of Signs, may be followed by an *a priori* Argument in favour of our own Conclusion; and the like in many other such cases.

§ 5.

When the Premises and when the Conclusion should come first.

A Proposition that is ***well known*** (whether easy to be established or not) and which contains nothing particularly offensive, should in general be stated at once, and the Proofs subjoined; but if it be not familiar to the hearers, and especially if it be likely to be unacceptable, it is usually better to state the Arguments first, or at least some of them, and then introduce the Conclusion.

There is no question relating to Arrangement, more important than the present; and it is therefore the more unfortunate that Cicero, who possessed so much practical skill, should have laid down no rule on this point, (though it is one which evidently had engaged his attention,) but should content himself with saying that sometimes he adopted the one mode and sometimes the other,* (which doubtless he did not do at random, without distinguishing the cases in which each is to be preferred, and laying down principles to guide our decision. Aristotle also, when he lays down the two great heads

* *De Orat.*

into which a speech is divisible, the Proposition and the Proof,* is equally silent as to the order in which they should be placed; though he leaves it to be understood, from his manner of speaking, that the Conclusion (or Question) is to be first stated, and then the Premises, as in Mathematics. This indeed is the usual and natural way of speaking or writing; viz. to begin by declaring your Opinion, and then to subjoin the Reasons for it. But there are many occasions on which it will be of the highest consequence to reverse this plan. It will sometimes give an offensively dogmatical air to a Composition, to begin by advancing some new and unexpected assertion; though sometimes again this may be advisable, when the Arguments are such as can be well relied on, and the principal object is to excite attention, and awaken curiosity. And accordingly, with this view, it is not unusual to present some doctrine, by no means really novel, in a new and paradoxical shape. But when the Conclusion to be established is one likely to hurt the feelings and offend the prejudices of the hearers, it is essential to keep out of sight, as much as possible, the point to which we are tending, till the principles from which it is to be deduced shall have been clearly established; because men listen with prejudice, if at all, to Arguments that are avowedly leading to a Conclusion which they are indisposed to admit; whereas if we thus, as it were, mask the battery, they will not be able to shelter themselves from the discharge. The observance accordingly, or neglect, of this rule, will often make the difference of success or failure.

* *Rhet.* book iii.

It may be observed, that if the Proposition to be maintained be such as the hearers are likely to regard as *insignificant*, the *question* should be at first suppressed; but if there be any thing *offensive* to their prejudices, the *question* may be stated, but the *decision* of it, for a time, kept back.

And it will often be advisable to advance very gradually to the full statement of the Proposition required, and to prove it, if one may so speak, by instalments; establishing separately, and in order, each part of the truth in question. It is thus that Aristotle establishes many of his doctrines, and among others his definition of Happiness, in the beginning of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, he first proves in what it does *not* consist, and then establishes, one by one, the several points which together constitute his notion.

Thus again, Paley (in his Evidences) first proves that the apostles, &c. *suffered*; next, that they encountered their sufferings *knowingly*; then, that it was *for* their testimony that they suffered; then, that the events they testified were *miraculous*; then, that those events were the *same* as are recorded in our books; &c. &c.

Waiving a question.

It is often expedient, sometimes unavoidable, to *waive* for the present, some question or portion of a question, while our attention is occupied with another point. Now it cannot be too carefully kept in mind, that it is a common mistake with inaccurate reasoners (and a mistake which is studiously kept up by an artful sophist) to suppose that what is thus *waived* is altogether *given up*. "Such a one does not attempt to prove this or that;" "he does not deny so and so:" "he tacitly admits that such and such may be the

case;" &c. are expressions which one may often hear triumphantly employed, on no better grounds. And yet it is very common in Mathematics for a question to be waived in this manner. Euclid, e. g. first asserts and proves, that the exterior angle of a triangle is greater than either of the interior opposite angles; without being able to determine at once, *how much* greater; and that any two angles of a triangle are less than two right angles; *waiving*, for the present, the question, *how much* less: he is enabled to prove, at a more advanced stage, that the exterior angle is equal to the two interior opposite angles together; and that all the three angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles.

The only remedy is, to state distinctly and repeatedly that you do not abandon as untenable such and such a position, which you are not at present occupied in maintaining;—that you are not to be understood as admitting the truth of this or that, though you do not at present undertake to disprove it.

§ 6.

When needless to account for any fact.

If the Argument *a priori* has been introduced in the proof of the main Proposition in question, there will generally be no need of afterwards adducing Causes to account for the truth established; (since that will have been already done in the course of the argument;) on the other hand, it will often be advisable to do this, when Arguments of the other class have alone been employed.

For it is in every case agreeable and satisfactory, and may often be of great utility, to explain, where it can be done, the Causes which produce an Effect that is itself

already admitted to exist. But it must be remembered that it is of great importance to make it clearly appear *which* object is, in each case, proposed; whether to establish the fact, or to account for it; since otherwise we may often be supposed to be employing a feeble Argument. For that which is a satisfactory explanation of an admitted fact, will frequently be such as would be very insufficient to prove it, supposing it were doubted.

§ 7.

Refutation. Refutations of Objections should generally be placed in the midst of the other Arguments, but nearer the beginning than the end.

If indeed very strong objections have obtained much currency, or have been just stated by an opponent, so that what is asserted is likely to be regarded as paradoxical, it may be advisable to begin with a Refutation; but when this is not the case, the mention of Objections in the opening will be likely to give a paradoxical air to our assertion, by implying a consciousness that much may be said against it. If again all mention of Objections be deferred till the last, the other Arguments will often be listened to with prejudice by those who may suppose us to be overlooking what may be urged on the other side.

Sometimes indeed it will be difficult to give a satisfactory Refutation of the opposed Opinions till we have gone through the arguments in support of our own: even in that case however it will be better to take some brief notice of them early in the Composition, with a promise of afterwards considering them more fully, and refuting them. This is Aristotle's usual procedure.

A sophistical use is often made of this last rule, when the Objections are such as cannot really be satisfactorily answered. The skilful Sophist will often, by the promise of a triumphant Refutation hereafter, gain attention to his own statement; which, if it be made plausible, will so draw off the hearer's attention from the Objections, that a very inadequate fulfilment of that promise will pass unnoticed, and due weight will not be allowed to the Objections.

It may be worth remarking, that Refutation will often occasion the introduction of fresh Propositions; i. e. we may have to disprove Propositions, which though incompatible with the principal one to be maintained, will not be directly contradictory to it; e. g. Burke, in order to the establishment of his theory of beauty, refutes the other theories which have been advanced by those who place it in "fitness" for a certain end — in "proportion" — in "perfection," &c.; and Dr. A. Smith, in his *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, combats the opinion of those who make "expediency the test of virtue" — of the advocates of a "Moral sense," &c which doctrines respectively are at variance with those of these authors, and *imply*, though they do not express, a contradiction of them.

Though I am at present treating principally of the proper *collocation* of Refutation, some remarks on the conduct of it will not be unsuitable in this place. In the first place, it is to be observed that there is (as Aristotle remarks, *Rhet.* book ii. apparently in opposition to some former writers) no distinct class of refutatory Arguments; since they become such merely by the circumstances under which they are employed

There are two ways in which any Proposition may be refuted; * first, by proving the contradictory of it; secondly, by overthrowing the Arguments by which it has been supported. The former of these is less strictly and properly called Refutation, being only accidentally such, since it might have been employed equally well had the opposite Argument never existed; and in fact it will often happen that a Proposition maintained by one author may be in this way refuted by another, who had never heard of his Arguments. Thus Pericles is represented by Thucydides as proving, in a speech to the Athenians, the probability of their success against the Peloponnesians, and thus, virtually, refuting the speech of the Corinthian ambassador at Sparta, who had laboured to shew the probability of their speedy downfal †. In fact, every one who argues in favour of any Conclusion is virtually refuting, in this way, the opposite Conclusion.

Two modes of refuting.

But the character of Refutation more strictly belongs to the other mode of proceeding, viz. in which a reference is made, and an answer given, to some specific Arguments in favour of the opposite Conclusion. This Refutation may consist either in the denial of one of the ***Premises***, or an objection against the ***conclusiveness*** of the reasoning. And here it is to be observed that the objection is often supposed, from the mode in which it

* Ἀντισυλλογισμὸς and ἔνστασις of Aristotle, book ii.

† The speeches indeed appear to be in great part the composition of the historian: but he professes to give the substance of what was either actually said, or *likely* to be said, on each occasion; and the Arguments urged in the speeches now in question are undoubtedly such as the respective speakers would be likely to employ.

is expressed, to belong to this last class, which perhaps it does not, but consists in the contradiction of a Premiss; for it is very common to say, "I admit your principle, but deny that it leads to such a consequence;" "the assertion is true, but it has no force as an Argument to prove that Conclusion;" this sounds like an objection to the Reasoning itself, but it will not unfrequently be found to amount only to a denial of the *suppressed* Premiss of an Enthymeme; the assertion which is admitted being only the expressed Premiss, whose force as an Argument must of course depend on the other Premiss, which is understood.* Thus Warburton admits that in the Law of Moses the doctrine of a future state was not revealed; but contends that this, so far from disproving, as the Deists pretend, his Divine mission does, on the contrary, establish it. But the objection is not to the Deist's *Argument* properly so called, but to the other Premiss, which they so hastily took for granted, and which he disproves, viz. "that a divinely-commissioned Lawgiver would have been sure to reveal that doctrine." The objection is then only properly said to lie against the Reasoning itself, when it is shewn that, granting all that is assumed on the other side, whether expressed or understood, still the Conclusion contended for would not follow from the Premises; either on account of some ambiguity in the Middle Term, or some other fault of that class. (See Logic, chapter *on Fallacies*.)

* It has been remarked to me by an intelligent friend, that in common discourse the word "Principle" is usually employed to designate the *major* premiss of an Argument, and "Reason," the *minor*

Direct and Indirect refutation.

It may be proper in this place to remark, that "Indirect Reasoning" is sometimes confounded with "Refutation," or supposed to be peculiarly connected with it; which is not the case; either Direct or Indirect Reasoning being employed indifferently, for Refutation, as well as for any other purpose. The application of the term "elenctic," (from ἐλέγχειν to refute or disprove,) to Indirect Arguments, has probably contributed to this confusion; which, however, principally arises from the very circumstance that occasioned such a use of that term; viz. that in the Indirect method the absurdity or falsity of a Proposition (opposed to our own) is proved; and hence is suggested the idea of an *adversary* maintaining that Proposition, and of the Refutation of that adversary being necessarily accomplished in this way. But it should be remembered, that Euclid and other mathematicians, though they can have no opponent to refute, often employ the Indirect Demonstration; and that on the other hand, if the contradictory of an opponent's Premiss can be satisfactorily proved in the Direct method, the Refutation is sufficient. It is true, however, that while, in Science, the Direct method is considered preferable, in Controversy, the Indirect is often adopted by choice, as it affords an opportunity for holding up an opponent to scorn and ridicule, by deducing some very absurd conclusion from the principles he maintains, or according to the mode of arguing he employs. Nor indeed can a fallacy be so clearly exposed to the unlearned reader in any other way. For it is no easy matter to explain, to one ignorant of Logic, the grounds on which you object to an inconclusive argument; though he will be able to perceive it's correspondence with another brought forward to illustrate it, in which an absurd conclusion may be introduced, as drawn from true premises.

Proving the truth of the Direct, or in the Indirect method;

It is evident that either the Premiss of an opponent, or his Conclusion, may be disproved, either in the Direct, or in the Indirect method; i. e. either by proving the truth of the Contradictory, or by shewing that an absurd conclusion may fairly be deduced from the proposition in question: when this latter mode of refutation is adopted with respect to the Premiss, the phrase by which this procedure is usually designated, is, that the "Argument proves too much;" i. e. that it proves, besides the conclusion drawn, another which is manifestly inadmissible; e. g. the Argument by which Dr. Campbell labours to prove that every correct Syllogism must be nugatory, as involving a "*petitio principii*," proves, if admitted at all, more than he intended; since it may easily be shewn to be equally applicable to all Reasoning whatever.

It is worth remarking, that that which is in substance an Indirect argument, may easily be altered in form so as to be stated in the Direct mode. For, strictly speaking, that is Indirect reasoning in which we assume as true the Proposition whose Contradictory it is our object to prove and deducing regularly from it an absurd Conclusion, infer thence that the Premiss in question is false; the alternative proposed in all correct reasoning being either to admit the Conclusion, or to deny one of the Premises; but by adopting the form of a Destructive Conditional,*

* See Logic.

the same argument as this, in substance, may be stated *directly*. E. g. we may say, "let it be admitted, that no testimony can satisfactorily establish such a fact as is not agreeable to our experience; thence it will follow that the Eastern Prince judged wisely and rightly, in at once rejecting, as a manifest falsehood, the account given him of the phenomenon of ice; but he was evidently mistaken in so doing; therefore the Principle assumed is unsound." Now the substance of this Argument remaining the same, the form of it may be so altered as to make the Argument Direct; viz. "*if* it be true that no testimony, &c. that Eastern Prince must have judged wisely, &c. but he did not; therefore that Principle is not true."

Character of conditional propositions.

Universally indeed a Conditional Proposition may be regarded as an assertion of the validity of a certain Argument; the Antecedent corresponding to the Premises, and the Consequent to the Conclusion; and neither of them being asserted as true, only the dependence of the one on the other; the alternative then is, to admit the Consequent, (which forms the Constructive Syllogism,) or to deny the Antecedent; which forms the Destructive; and the former accordingly corresponds to Direct reasoning, the latter to Indirect; being, as has been said, a mode of stating it in the Direct form; as is evident from the examples adduced.

Ironical effect of indirect arguments.

The difference between these two modes of stating such an Argument is considerable, when there is a long chain of reasoning; for when we employ the Categorical form, and assume as true the Premises we design to disprove, it is evident we must be speaking *ironically*, and in the character, assumed for the moment, of an adversary; when, on the contrary, we use the hypothetical form, there is no irony. Butler's *Analogy* is an instance of the latter procedure; he contends that *if* such and such objections are admissible against Religion, they must be applied equally to the constitution and course of Nature. Had he, on the other hand, assumed, for the argument's sake, that such objections against Religion *are* valid, and had thence proved the condition of the natural world to be totally different from what we see it to be, his arguments, which would have been the same in substance, would have assumed an ironical form. This form has been adopted by Burke in his celebrated *Defence of Natural Society, by a late noble Lord*;* in which, assuming the person of Bolingbroke, he proves, according to the principles of that author, that the arguments he brought against ecclesiastical, would equally lie against civil, institutions.

It is in some respects a recommendation of this latter method, and in others an objection to it, that the sophistry of an adversary will often be exposed by it in a *ludicrous* point of view; and this, even where no such effect is designed; the very essence of jest being its *mimic*

* This is an Argument from *Analogy*, as well as Bishop Butler's, though not relating to the same point; Butler's being a defence of the *Doctrines* of Religion; Burke's of its *Institutions* and practical effects. A defence of the *Evidences* of our religion, (the third point against which objections have been urged,) on a similar plan with the work of Burke just mentioned, and consequently, like that, in an ironical form, I attempted a few years ago, in a pamphlet, (published anonymously merely for the preservation of its ironical character.) whose object was to shew, that objections, (historic-doubts,) similar to those brought against the Scripture-history, and much more plausible, might be urged against all the received accounts of Napoleon Buonaparte.

sophistry.* This will often give additional force to the Argument, by the vivid impression which ludicrous images produce;† but again, it will not unfrequently have this disadvantage, that weak men, perceiving the wit, are apt to conclude that nothing *but* wit is designed, and lose sight perhaps of a solid and convincing Argument, which they regard as no more than a good joke. Having been warned that "ridicule is not the test of truth," and "that wisdom and wit" are not the same thing, they distrust every thing that can possibly be regarded as witty; not having judgment to perceive the combination, when it occurs, of wit with sound Reasoning. The ivy-wreath completely conceals from their view the point of the Thyrsus. And moreover if such a mode of Argument be employed on serious subjects, the "weak brethren" are sometimes scandalized by what appears to them a profanation; not having discernment to perceive when it is that the ridicule does, and when it does not, affect the solemn subject itself. But for the respect paid to Holy Writ, the taunt of Elijah against the prophets of Baal would probably appear to such persons irreverent. And the caution now implied will appear the more important, when it is considered how large a majority they are, who, in this point, come under the description of "weak brethren." He that can laugh at what is ludicrous, and at the same time preserve a clear

Danger of Irony.

* See Logic, Chapter *on Fallacies*, at the conclusion.

† Discit enim citius, meminitque libentius illud
Quod quis deridet, quam quod probat et veneratur.
Hor. Ep. i. b. 2.

discernment of sound and unsound Reasoning, is no ordinary man.*

It may be observed generally, that too much stress is often laid, especially by unpractised Reasoners, on Refutation; (in the strictest and narrowest sense, i. e. of Objections to the Premises, or to the Reasoning,) they are apt both to expect a Refutation where none can fairly be expected, and to attribute to it, when satisfactorily made out, more than it really accomplishes.

For first, not only specious, but real and solid Arguments, such as it would be difficult or impossible to refute, may be urged against a Proposition which is nevertheless true, and may be satisfactorily established by a *preponderance* of probability. It is in strictly scientific Reasoning alone that all the Arguments which lead to a false Conclusion must be fallacious: in what is called moral or probable Reasoning, there may be sound Arguments and valid

Unanswerable arguments may exist on both sides.

* There seem to be some persons so constituted as to be incapable of comprehending the plainest irony; though they have not in other points any corresponding weakness of intellect. The humorous satirical pamphlet attributed to an eminent literary character entitled "Advice to a Reviewer," I have known persons read without perceiving that it was ironical. And the same, with the "Historic Doubts" lately referred to.

There is also this danger in the use of Irony, that sometimes when titles, in themselves favourable, are applied (or their application retained) to any set of men, in bitter scorn, they will then sometimes be enabled to appropriate such titles in a serious sense: the ironical force gradually evaporating. I mean, such titles as "Orthodox," "Evangelical," "Saints," "Reformers," "Liberals," "Political Economists," &c. The advantage thus given may be illustrated by the story of the cocoa-nuts in Sinbad the Sailor's fifth voyage.

objections on both sides.* E. g. it may be shewn that each of two contending parties has some reason to hope for success; and this, by irrefragable Arguments on both sides; leading to Conclusions which are not (strictly speaking) contradictory to each other; for though only one party can obtain the victory, it may be true that each has some reason to expect it. The real question in such cases is, which event is the *more* probable;—on which side the evidence preponderates. Now it often happens that the inexperienced Reasoner, thinking it necessary that every objection should be satisfactorily answered, will have his attention drawn off from the arguments of the opposite side, and will be occupied perhaps in making a weak defence, while victory was in his hands. The objection perhaps may be unanswerable, and yet may safely be allowed, if it can be shewn that more and weightier objections lie against every other supposition. This is a most important caution for those who are studying the Evidences of Religion. Let the opposer of them be called on, instead of confining himself to detached cavils, and saying, how do you answer this? and how do you explain that? to frame some consistent hypothesis to account for the introduction of Christianity by human means; and then to consider whether there are more or fewer difficulties in his hypothesis than in the other.

On the other hand, one may often meet with a sophistical refutation of objections, consisting in counter-objections urged against something else which is taken for

* "There are objections against a *Plenum*, and objections against a *Vacuum*; but one of them must be true." JOHNSON.

granted to be, though it is not, the *only alternative*. E. g. objections against an unlimited Monarchy may be met by a glowing description of the horrors of the mob-government of the Athenian and Roman Republics. If an exclusive attention to mathematical pursuits be objected to, it may be answered by deprecating the exclusion of such studies. It is thus that a man commonly replies to the censure passed on any vice he is addicted to, by representing some other vice as worse; e. g. if he is blamed for being a sot, he dilates on the greater enormity of being a thief; as if there were any need he should be either. This fallacy may be stated logically, as a Disjunctive Hypothetical with the Major false.

Secondly, the force of a Refutation is often over-rated: an Argument which is satisfactorily answered ought merely to *go for nothing*: it is possible that the Conclusion drawn may nevertheless be true: yet men are apt to take for granted that the Conclusion itself is disproved, when the Arguments brought forward to establish it have been satisfactorily refuted; assuming, when perhaps there is no ground for the assumption, that these are *all* the Arguments that could be urged.*

Over estimate of the force of refutation.

* "Another form of *ignoratio elenchi*, (irrelevant conclusion,) which is rather the more serviceable on the side of the respondent, is, to prove or disprove *some part* of that which is required, and dwell on *that*, suppressing all the rest.

"Thus if a University is charged with cultivating *only* the mere elements of Mathematics, and in reply a list of the books studied there is produced, should even *any one* of those books be *not* elementary, the charge is in fairness refuted, but the Sophist may then earnestly contend that *some* of the books *are* elementary; and thus keep out of sight the real question, viz. whether they are *all* so. This is the great art of the *assertor* of a book, suppose the main po

This may be considered as the fallacy of denying the Consequent of a Conditional Proposition, from the Antecedent having been denied: "if such and such an Argument be admitted, the Assertion in question is true; but that Argument is inadmissible; *therefore the Assertion is not true.*" Hence the injury done to any cause by a weak advocate; the cause itself appearing to the vulgar to be overthrown, when the Arguments brought forward are answered.*

sitions in any work to be irrefragable, it will be strange if some illustration of them, or some subordinate part in short, will not admit of a plausible objection; the opponent then joins issue on one of these incidental questions, and comes forward with "a Reply" to such and such a work." Logic, pp. 178,179, § 18. Another expedient which *answerers* sometimes resort to, and which is less likely to remain permanently undetected, is to garble a book; exhibiting statements without their explanations, — conclusions without their proofs, — and passages brought together out of their original order; — so as to produce an appearance of falsehood, confusion, or inconclusiveness. The last and boldest step is for the "answerer" to make some false statement or absurd remark, and then father it upon the author. And even this artifice will sometimes succeed for a time, because many persons do not suspect that any one would venture upon it Again, it is no uncommon manœuvre of a dexterous sophist, when there is some argument, statement, scheme, &c. which he cannot directly defeat, to assent with seeming cordiality, but with some exception, addition, or qualification, (as e. g. an additional clause in an Act,) which, though seemingly unimportant, shall entirely nullify all the rest. This has been humourously compared to the trick of the pilgrim in the well-known tale, who took the liberty to boil his pease.

* "Hence the danger of ever advancing more than can be well maintained; since the refutation of *that* will often quash the whole: a guilty person may often escape by having too much laid to his charge; so he may also by having too much evidence against him, *i. e.* some that is not in itself satisfactory: thus, a prisoner may

On the same principle is founded a most important maxim, that it is not only the fairest, but also the wisest plan, to *state Objections in their full force*; at least, wherever there does exist a satisfactory answer to them; otherwise, those who hear them stated more strongly than by the uncandid advocate who had undertaken to repel them, will naturally enough conclude that they are unanswerable. It is but a momentary and ineffective triumph that can be obtained by manœuvres like those of Turnus's charioteer, who furiously chased the feeble straglers of the army, and evaded the main front of the battle.

And when the objections urged are not only unanswerable, but (what is more) *decisive*, — when some

sometimes obtain acquittal by shewing that one of the witnesses against him is an infamous informer and spy; though perhaps if that part of the evidence had been omitted, the rest would have been sufficient for conviction. Logic, p. 178.

The maxim here laid down, however, applies only to those causes in which, (waiving the consideration of honesty,) first, it is wished to produce not merely a temporary, but a lasting impression, and that, on readers or hearers of some judgment; and secondly, where there really *are* some *weighty* arguments to be urged. When no charge e. g. can really be substantiated, and yet it is desired to produce some present effect on the unthinking, there may be room for the application of the proverb, "Slander stoutly, and something will stick:" the vulgar are apt to conclude, that where a great deal is said, *something* must be true; and many are fond of that lazy contrivance for saving the trouble of thinking,—"splitting the difference;" imagining that they shew a laudable caution in believing *only a part* of what is said. And thus a malignant Sophist may gain such a temporary advantage by the multiplicity of his attacks, as the rabble of combatants described by Homer sometimes did by their showers of javelins, which encumbered and weighed down the shield of one of his heroes, though they could not penetrate it.

argument that has been adduced, or some portion of a system, &c. is perceived to be really unsound, it is the wisest way fairly and fully to confess this, and abandon it altogether. There are many who seem to make it a point of honour never to yield a single point,— never to retract: or, if compelled to do this, "to back out" (as the phrase is) of an untenable position, so as to display their reluctance to make any concession; as if their credit was staked on preserving unbroken the talisman of professed infallibility. But there is little wisdom (the question of honesty is out of the province of this treatise) in such a procedure; which in fact is very liable to cast a suspicion on that which is really sound, when it appears that the advocate is ashamed to abandon what is unsound. And such an honest avowal as I have been recommending, though it may raise at first a feeble and brief shout of exultation, will soon be followed by a general and increasing murmur of approbation. Uncandid as the world often is, it seldom fails to applaud the magnanimity of confessing a defect or a mistake, and to reward it with an increase of confidence. Indeed this increased confidence is often rashly bestowed, by a kind of over-generosity in the Public: which is apt too hastily to consider the confession of an error as a proof of universal sincerity. Some of the most skilful sophists accordingly avail themselves of this; and gain evidence for much that is false, by acknowledging with an air of frankness some *one* mistake; which, like a tub thrown to the whale, they sacrifice for the sake of persuading us that they have committed *only one* error. I fear it can hardly be affirmed as yet, that "this trick has been so long used in controversy, as to be almost worn out."*

§ 8.

Too earnest refutation.

It is important to observe, that too earnest and elaborate a refutation of arguments which are really insignificant, or which their opponent wishes to represent as such, will frequently have the effect of giving them importance. Whatever is slightly noticed, and afterwards passed by with contempt, many readers and hearers will very often conclude (sometimes for no other reason) to be really contemptible. But if they are assured of this again and again with great earnestness, they often begin to doubt it. They see the respondent plying artillery and musketry, — bringing up horse and foot to the charge; and conceive that what is so vehemently assailed must possess great strength. *One* of his refutations might perhaps have left them perfectly convinced, and all of them together, leave them in doubt.

Danger of writing too forcibly.

But it is not to Refutation alone that this principle will apply. In other cases also it may happen (paradoxical as it is at first sight) that it shall be possible, and dangerous, to write *too forcibly*. When indeed the point maintained is one which most persons admit or are disposed to admit, but which they are prone to lose sight of, or to underrate in respect of its importance, or not to dwell on with an attention sufficiently practical, that is just the occasion which calls on us to put forth all our efforts in setting it forth in the most forcible manner possible. Yet even here, it is

* See defence of Oxford, Second Reply, p. 95.

often necessary to caution the hearers against imagining that a point is *difficult* to establish because its *importance* leads us to dwell very much on it. Some e. g. are apt to suppose, from the copious and elaborate arguments which have been urged in defence of the authenticity of the Christian Scriptures, that these are books whose authenticity is *harder to be established* than that of other supposed-ancient works;* whereas the fact is, in the very highest degree, the reverse. The *importance*, and the *difficulty*, of proving any point, are very apt to be confounded together. We bar the doors carefully, not merely when we expect a *formidable* attack, but when we have *treasure* in the house. But when any principle is to be established, which, though in itself capable of being made evident to the humblest capacity, yet has been long and generally overlooked, and to which established prejudices are violently opposed, it will sometimes happen that to set forth the absurdity of such prejudices in the strongest point of view, (though in language perfectly decent and temperate,) and to demonstrate the conclusion, over and over, so clearly and forcibly that it shall seem the most palpable folly or dishonesty to deny it, will, with some minds, have an opposite tendency to the one desired. Some perhaps, conscious of having been the slaves or the supporters of such prejudices as are thus held up to contempt, (not indeed by disdainful language, but simply by being placed in a very clear light,) and of having overlooked truths, which when thus clearly explained and proved, appear perfectly evident even to

* See Taylor's History of the Transmission of Ancient Books; a very interesting and valuable work.

a child, will consequently be stung by a feeling of shame passing off into resentment, which stops their ears against argument. They could have borne perhaps to change their opinion; but not, so to change it as to tax their former opinion with the greatest folly. They would be so *sorry to think* they had been blinded to such an excess, and are so angry with him who is endeavouring to persuade them to think so, that these feelings determine them *not* to think it. They try (and it is an attempt which few persons ever make in vain) to shut their eyes against an humiliating conviction: and thus, the very triumphant force of the reasoning adduced, serves to harden them against admitting the conclusion: much as one may conceive Roman soldiers desperately holding out an untenable fortress to the last extremity, from apprehension of being made to pass under the yoke by the victors, should they surrender. Others again, perhaps comparatively strangers to the question, and not prejudiced, or not strongly prejudiced, against your conclusion, but ready to admit it if supported by sufficient arguments, will sometimes, if your arguments are *very much beyond* what is sufficient, have their suspicions roused by this very circumstance.

"Can it be possible," they will say, "that a conclusion so very obvious as this is made to appear, should not have been admitted long ago? Is it conceivable that such and such eminent philosophers, divines, statesmen, &c. should have been all their lives under delusions so gross?" Hence they are apt to infer, either that the author has mistaken the opinions of those he imagines opposed to him, or else, that there is some subtle fallacy in his arguments. The former of these suspicions is a

matter of little or no consequence, except as far as regards the author's credit for acuteness.* As far as the legitimate province of the orator is concerned, he may be satisfied with establishing a just principle, and leaving men to imagine if they will, that nobody had ever doubted it. But the other suspicion may lead to very serious evil; and it is not by any means unlikely to occur. Many a one will be convinced that there must be some flaw in a course of argument in which he is conscious, and perhaps ready to confess, that he cannot point out any, merely on the ground, that if there is none, but the whole is perfectly sound and valid, he cannot conceive that it should have been overlooked, (so obvious as it is made to appear,) for perhaps ages together, by able men who had devoted their thoughts to the subject. And his total inability, as I have said, to point out any fallacy, will by no means remove his conviction or suspicion that there must *be* some, if the conclusion be one, which, for the reason just mentioned, seems to him inconceivable. There are many persons unable to find out the flaw in the argument e. g. by which it is pretended to be demonstrated that Achilles could not overtake the Tortoise:

* "The more simple, clear, and obvious any principle is rendered, the more likely is its exposition to elicit those common remarks, 'of course! of course!' 'no one could ever doubt that;' 'this is all very true, but there is nothing *new* brought to light; nothing that was not familiar to every one;' 'there needs no ghost to tell us that.' I am convinced that a verbose, mystical, and partially obscure way of writing, on such a subject, is the most likely to catch the attention of the multitude. The generality verify the observation of Tacitus, 'omne ignotum pro mirifico:' and when any thing is made very plain to them, are apt to fancy that they knew it already." *Preface to Elements of Logic*, p. xvii.

but *some* flaw every one is sure there must be, from his full conviction that Achilles *could* overtake the Tortoise.

In this way it is very possible that our reasoning may be "dark with excess of light."

Of course it is not meant that a Refutation should ever appear (when that can be avoided) *insufficient*;—that a conclusion should be left *doubtful* which we are able to establish fully. But in combating deep-rooted prejudices, and maintaining unpopular and paradoxical truths, the point to be aimed at should be, to adduce what is sufficient, and *not much more* than is sufficient, to prove your conclusion. If (in such a case) you can but satisfy men that your opinion is decidedly more probable than the opposite, you will have carried your point more effectually, than if you go on, much beyond this, to demonstrate, by a multitude of the most forcible arguments, the extreme absurdity of thinking differently, till you have affronted the self-esteem of some, and awakened the distrust of others.*

§ 9.

The most obvious arguments have precedence.

The Arguments which should be placed first in order are, *cæteris paribus*, the most ***Obvious***, and such as naturally first occur.

This is evidently the natural order; and the adherence to it gives an easy, natural air to the Composition. It is seldom therefore worth while to de-

* A French writer, M. Say, relates a story of some one who, for a wager, stood a whole day on one of the bridges in Paris, offering to sell a five-franc-piece for one franc, and (naturally) not finding a purchaser.

part from it for the sake of beginning with the most powerful arguments, (when they happen not to be also the most obvious,) or on the other hand, for the sake of reserving these to the last, and beginning with the weaker; or again, of imitating, as some recommend, Nestor's plan of drawing up troops, placing the best first and last, and the weakest in the middle. It will be advisable however (and by this means you may secure this last advantage) when the strongest arguments naturally occupy the foremost place, to *recapitulate in a reverse order;* which will destroy the appearance of anti-climax, and is also in itself the most easy and natural mode of recapitulation. Let, e. g. the arguments be A, B, C, D, E, &c. each less weighty than the preceding; then in recapitulating proceed from E to D, C, B, concluding with A.

Reverse recapitulation.

CHAP. IV.

Of Introductions.

§ 1.

A Proeme, Exordium, or Introduction, is, as Aristotle has justly remarked, not to be accounted one of the essential parts of a Composition, since it is not in every case necessary. In most, however, except such as are extremely short, it is found advisable to premise something before we enter on the main argument, to avoid an appearance of abruptness, and to facilitate, in some way or other, the object proposed. In larger works this

assumes the appellation of Preface or Advertisement; and not unfrequently two are employed, one under the name of Preface, and another, more closely connected with the main work, under that of Introduction.

The rules which have been laid down already will apply equally to that preliminary course of argument of which Introductions often consist.

The writers before Aristotle are censured by him for inaccuracy, in placing under the head of Introductions, as properly belonging to them, many things which are not more appropriate in the beginning than elsewhere; as, e. g. the contrivances for exciting the hearers' *attention;* which, as he observes, is an improper arrangement; since, though such an Introduction may sometimes be required, it is, generally speaking, any where else rather than in the *beginning*, that the attention is likely to flag.

The rule laid down by Cicero, (*De Orat.*) not to compose the Introduction first, but to consider first the main argument, and let that suggest the Exordium, is just and valuable; for otherwise, as he observes, seldom any thing will suggest itself but vague generalities; "*common*" topics, as he calls them, i. e. what would equally well suit several different compositions; whereas, the Introduction, which is composed last, will naturally spring out of the main subject, and appear appropriate to it.

Introductions not to be composed first.

§ 2.

1st, One of the objects most frequently proposed in an Introduction, is, to shew that the subject in question is *important*, *curious*, or otherwise

Introduction inquisitive.

interesting, and worthy of attention. This may be called an "Introduction inquisitive."*

Introduction paradoxical.

2dly, It will frequently happen also, when the point to be proved or explained is one which may be very fully established, or on which there is little or no doubt, that it may nevertheless be *strange*, and different from what might have been expected; in which case it will often have a good effect in rousing the attention, to set forth as strongly as possible this *paradoxical* character, and dwell on the seeming improbability of that which must, after all, be admitted. This may be called an "Introduction paradoxical."†

* See Tacitus in the opening of his "History;" and the beginning of Paley's "Natural Theology."

† "If you should see a flock of pigeons in a field of corn: and if (instead of each picking where and what it liked, taking just as much as it wanted, and no more) you should see ninety-nine of them gathering all they got into a heap; reserving nothing for themselves, but the chaff and the refuse; keeping this heap for one, and that the weakest, perhaps worst, of the flock; sitting round, and looking on all the winter, whilst this one was devouring, throwing about, and wasting it; and if a pigeon, more hardy or hungry than the rest, touched a grain of the hoard, all the others instantly flying upon it, and tearing it to pieces; if you should see this, you would see nothing more than what is every day practised and established among men. Among men, you see the ninety and nine toiling and scraping together a heap of superfluities for one, (and this one too, oftentimes the feeblest and worst of the whole set, a child, a woman, a madman, or a fool:) getting nothing for themselves all the while, but a little of the coarsest of the provision, which their own industry produces; looking quietly on, while they see the fruits of all their labour spent or spoiled; and if one of the number take or touch a particle of the hoard, the others joining against him, and hanging him for the theft.

"There must be some very important advantages to account for an institution, which, in the view of it above given, is so paradoxical and unnatural.

"The principal of those advantages are the following:" &c.—Paley's *Moral Philosophy*, book iii. part i. c. 1 and 2.

3dly, What may be called an "Introduction corrective," is also in frequent use; viz. to shew that the subject has been *neglected*, *misunderstood*, or *misrepresented* by others. This will, in many cases, remove a most formidable obstacle in the hearer's mind, the anticipation of triteness, if the subject be, or may be supposed to be, a backnied one: and it may also serve to remove or loosen such prejudices as might be adverse to the favourable reception of our Arguments. Introduction corrective.

4thly, It will often happen also, that there may be need to explain some *peculiarity* in the mode of reasoning to be adopted; to guard against some possible *mistake* as to the object proposed; or to apologise for some *deficiency*: this may be called the "Introduction preparatory." Introduction preparatory.

5thly, and lastly, in many cases there will be occasion for what may be called a "Narrative Introduction," to put the reader or hearer in possession of the outline of some transaction, or the description of some state of things, to which references and allusions are to be made in the course of the Composition. Thus, in Preaching, it is generally found advisable to detail, or at least briefly to sum up, a portion of Scripture-history, or a parable, when either of these is made the subject of a Sermon. Introduction narrative.

Two or more of the Introductions that have been mentioned are often combined; especially in the Preface to a work of any length.

And very often the Introduction will contain appeals to various passions and feelings in the hearers; especially a feeling of approbation towards the speaker, or of prejudice against an opponent who has preceded him; but

this is, as Aristotle has remarked, by no means confined to Introductions.*

* It has not been thought necessary to treat of Conclusion, Peroration, or Epilogue, as a distinct head: the general rules, that a Conclusion should be neither sudden and abrupt, (so as to induce the hearer to say, "I did not know he was going to *leave off*,") nor, again, so long as to excite the hearer's impatience after he has been led to expect an end, being so obvious as hardly to need being mentioned. The matter of which the concluding part of a Composition consists, will, of course, vary according to the subject and the occasion: but that which is most appropriate, and consequently most frequent, (in Compositions of any considerable length,) is a Recapitulation, either of a part or the whole of the arguments that have been used; respecting which a remark has been made at the end of chap iii. § 9.

Any thing relative to the Feelings and the Will, that may be especially appropriate to the Conclusion, will be mentioned in its proper place.

PART II

OF PERSUASION.

CHAP. I.

Introductory.

§ 1.

PERSUASION, properly so called, i. e. the art of influencing the *Will*, is the next point to be considered. And Rhetoric is often regarded (as was formerly remarked) in a more limited sense, as conversant about this head alone. But even, according to that view, the rules above laid down will be found not the less relevant; since the *Conviction* of the understanding (of which I have hitherto been treating) is an essential *part* of Persuasion; and will generally need to be effected by the Arguments of the Writer or Speaker. For in order that the Will may be influenced, two things are requisite; viz. 1. that the proposed *Object* should appear desirable; and 2. that the *Means* suggested should be proved to be conducive to the attainment of that object; and this last, evidently must depend on a process of Reasoning. In order, e. g. to induce the Greeks to unite their efforts against the Persian invader, it was necessary both to prove that cooperation could alone render their resis-

Analysis of Persuasion.

tance effectual, and also to awaken such feelings of patriotism, and abhorrence of a foreign yoke, as might prompt them to make these combined efforts. For it is evident, that however ardent their love of liberty, they would make no exertions if they apprehended no danger; or if they thought themselves able, separately, to defend themselves, they would be backward to join the confederacy; and on the other hand, that if they were willing to submit to the Persian yoke, or valued their independence less than their present ease, the fullest conviction that the Means recommended would secure their independence, would have had no practical effect.

Exhortation.

Persuasion, therefore, depends on, first, *Argument*, (to prove the expediency of the Means proposed,) and secondly, what is usually called *Exhortation*, i. e. the excitement of men to adopt those Means, by representing the End as sufficiently desirable. It will happen indeed, not unfrequently, that the one or the other of these objects will have been already, either wholly or in part, accomplished; so that the other shall be the only one that it is requisite to insist on; viz. sometimes the hearers will be sufficiently intent on the pursuit of the End, and will be in doubt only as to the Means of attaining it; and sometimes, again, they will have no doubt on that point, but will be indifferent, or not sufficiently ardent, with respect to the proposed End, and will need to be stimulated by Exhortations. Not sufficiently ardent, I have said, because it will not so often happen that the object in question will be one to which they are *totally* indifferent, as that they will, practically at least, not reckon it, or not feel it, to be worth the requisite pains. No one is absolutely indifferent about the attainment of a happy immortality; and yet a great part of the Preacher's business consists in Exhortation, i. e. endeavouring to induce men to use those exertions which they themselves know to be necessary for the attainment of it.

Aristotle, and many other writers, have spoken of appeals to the Passions as an unfair mode of influencing the hearers; in answer to which Dr. Campbell has remarked, that there can be no Persuasion without an address to the Passions:* and it is evident, from what

* "To say, that it is possible to persuade without speaking to the passions is but at best a kind of specious nonsense. The coolest reasoner always in persuading, addresseth himself to the passions some way or other. This he cannot avoid doing, if he speak to the purpose. To make me believe, it is enough to shew me that things are so; to make me act, it is necessary to shew that the action will answer some End. That can never be an End to me which gratifies no passion or affection in my nature. You assure me, 'It is for my honour.' Now you solicit my pride, without which I had never been able to understand the word. You say, 'It is for my interest.' Now you bespeak my self-love. 'It is for the public good.' Now you rouse my patriotism. 'It will relieve the miserable.' Now you touch my pity. So far therefore is it from being an unfair method of persuasion to move the passions, that there is no persuasion without moving them.

"But if so much depend on passion, where is the scope for argument? Before I answer this question, let it be observed, that, in order to persuade, there are two things which must be carefully studied by the orator. The first is, to excite some desire or passion in the hearers; the second is, to satisfy their judgment that there is a connexion between the action to which he would persuade them, and the gratification of the desire or passion which he excites. This is the analysis of persuasion. The former is effected by communicating lively and glowing ideas of the object; the latter, unless so evident of itself as to supersede the necessity, by presenting the best and most forcible arguments which the nature of the subject

has been just said, that he is right, if under the term Passion is included every active principle of our nature. This however is a greater latitude of meaning than belongs even to the Greek word *Πάθη*, though the signification of that is wider than, according to ordinary use, that of our term "Passions." But Aristotle by no means overlooked the necessity with a view to Persuasion, properly so termed, of calling into action some motive that may influence the Will; it is plain that whenever he speaks with reprobation of an appeal to the Passions, his meaning is, the excitement of such feelings as *ought not to influence* the decision of the question in hand. A desire to do justice, may be called, in Dr. Campbell's wide acceptation of the term, a Passion: this is what ought to influence a Judge; and no one would ever censure a Pleader for striving to excite and heighten this desire; but if the decision be influenced by an appeal to Anger, Pity, &c. the feelings thus excited being such as ought not to have operated, the Judge must be allowed to have been unduly biassed; and that this is Aristotle's meaning is evident from his characterising the introduction of such topics, as *ἔξω τοῦ πράγματος*, "foreign to the matter in hand." And it is evident that as the motives which ought to operate will be different in different cases, the same may be objectionable and not fairly admissible, in one case, which in another would be perfectly allow-

Influence of the Will.

admits. In the one lies the pathetic, in the other the argumentative. These incorporated together constitute that vehemence of contention to which the greatest exploits of Eloquence ought doubtless to be ascribed."— Campbell's *Philosophy of Rhetoric*, book i. c. vii. sec. 4.

able.* An instance occurs in Thucydides, in which this is very judiciously and neatly pointed out: in the debate respecting the Mityleneans, who had been subdued after a revolt, Cleon is introduced contending for the *justice* of inflicting on them capital punishment; to which Diodotus is made to reply, that the Athenians are not sitting in *judgment* on the offenders, but in *deliberation* as to their own *interest;* and ought therefore to consider, not the *right* they may have to put the revolters to death, but the *expediency* or inexpediency of such a procedure.

In judicial cases, on the contrary, any appeal to the personal interests of the Judge, or even to public expediency, would be irrelevant. In *framing* laws indeed, and (which comes to the same thing) giving those decisions which are to operate as Precedents, the public good is the object to be pursued; but in the mere *administering* of the established laws, it is inadmissible.

There are many feelings, again, which it is evident should in no case be allowed to operate; as Envy, thirst for Revenge, &c. &c. the excitement of which by the orator is to be reprobated as an unfair artifice; but it is not the less necessary to be well acquainted with their nature, in order to allay them when previously existing in the hearers, or to counteract the efforts of an adversary in producing or directing them. It is evident indeed, that all the weaknesses, as well as the powers, of the human mind, and all the arts by which the Sophist takes advantage of these weaknesses, must be familiarly known by a perfect Orator; who,

Improper motives.

* See the Treatise on FALLACIES, sec. 14.

though he may be of such a character as to disdain employing such arts, must not want the ability to do so, or he would not be prepared to counteract them. An acquaintance with the nature of poisons is necessary to him who would administer antidotes.

§ 2.

Prejudice existing against excitement of Feelings.

There is I conceive no point in which the idea of dishonest artifice is so intimately associated with that of Rhetoric, as the address to the Feelings or Active Principles of our nature. This is usually stigmatized as "an appeal to the Passions instead of the Reason;" as if Reason alone could ever influence the Will, and operate as a motive; which it no more can, than the eyes, which shew a man his road, can enable him to move from place to place; or than a ship provided with a compass, can sail without a wind. It may be said indeed, with truth, that an orator does often influence the Will by improper appeals to the Passions; but it is no less true that he often imposes on the Understanding of his hearers by sophistical *Arguments:* yet this does not authorize us to reprobate the employment of Argument. But it seems to be commonly taken for granted, that whenever the feelings are excited they are of course *over-excited*. Now so far is this from the fact, — so far is it from being true, that men are universally, or even generally, in danger of being misled in conduct by an *excess* of feeling, that the reverse is at least as often the case. The more generous feelings, such as Compassion, Gratitude, Devotion, nay, even rational and *rightly-directed* Self-Love, Hope, and Fear, are oftener defective than excessive:

and that, even in the estimation of the parties themselves, if they are well-principled, judicious, reflective, and candid men. Do the feelings of such a man, when contemplating, for instance, the doctrines and the promises of the Christian Religion, usually come up to the standard which he himself thinks reasonable? And not only in the case of Religion, but in many others also, a man will often wonder at, and be rather ashamed of, the coldness and languor of his own feelings, compared with what the occasion calls for: and even makes efforts to rouse in himself such emotions as he is conscious his reason would approve.

The sentiments &c. not under the direct control of the Will.

In making such an effort, a curious and important fact is forced on the attention of every one who reflects on the operations of his own mind; viz. that the Feelings, Propensities, and Sentiments of our nature, are not, like the Intellectual Faculties, under the direct control of Volition. The distinction is much the same as between the voluntary and the involuntary actions of different parts of the body. One may, by a deliberate act of the Will, set himself to calculate,— to reason,— to recall historical facts, &c. just as he does, to move any of his limbs: on the other hand, a Volition to hope or fear, to love or hate, to feel devotion or pity, and the like, is as ineffectual as to will that the pulsations of the heart, or the secretions of the liver, should be altered. Some indeed are I believe (strange as it would seem) not aware of the total inefficacy of their own efforts of volition in such cases: that is, they mistake for a *feeling* of gratitude, compassion, &c. their *conviction* that the case is one which *calls for* gratitude or compassion.

A very moderate degree of attention however to what is passing in the mind will enable any one to perceive the difference.

How is this difficulty to be surmounted? Good sense suggests, in each case, an analogous remedy. It is in vain to form a Will to quicken the circulation; but we may, by a voluntary act, swallow a medicine which will have that effect: and so also, though we cannot, by a direct effort of volition, excite or allay any Sentiment or Emotion, we may, by a voluntary act, fill the Understanding with such thoughts as shall operate on the Feelings. Thus, by attentively studying and meditating on the history of some extraordinary Personage,—by contemplating and dwelling on his actions and sufferings,—his virtues and his wisdom,—and by calling on the Imagination to present a vivid picture of all that is related and referred to,—in this manner, we may at length succeed in kindling such feelings, suppose, of reverence, admiration, gratitude, love, hope, emulation, &c. as we were already prepared to acknowledge are suitable to the case. So again, if a man of sense wishes to *allay* in himself any emotion, that of resentment for instance, though it is not under the direct control of the Will, he deliberately sets himself to *reflect* on the softening circumstances; such as the provocations the other party may suppose himself to have received; perhaps, his ignorance, or weakness, or disordered state of health:—he endeavours to imagine himself in the place of the offending party;—and above all, if he is a Christian, he meditates on the parable of the debtor who, after having been himself forgiven, claimed payment with rigid severity from his fellow-servant; and on other similar lessons of Scripture.

Now in any such process as this, (which is exactly analogous to that of taking a medicine that is to operate on the involuntary bodily organs,) a process to which a man of well regulated mind continually finds occasion to resort, he is precisely acting the part of a skilful orator to himself; and that too, in respect of the very point to which the most invidious names are usually given, "the appeal to the feelings." Such being then the state of the case, how, it may be said, can it be accounted for, that the idea of unfair artifice should be so commonly associated not only with Rhetoric in general, but most especially with that particular part of it now under consideration? though no other artifice is necessarily employed by the orator than a man of sense makes use of towards himself.

A man of sense practises Rhetoric on himself.

Many different circumstances combine to produce this effect. In the first place, the intellectual powers being, as has been said, under the immediate control of the will, which the Feelings, Sentiments, &c. are not, an address to the Understanding is consequently, from the nature of the case, *direct;* to the Feelings, *indirect*. The conclusion you wish to draw, you may state plainly, as such; and avow your intention of producing reasons, which shall effect a conviction of that conclusion: you may even entreat the hearers' steady attention to the point to be proved, and to the process of argument by which it is to be established. But this, for the reasons above mentioned, is widely different from the process by which we operate on the Feelings: no passion, sentiment, or emotion, is excited by *thinking about* it, and attending to it, but by thinking about, and attending to, such objects as are calculated to awaken it. Hence

it is, that the more oblique and indirect process which takes place when we are addressing ourselves to this part of the human mind, is apt to suggest the idea of trick and artifice; although it is, as I have said, only such as a wise man practises towards himself.

In the next place, though men are often deluded by sophistical arguments addressed to the Understanding, they do not, in this case, so readily *detect* the deceit that has been practised on them, as they do in the case of their being misled by the excitement of Passions. A few days, or even hours, will often allow them to cool, sufficiently, to view in very different colours, some question on which they have perhaps decided in a moment of excitement; whereas any sophistical *reasoning* by which they had been misled, they are perhaps as unable to detect as ever. The state of the Feelings, in short, varies from day to day; the Understanding remains nearly the same: and hence the idea of deceit is more particularly associated with that kind of deceit which is the less permanent in its effects, and the sooner detected.

To these considerations it may be added, that men have in general more confidence in the soundness of their Understanding, than in their self-command and due regulation of Feelings: they are more unwilling, consequently, to believe that an orator has misled, or can mislead them, by sophistical arguments, that is, by taking advantage of their *intellectual* weakness, than by operating on their Feelings; and hence, the delusions which an artful orator produces, are often attributed in a greater degree than is really the case, to the influence he has exerted on the Passions.

But if every thing were to be regarded with aversion or with suspicion that is capable of being employed dishonestly, or for a bad purpose, the use of language might be condemned altogether. It does indeed often happen, that men's feelings are extravagantly excited on some inadequate occasion: this only proves how important it is that either they, or the person who undertakes to advise them, should understand how to bring down these feelings to the proper pitch. And it happens full as often (which is what most persons are apt to overlook) that their feelings fall far short of what, even in their own judgment, the occasion would call for: and in this case an excitement of such feelings, though not effected directly by a process of reasoning, is very far from being any thing *opposed* to reason, or tending to mislead the judgment. Stimulants are not to be condemned as necessarily bringing the body into an *unnatural* state, because they raise the circulation: in a fever this would be hurtful; but there may be a torpid, lethargic disease, in which an excitement of the circulation is precisely what is wanted to bring it into a healthy condition.

The feelings as apt to fall short of, as to exceed, the proper point.

§ 3.

The active principles of our nature may be classed in various ways; the arrangement adopted by Mr. Dugald Stewart * is, perhaps, the most correct and convenient: the heads he enumerates are *Appetites*, (which have their origin in the body,) *Desires*, and *Affections*; these last being such as imply

Division of active principle.

* *Outlines of Moral Philosophy.*

some kind of disposition relative to another *Person*; to which must be added, ***Self-love***, or the desire of Happiness as such; and the ***Moral-faculty***, called by some writers Conscience, by others the Moral sense, and by Dr. A. Smith, the sense of Propriety.

Under the head of Affections may be included the sentiments of Esteem, Regard, Admiration, &c. which it is so important that the audience should feel towards the Speaker. Aristotle has considered this as a distinct head; separating the consideration of the speaker's Character (Ἦθος τοῦ λέγοντος) from that of the disposition of the hearers; under which, however, it might, according to his own views, have been included; it being plain from his manner of treating of the Speaker's Character, that he means, not his *real* character, (according to the fanciful notion of Quinctilian,) but the impression produced on the minds of the hearers, by the speaker, respecting himself. He remarks, justly, that the Character to be established is that of, first, Good Principle, secondly, Good Sense, and thirdly, Good-will and friendly disposition towards the audience addressed;* and that if the Orator can completely succeed in this, he will persuade more powerfully than by the strongest Arguments. He might have added, (as indeed he does slightly hint at the conclusion of his Treatise,) that, where there is an opponent, a like result is produced by exciting the contrary feelings respecting him; viz. holding him up to contempt, or representing him as an object of reprobation or suspicion.

Character to be established by the speaker.

To treat fully of all the different emotions and springs of action which an Orator may at any time find it necessary to call into play, or to contend against, would be to enter on an almost boundless field of Metaphysical inquiry, which does not properly fall within the limits of the subject now before us: and on the other hand, a *brief* definition of each passion, &c. and a few general remarks on it, could hardly fail to be trite and uninteresting. A few miscellaneous Rules therefore may suffice, relative to the conduct, generally, of those parts of any Composition which are designed to influence the Will.

* Ἀρετή, Φρόνησις, Εὔνοια, book ii. c. 1.

CHAP. II.

Of the conduct of any address to the feelings generally

§ 1.

The first and most important point to be observed in every address to any Passion, Sentiment, Feeling, &c. is, (as has been already hinted,) that it should not be introduced as such, and plainly avowed; otherwise the effect will be, in great measure, if not entirely, lost. This circumstance forms a remarkable distinction between the head now under consideration, and that of Argumentation. When engaged in reasoning, properly so called, our purpose not only need not be concealed, but may, (as I have said,) without prejudice to the effect, be distinctly declared: on the other hand, even when the feelings we wish to excite are such as ought to operate, so that there is no reason to be ashamed of the endeavours thus to influence

Men impatient of dictation in respect of their feelings.

the hearer, still, our purpose and drift should be, if not absolutely concealed, yet not openly declared, and made prominent. Whether the motives which the orator is endeavouring to call into action be suitable or unsuitable to the occasion,—such as it is right, or wrong, for the hearer to act upon, the same rule will hold good. In the latter case it is plain, that the speaker who is seeking to bias unfairly the minds of the audience will be the more likely to succeed by going to work clandestinely, in order that his hearers may not be on their guard, and prepare and fortify their minds against the impression he wishes to produce. In the other case,—where the motives dwelt on are such as ought to be present, and strongly to operate, men are not likely to be pleased with the idea that they *need* to have these motives urged upon them, and that they are not already sufficiently under the influence of such sentiments as the occasion calls for. A man may indeed be convinced that he is in such a predicament; and may ultimately feel obliged to the Orator for exciting or strengthening such sentiments; but while he confesses this, he cannot but feel a degree of mortification in making the confession, and a kind of jealousy of the apparent assumption of superiority, in a speaker, who seems to say, "now I will exhort you to feel as you ought on this occasion;" "I will endeavour to inspire you with such noble, and generous, and amiable sentiments as you ought to entertain:" which is, in effect, the tone of him who avows the purpose of Exhortation. The mind is sure to revolt from the humiliation of being thus moulded and fashioned, in respect to its feelings, at the pleasure of another; and is apt, perversely, to resist the influence of such a discipline.

Whereas, there is no such implied superiority in avowing the intention of convincing the understanding. Men know, and (what is more to the purpose) feel, that he who presents to their minds a new and cogent train of Argument, does not necessarily possess or assume any offensive superiority; but may, by merely having devoted a particular attention to the point in question, succeed in setting before them Arguments and Explanations which have not occurred to themselves. And even if the Arguments adduced, and the Conclusions drawn, should be opposite to those with which they had formerly been satisfied, still there is nothing in this so humiliating, as in that which seems to amount to the imputation of a moral defect.

Caution against avowed exhortation

It is true that Sermons not unfrequently prove *popular*, which consist avowedly and almost exclusively of Exhortation, strictly so called,—in which the design of influencing the sentiments and feeling is not only apparent, but prominent throughout: but it is to be feared, that those who are the most pleased with such discourses, are more apt to apply these Exhortations to their *neighbours* than to themselves; and that each bestows his commendation rather from the consideration that such admonitions are much needed, and must be generally useful, than from finding them thus useful to himself.

When indeed the speaker has made some progress in exciting the feelings required, and has in great measure gained possession of his audience, a direct and distinct Exhortation to adopt the conduct recommended will often prove very effectual; but never can it be needful or advisable to *tell* them (as some do) that you are *going* to *exhort* them.

It will, indeed, sometimes happen that the excitement of a certain feeling will depend, in some measure, on a process of Reasoning; e. g. it may be requisite to prove, where there is a doubt on the subject, that the person recommended to the Pity, Gratitude, &c. of the hearers, is really an object deserving of these sentiments: but even then, it will almost always be the case, that the chief point to be accomplished shall be to raise those feelings to the requisite height, after the understanding is convinced that the occasion calls for them. And this is to be effected not by Argument, properly so called, but by presenting the circumstances in such a point of view, and so fixing and detaining the attention upon them, that corresponding sentiments and emotions shall gradually, and as it were spontaneously arise.*

* Sermons would probably have more effect, if, instead of being, as they frequently are, directly *hortatory*, they were more in a *didactic* form;—occupied chiefly in *explaining* some transaction related, or doctrine laid down, in Scripture. The generality of hearers are too much familiarized to direct exhortation to feel it adequately: if they are led to the same point obliquely, as it were, and induced to dwell with interest for a considerable time on some point, closely, though incidentally, connected with the most awful and important truths, a very slight application to themselves might make a greater impression than the most vehement appeal in the outset: often indeed they would themselves make this application unconsciously; and if on any this procedure made no impression, it can hardly be expected that any thing else would. To use a homely illustration, a moderate charge of powder will have more effect in splitting a rock, if we begin by deep boring, and introducing the charge into the very heart of it than ten times the quantity exploded on the surface.

§ 2.

Advantage of copious detail.

Hence arises another Rule,* closely connected with the foregoing, though it also so far relates to style that it might with sufficient propriety have been placed under that head; viz. that in order effectually to excite feelings of any kind, it is necessary to employ some copiousness of detail, and to dwell somewhat at large on the several circumstances of the case in hand; in which respect there is a wide distinction between strict Argumentation, with a view to the Conviction of the understanding alone, and the attempt to influence the will, by the excitement of any emotion. With respect to Argument itself indeed, different occasions will call for different degrees of Copiousness, Repetition, and Expansion;—the chain of Reasoning employed, may, in itself, consist of more or fewer links;—abstruse and complex Arguments must be unfolded at greater length than such as are more simple;—and the more uncultivated the audience, the more full must be the explanation and illustration, and the more frequent the repetition, of the Arguments presented to them; but still the same general principle prevails in all these cases; viz. to aim merely at letting

* "Non enim, sicut argumentum, simul atque positum est, arripitur, alterumque et tertium poscitur; ita misericordiam aut invidiam aut iracundiam, simul atque intuleris, possis commovere: argumentum enim ratio ipsa confirmat, quæ, simul atque emissa est, adhæresci; illud autem genus orationis non cognitionem judicis, sed magis perturbationem requirit, quam consequi, nisi multâ et variâ et copiosâ oratione, et simili contentione actionis, nemo potest. Quare qui aut breviter aut summisse dicunt, docere judicem possunt, commovere non possunt; in quo sunt omnia." Cic. *de Orat.* lib. ii. c. 53.

the Arguments be fully *understood and admitted;* this will indeed occupy a shorter or longer space, according to the nature of the case and the character of the hearers; but all Expansion and Repetition *beyond* what is necessary to accomplish conviction, is in every instance tedious and disgusting. On the contrary, in a description of any thing that is likely to act on the feelings, this effect will by no means be produced as soon as the understanding is sufficiently informed; detail and expansion are here not only admissible, but absolutely necessary, in order that the mind may have leisure and opportunity to form vivid and distinct ideas. For as Quinctilian well observes, he who tells us that a city was sacked, although that one word implies all that occurred, will produce little, if any, impression on the feelings,* in comparison of one who sets before us a lively description of the various lamentable circumstances; to tell the *whole*, he adds, is by no means the same as to tell *every thing*.†

* Dr. Campbell has treated very ably of some circumstances which tend to heighten any impression. The reader is referred to the Appendix for some extracts. See Appendix, [D.]

† Accordingly it may be observed, that though every one understands what is meant by "a wound," there are some who cannot hear a minute description of one, without fainting.

The death of Patroclus is minutely related by Homer for the interest of the *reader;* though to Achilles, whose feelings would be sufficiently excited by the bare fact, it is told in two words: κεῖται Πάτροκλος.

There is an instance related in a number of the Adventurer, of a whole audience being moved to tears by a *minute detail* of the circumstances connected with the death of a youthful pair at the battle of Fontenoy; though they had previously listened without emotion to a *general* statement of the dreadful carnage in that engagement.

It is not however with a view to the Feelings only that some copiousness of detail will occasionally be needful: it will often happen that the Judgment cannot be correctly formed, without dwelling on circumstances.

Imagination needed in the study of History.

It has seldom if ever been noticed, how important among the intellectual qualifications for the study of history, is a vivid Imagination: a faculty which consequently a skilful narrator must himself possess, and to which he must be able to furnish excitement in others. Some may perhaps be startled at this remark, who have been accustomed to consider Imagination as having no other office than to *feign* and falsify. Every faculty is liable to abuse and misdirection; and Imagination among the rest: but it is a mistake to suppose that it necessarily tends to pervert the truth of History, and to mislead the Judgment. On the contrary, our view of any transaction, especially one that is remote in time or place, will necessarily be imperfect, generally incorrect, unless it embrace something more than the bare outline of the occurrences; — unless we have before the mind a lively idea of the scenes in which the events took place, the habits of thought and of feeling of the actors, and all the circumstances connected with the transaction; — unless in short we can in a considerable degree transport ourselves out of our own age, and country, and persons, and imagine ourselves the agents or spectators. It is from a consideration of all these circumstances that we are enabled to form a right judgment as to the facts which History records, and to derive instruction from it.* What we imagine, may

* See Appendix, [E.]

indeed be merely *imaginary*, i. e. unreal; but it may be what actually does or did exist. To say that Imagination, if not regulated by sound judgment and sufficient knowledge, may chance to convey to us false impressions of past events, is only to say that man is fallible. But such false impressions are even *much the more* likely to take possession of those whose Imagination is feeble or uncultivated. They are apt to imagine the things, persons, times, countries, &c. which they read of, as much less different from what they see around them, than is really the case.

§ 3.

Indirect description.

It is not, however, always advisable to enter into a *direct* detail of circumstances, which would often have the effect of wearying the hearer beforehand, with the expectation of a long description of something in which he probably does not as yet feel much interest; and would also be likely to prepare him too much, and forewarn him, as it were, of the object proposed, — the design laid against his feelings. It will often, therefore, have a better effect to describe obliquely, (if I may so speak,) by introducing circumstances connected with the main object or event, and affected by it, but not absolutely forming a part of it. And circumstances of this kind may not unfrequently be selected, so as to produce a more striking impression of any thing that is in itself great and remarkable, than could be produced by a minute and direct description; because in this way the general and collective result of *a whole*, and the effects produced by it on other objects, may be vividly impressed on the hearer's mind; the circumstantial detail of *collateral* matters not drawing off the mind from the contemplation of the principal matter as one and complete. Thus, the woman's application to the King of Samaria, to compel her neighbour to fulfil the agreement of sharing with her the infant's flesh, gives a more frightful impression of the horrors of the famine than any more direct description could have done; since it presents to us the picture of that hardening of the heart to every kind of horror, and that destruction of the ordinary state of human sentiment, which is the *result* of long-continued and extreme misery. Nor could any detail of the particular vexations suffered by the exiled Jews for their disobedience, convey so lively an idea of them as that description of their *result* contained in the denunciation of Moses; "In the evening thou shalt say, Would God it were morning! and in the morning thou shalt say, Would God it were evening!"

In the poem of Rokeby, a striking exemplification occurs of what has been said: Bertram, in describing the prowess he had displayed as a Buccaneer, does not particularize any of his exploits, but alludes to the terrible *impression* they had left:

> Panama's maids shall long look pale,
> When Risingham inspires the tale;
> Chili's dark matrons long shall *tame*
> *The froward child* with Bertram's name.

The first of Dramatists, who might have been perhaps the first of Orators, has offered some excellent exemplifications of this rule; especially in the speech of Antony over Cæsar's body.

§ 4.

Comparison. Comparison is one powerful means of exciting or heightening any emotion; viz. by presenting a parallel between the case in hand and some other that is calculated to call forth such emotions; taking care, of course, to represent the present case as stronger than the one it is compared with, and such as ought to affect us more powerfully.

Climax. When several successive steps of this kind are employed to raise the feelings gradually to the highest pitch, (which is the principal employment of what Rhetoricians call the Climax,)* a far stronger effect is produced than by the mere presentation of the most striking object at once. It is observed by all travellers who have visited the Alps, or other stupendous mountains, that they form a very inadequate notion of the vastness of the greater ones, till they ascend some of the less elevated, (which yet are huge mountains,) and thence view the others still towering above them. And the mind, no less than the eye, cannot so well take in and do justice to any vast object at a single glance, as by several successive approaches and repeated comparisons. Thus in the well-known Climax of Cicero in the Oration against Verres, shocked as the Romans were likely to be at the bare mention of the crucifixion of one of their citizens, the successive steps by which he brings them to the contemplation of such an event, were calculated to work up their feelings to a much higher pitch: "It is an outrage to bind a Roman citizen; to scourge him is an atrocious crime; to put him to death is almost parricide; but to *crucify* him — what shall I call it?"

* An analogous Arrangement of *Arguments*, in order to set forth the full force of the one we mean to dwell upon, would also receive the same appellation; and in fact is very often combined and blended with that which is here spoken of.

It is observed, accordingly, by Aristotle, in speaking of Panegyric, that the person whom we would hold up to admiration, should always be compared, and advantageously compared, if possible, with those that are already illustrious, but if not, at least with *some* person whom he excels: to *excel*, being in itself, he says, a ground of admiration. The same rule will apply, as has been said, to all other feelings as well as to Admiration: Anger, or Pity, for instance, are more effectually excited if we produce cases such as would call forth those passions, and which, though similar to those before us, are not so strong; and so with respect to the rest.

When it is said, however, that the object which we compare with another, introduced for the purpose, should be one which *ought* to excite the feeling in question in a higher degree than that other, it is not meant that this must actually be, already, the impression of the hearers: the reverse will more commonly be the case; that the instances adduced will be such as *actually* affect their feelings more strongly than that to which we are endeavouring to turn them, till the flame spreads, as it were, from the one to the other. This will especially hold good in every case where *self* is concerned; e. g. men feel naturally more indignant at a slight affront offered to themselves, or those closely connected with them, than at the most grievous wrong done to a stranger; if therefore you would excite their utmost indignation in such a case, it must be by comparing it with a parallel

case that concerns themselves; i. e. by leading them to consider how they would feel were such and such an injury done to themselves. And, on the other hand, if you would lead them to a just sense of their own faults, it must be by leading them to contemplate like faults in others; of which the celebrated parable of Nathan, addressed to David, affords an admirable instance.

It often answers very well to introduce in this manner an instance not only avowedly *fictitious*, but even manifestly *impossible*, provided it be but *conceivable*. A case may thus be exhibited more striking and apposite than any real or possible one that could be found. I have inserted in the Appendix some examples of this kind.*

§ 5.

Exaggerating and extenuating methods.

Another Rule, (which also is connected in some degree with Style,) relates to the tone of feeling to be manifested by the writer or speaker himself, in order to excite the most effectually the desired emotions in the minds of the hearers. And this is to be accomplished by two opposite methods: the one, which is the more obvious, is to *express* openly the feeling in question; the other, to seem labouring to *suppress* it: in the former method, the most forcible remarks are introduced,— the most direct as well as impassioned kind of description is employed,— and something of exaggeration introduced, in order to carry the hearers as far as possible in the same direction in which the Orator seems to be himself hurried, and to infect them to a certain degree with the emotions and sentiments which he

* See Appendix, [F.]

thus manifests: the other method, which is often no less successful, is to abstain from all remarks, or from all such as come up to the expression of feeling which the occasion seems to authorize—to use a gentler mode of expression than the case might fairly warrant, — to deliver "an unvarnished tale," leaving the hearers to make their own comments,—and to appear to stifle and studiously to keep within bounds such emotions as may seem natural. This produces a kind of reaction in the hearers' minds; and being struck with the inadequacy of the expressions, and the labored calmness of the speaker's manner of stating things, compared with what he may naturally be disposed to feel, they will often rush into the opposite extreme, and become the more strongly affected by that which is set before them in so simple and modest a form. And though this method is in reality more artificial than the other, the artifice is the more likely (perhaps for that very reason) to escape detection; men being less on their guard against a speaker who does not seem so much labouring to work up *their* feelings, as to repress or moderate his own; provided that this calmness and coolness of manner be not carried to such an extreme as to bear the appearance of affectation; which caution is also to be attended to in the other mode of procedure no less; an excessive hyperbolical exaggeration being likely to defeat its own object. Aristotle mentions, (*Rhet.* book ix.) though very briefly, these two modes of rousing the feelings, the latter under the name of *Eironeia*, which in his time was commonly employed to signify, not according to the modern use of "Irony," saying "the *contrary* to what is meant," but, what later writers usually express by *Litotes*, i. e. "saying *less* than is meant."

The two methods may often be both used on the same occasion, beginning with the calm, and proceeding to the impassioned, afterwards, when the feelings of the hearers are already wrought up to a certain pitch: *ὅταν ἔχῃ ἤδη τοὺς ἀκροατὰς, καὶ ποιῃ ἐνθουσιάσαι.** Universally indeed it is a fault carefully to be avoided, to express feelings more vehemently than that the audience can go along with the speaker; who would, in that case, as Cicero observes, seem like one raving among the sane, or intoxicated in the midst of the sober.† And accordingly,

* Aristotle, *Rhet.* book iii. ch. 7.

† In no point perhaps more than in that now under consideration is the importance of a judicious *arrangement* to be perceived. The natural and suitable order of the parts of a discourse (natural it may be called, because corresponding with that in which the ideas suggest themselves to the mind) is, that their statements and arguments should first be clearly and calmly laid down and developed, which are the ground and justification of such sentiments and emotions as the case calls for; and that then the impassioned appeal (supposing the circumstances such as admit of or demand this) should be made, to hearers well prepared by their previous deliberate conviction, for resigning themselves to such feelings as fairly arise out of that conviction. The former of these two parts may be compared to the back of a sabre; the latter to its edge. The former should be firm and weighty; the latter keen. The writer who is deficient in strength of Argument, seems to want weight and stoutness of metal; his strokes make but a superficial impression, or the weapon is shivered to fragments in his hand. He again whose Logic is convincing, but whose deficiency is in the keenness of his application to the heart and to the will of the hearer, seems to be wielding a blunt though ponderous weapon; we wonder to find that such weighty blows have not cut deeper. And he who reverses the natural order,— who *begins* with a vehement address to the feelings, and afterwards proceeds to the arguments which alone justify such feelings, reminds us of one wielding an excellent sword, but striking with the *back* of it: if he did but turn it round, its blows would take effect.

except where from extraneous causes the audience are already in an excited state, we must carry them forward gradually, and allow time for the fire to kindle. The blast which would heighten a strong flame, would, if applied too soon, extinguish the first faint spark. The speech of Antony over Cæsar's corpse, which has been already mentioned, affords an admirable example of that combination of the two methods which has just been spoken of.

Generally, however, it will be found that the same Orators do not excel equally in both modes of exciting the feelings; and it should be recommended to each to employ principally that in which he succeeds best; since either, if judiciously managed, will generally prove effectual for its object. The well-known tale of Inkle and Yarico, which is an instance of the *extenuating* method, (as it may be called,) could not, perhaps, have been rendered more affecting, if equally so, by the most impassioned vehemence and rhetorical heightening.

§ 6.

Diversion of a feeling.

When the occasion or object in question is not such as calls for, or as is likely to excite in those particular readers or hearers, the emotions required, it is a common Rhetorical artifice to turn their attention to some object which *will* call forth these feelings; and when they are too much excited to be capable of judging calmly, it will not be difficult to turn their passions, once roused, in the direction required, and to make them view the case before them in a very different light. When the metal is heated, it may easily be moulded into the desired form. Thus vehement indignation against

some crime, may be directed against a person who has not been proved guilty of it; and vague declamations against corruption, oppression, &c. or against the mischiefs of anarchy; with high-flown panegyrics on liberty, rights of man, &c. or on social order, justice, the constitution, law, religion, &c. will gradually lead the hearers to take for granted, without proof, that the measure proposed will lead to these evils or these advantages; and it will in consequence become the object of groundless abhorrence or admiration. For the very utterance of such words as have a multitude of what may be called *stimulating* ideas associated with them, will operate like a charm on the minds, especially of the ignorant and unthinking, and raise such a tumult of feeling, as will effectually blind their judgment; so that a string of vague abuse or panegyric, will often have the effect of a train of sound Argument. This artifice falls under the head of "Irrelevant Conclusion," or *ignoratio elenchi*, mentioned in the Treatise on *Fallacies*.

CHAP. III.

Of the favourable or unfavourable disposition of the hearers towards the Speaker or his opponent.

§ 1.

In raising a favourable impression of the speaker, or an unfavourable one of his opponent, a peculiar tact will of course b necessary; especially in the former, since direct self-commendation will usually be disgusting, to a greater degree, even than a direct personal attack on another; though, if the Orator is pleading his own cause, or one in which he is personally concerned, (as was the case in the speech of Demosthenes concerning the Crown,) a greater allowance will be made for him on this point; especially if he be a very eminent person, and one who may safely appeal to public actions performed by him. Thus Pericles is represented by Thucydides as claiming directly, when speaking in his own vindication, exactly the qualities (good Sense, good Principle, and Good-will) which Aristotle lays down as constituting the character which we must seek to appear in. But then it is to be observed, that the historian represents him as accustomed to address the people with more authority than others for the most part ventured to assume. It is by the expression of wise, amiable, and generous *Sentiments*, that Aristotle recommends the speaker to manifest his own character;* but

Indirect self-commendation.

* Of course it will often happen that the hearers will thus be induced, on insufficient grounds, to give the speaker full credit for moral excellence, from his merely uttering the language of it: the

even this must generally be done in an *oblique** and seemingly incidental manner, lest the hearers be disgusted with a pompous and studied display of fine sentiments; and care must also be taken not to affront them by seeming to inculcate as something likely to be new to them, maxims which they regard as almost truisms. Of course the application of this last caution must vary according to the character of the persons addressed; that might excite admiration and gratitude in one audience, which another would receive with indignation and ridicule. Most men, however, are disposed rather to overrate than to extenuate their own moral judgment; or at least to be jealous of any one's appearing to underrate it.

Eloquence relative.

Universally indeed, in the Arguments used, as well as in the appeals made to the Feelings, a consideration must be had of the hearers, whether they are learned or ignorant,—of this or that profession,—nation,—character, &c. and the address must be adapted to each; so that there can be no excellence of writing or speaking in the abstract; nor can we any more pronounce on the Eloquence of any Composition, than upon the wholesomeness of a medicine, without knowing for whom it is intended. The less enlightened the hearers, the harder, of course, it is to

fallacy which in this case misleads them may be regarded as that of undistributed middle: "a good man would speak so and so; the speaker does this: therefore he must be a good man."

* E. g. "It would be needless to impress upon you the maxim," &c. "You cannot be ignorant," &c. &c. "I am not advancing any high pretensions in expressing the sentiments which such an occasion must call forth in every honest heart," &c.

make them comprehend a long and complex train of Reasoning; so that sometimes the Arguments, in themselves the most cogent, cannot be employed at all with effect; and the rest will need an expansion and copious illustration which would be needless, and therefore tiresome, (as has been above remarked,) before a different kind of audience: on the other hand, their feelings may be excited by much bolder and coarser expedients; such as those are the most ready to employ, and the most likely to succeed in, who are themselves but a little removed above the vulgar; as may be seen in the effects produced by fanatical preachers. But there are none whose feelings do not occasionally need and admit of excitement by the powers of Eloquence; only there is a more exquisite skill required in thus affecting the educated classes than the populace.*

* "The less improved in knowledge and discernment the hearers are, the easier it is for the speaker to work upon their passions, and by working on their passions, to obtain his end. This, it must be owned, appears on the other hand to give a considerable advantage to the preacher; as in no Congregation can the bulk of the people be regarded as on a footing, in point of improvement, with either House of Parliament, or with the Judges in a Court of Judicature. It is certain, that the more gross the hearers are, the more avowedly may you address yourself to their passions, and the less occasion there is for argument; whereas, the more intelligent they are, the more covertly must you operate on their passions, and the more attentive must you be in regard to the justness, or at least the speciousness, of your reasoning. Hence some have strangely concluded, that the only scope for eloquence is in haranguing the multitude; that in gaining over to your purpose men of knowledge and breeding, the exertion of Oratorical talents hath no influence. This is precisely as if one should argue, because a mob is much more easily subdued than regular troops, there is no occasion for the art of war, nor is there a proper field for the exertion of military skill,

On the other hand, it is, as has been said, in the same degree more difficult to bring the uneducated to a comprehension of the Arguments employed; and this, not only from their reasoning-powers having less general cultivation, but also, in many instances, from their ignorance of the subject; — their needing to be informed of the facts, and to have the principles explained to them, on which the Argument proceeds. And I cannot but think that the generality of sermons seem to presuppose a degree of religious knowledge in the hearers greater than many of them would be found on examination to possess. When this is the case, the most angelic eloquence must be unavailing to any practical purpose.

In no point more than in that now under consideration, viz. the Conciliation (to adopt the term of the Latin writers) of the hearers, is it requisite to consider who and what the hearers are; for when it is said that good Sense, good Principle, and Good-will, constitute

unless when you are quelling an undisciplined rabble. Every body sees in this case, not only how absurd such a way of arguing would be, but that the very reverse ought to be the conclusion. The reason why people do not so quickly perceive the absurdity in the other case, is, that they affix no distinct meaning to the word *eloquence*, often denoting no more by that term than simply the power of moving the passions. But even in this improper acceptation, their notion is far from being just; for wherever there are men, learned or ignorant, civilized or barbarous, there are passions; and the greater the difficulty is in affecting these, the more art is requisite." Campbell's *Rhetoric*, book i. chap. x. sec. 2. p. 224, 225.

It may be added to what Dr. C. has here remarked, that the title of *eloquent* may have come to be often limited to such compositions as he is speaking of, from the circumstance that their eloquence is (to readers of cultivated mind) more *conspicuous*. That which affects our own feelings is not, by us, at the time at least, perceived to *be* eloquence. See note to the next section.

the character which the speaker ought to establish of himself, it is to be remembered that every one of these is to be considered in reference to the opinions and habits of the audience. To think very differently from his hearers, may often be a sign of the Orator's wisdom and worth; but *they* are not likely to consider it so. A witty Satirist* has observed, that "it is a short way to obtain the reputation of a wise and reasonable man, whenever any one tells you his opinion, to agree with him." Without going the full length of completely acting on this maxim, it is absolutely necessary to remember, that in proportion as the speaker manifests his dissent from the opinions and principles of his audience, so far, he runs the risk at least of impairing their estimation of his judgment. But this it is often necessary to do when any serious object is proposed; because it will commonly happen that the very End aimed at shall be one which implies a change of sentiments, or even of principles and character, in the hearers.† Those indeed who aim only at popularity, are right in conforming their sentiments to those of the hearers, rather than the contrary; but it is plain that though in this way they obtain the greatest reputation for Eloquence, they deserve it

* Swift.

† This must be very much the case with any preacher of the Gospel, but must have been much more so with its first promulgators. "Christ crucified" was "to the Jews a stumbling-block, and to the Greeks, foolishness." The total change required in all the notions, habits, and systems of conduct in the first converts, constituted an obstacle to the reception of the new religion, which no other that has prevailed ever had to contend with. The striking contrast which Mahommedism presents, in this respect, to Christianity, constitutes the rapid diffusion of the two, by no means parallel cases

the less; it being much easier, according to the tale related of Mahomet, to go to the mountain, than to bring the mountain to us.* There is but little Eloquence in convincing men that they are in the right, or inducing them to approve a character which coincides with their own.

The Christian preacher therefore is in this respect placed in a difficult dilemma; since he may be sure that the less he complies with the depraved judgments of man's corrupt nature, the less acceptable is he likely to be to that depraved judgment. Difficulties of a Preacher.

But he who would claim the highest rank as an Orator, (to omit all higher considerations,) must be the one who is the most successful, not in gaining popular applause, but in *carrying his point*, whatever it be. The preacher, however, who is intent on this object, should use all such precautions as are not inconsistent with it, to avoid raising unfavourable impressions in his hearers. Much will depend on a gentle and conciliatory manner; nor is it necessary that he should, at once, in an abrupt and offensive form, set forth *all* the differences of sentiment between himself and his congregation, but win them over by degrees; and in whatever point, and to whatever extent, he may suppose them to agree with him, it is allowable, and for that reason advisable, to dwell on that agreement; as the Apostles began every address to the Jews by an appeal to the Prophets, whose authority they admitted; and as Paul opens his discourse to the Athenians (though unfortunately the words of our translation are likely to convey an opposite idea) * by a commendation of their respect for religion. And above all, where censure is called for, the speaker should avoid, not merely on Christian, but also on Rhetorical principles, all appearance of exultation in his own superiority,—of contempt, or of uncharitable triumph in the detection of faults; "in *meekness*, *instructing* them that oppose themselves."

* Little force is necessary to push down heavy bodies placed on the verge of a declivity; but much force is requisite to stop them in their progress, and push them up. If a man should say, that because the first is more frequently effected than the last, it is the best trial of strength, and the only suitable use to which it can be applied, we should at least not think him remarkable for distinctness in his ideas. Popularity alone, therefore, is no test at all of the eloquence of the speaker, no more than velocity alone would be, of the force of the external impulse originally given to the body moving. As in this the direction of the body, and other circumstances, must be taken into the account; so in that, you must consider the tendency of the teaching, whether it favors or opposes the vices of the hearers. To head a sect, to infuse party-spirit, to make men arrogant, uncharitable, and malevolent, is the easiest task imaginable, and to which almost any blockhead is fully equal. But to produce the contrary effect, to subdue the spirit of faction, and that monster, spiritual pride, with which it is invariably accompanied, to inspire equity, moderation, and charity into men's sentiments and conduct with regard to others, is the genuine test of eloquence." Campbell's *Rhetoric*, book i. chap. x. sec. 5. p. 239.

§ 2.

Of intellectual qualifications, there is one which, it is evident, should not only not be blazoned forth, but should in a great measure be concealed, or kept out of sight; viz. Rhetorical skill; since whatever is attributed to the Eloquence of the speaker Danger of reputation for eloquence.

* Δεισιδαιμονεστέρους, not "too superstitious," but (as almost all commentators are now agreed) "very much disposed to the worship of Divine beings."

is so much deducted from the strength of his cause. Hence, Pericles is represented by Thucydides as artfully claiming, in his vindication of himself, the power of *explaining* the measures he proposes, not, Eloquence in *persuading* their adoption. And accordingly a skilful Orator seldom fails to notice and extol the Eloquence of his opponent, and to warn the hearers against being misled by it. It is a peculiarity therefore in the Rhetorical art, that in it, more than in any other, ***vanity*** has a direct and immediate tendency to interfere with the proposed object. Excessive vanity may indeed, in various ways, prove an impediment to success in other pursuits; but in the endeavour to Persuade, all wish to appear excellent in that art, operates as a hindrance. A Poet, a Statesman, or a General, &c. though extreme covetousness of applause may mislead them, will, however, attain their respective Ends, certainly not the less for being admired as excellent, in Poetry, Politics, or War; but the Orator attains his End the better the less he is regarded as an Orator; if he can make the hearers believe that he is not only a stranger to all unfair artifice, but even destitute of all Persuasive skill whatever, he will persuade them the more effectually,* and if there ever could be an absolutely perfect Orator, no one would, at the time at least, discover that he was so. †

* "I am no orator, as Brutus is," &c. Shaksp. Julius Cæsar

† The following passage from a review of "The Heart of Mid-Lothian," coincides precisely with what has here been remarked: "We cannot bestow the same unqualified praise on another celebrated scene, Jeannie's interview with Queen Caroline. Jeannie's pleading appears to us much too rhetorical for the person and for the occasion, and the queen's answer, supposing her to have been overpowered by Jeannie's entreaties, 'This is eloquence,' is still worse. Had it *been* eloquence, it must necessarily have been unperceived by the queen If there is any art of which *celare artem* is the basis, it is this. The instant it peeps out, it defeats its own object, by diverting our attention from the subject to the speaker, and that with a suspicion of his sophistry equal to our admiration of his ingenuity. A man who, in answer to an earnest address to the feelings of his hearer, is told, 'you have spoken eloquently,' feels that he has failed. Effie, when she entreats Sharpitlaw to allow her to see her sister, *is* eloquent, and his answer accordingly betrays perfect unconsciousness that she has been so, 'You shall see your sister,' he began 'if you'll tell me;' then interrupting himself, he added in a more hurried tone, 'no, you shall see your sister, whether you tell me or no.'" Quarterly Review, No. li, p. 118

And this consideration may serve to account for the fact which Cicero remarks upon (*De Oratore*, book i.) as so inexplicable; viz. the small number of persons who, down to his time, had obtained high reputation as orators, compared with those who had obtained excellence in other pursuits. Few men are destitute of the desire of admiration; and most are especially ambitious of it in the pursuit to which they have chiefly devoted themselves; the Orator therefore is continually tempted to sacrifice the substance to the shadow, by aiming rather at the admiration of the hearers, than their conviction, and thus to fail of that excellence in his art which he might otherwise be well qualified to attain, through the desire of a reputation for it. And on the other hand, some may have been really persuasive speakers, who yet may not have ranked high in men's opinion, and may not have been known to possess that art of which they gave proof by their skilful concealment of it. There is no point, in short, in which report is so little to be trusted.

If I were asked to digress a little from my subject, and to say what I should recommend in point of morality and of prudence, to the speaker or writer, and to those whom he addresses, with respect to the precept just given, I should, in reply, counsel him who wishes to produce a *permanent* effect, (for I am not now adverting to the case of a barrister,) to keep on the side of what he believes to be truth; and, avoiding all sophistry, to aim only at setting forth that truth as strongly as possible, (combating, of course, any unjust personal prejudice against himself,) without any endeavour to gain applause for his own abilities. If he is himself thoroughly convinced, and strongly impressed, and can keep clear of the seductions of vanity, he will be more likely in this way to gain due credit for the strength of his cause, than by yielding to a feverish anxiety about the opinion that others may form of him. And as I should of course advise the reader or hearer to endeavour, in each case, to form his *judgment* according to the real and valid arguments urged, and to regulate his *feelings and sentiments* according to what the case justly calls for, so, with a view to this end, I would suggest these two cautions; first, to keep in mind that there is danger of *over-rating* as well as of under-rating the eloquence of what is said; and that to attribute to the skill of the advocate what really belongs to the strength of his cause, is just as likely to lead to error as the opposite mistake: and secondly, to remember that when the feelings are strongly excited, they are not necessarily *over-excited:* it may be that they are only brought into the state which the occasion fully justifies; or even that they still fall short of this.*

* See part ii. chap. 1. § 2.

§ 3.

Of the three points which Aristotle directs the orator to claim credit for, it might seem at first sight that one, viz. "Good-will," is unnecessary to be mentioned; since Ability and Integrity would appear to comprehend, in most cases at least, all that is needed; a virtuous man, it may be said, must wish well to his countrymen, or to any persons whatever, whom he may be addressing. But on a more attentive consideration, it will be manifest that Aristotle had good reason for mentioning this head; if the speaker were believed to wish well to his *Country*, and to every individual of it, yet if he were suspected of being unfriendly to the political or other *Party* to which his hearers belonged, they would listen to him with prejudice.

A character for good-will as well as integrity requisite.

The abilities and the conscientiousness of Phocion seem not to have been doubted by any; but they were so far from gaining him a favourable hearing among the Democratical party at Athens, (who knew him to be no friend to Democracy,) that they probably distrusted him the more; as one whose public spirit would induce him, and whose talents would enable him, to subvert the existing Constitution.

One of the most powerful engines, accordingly, of the orator, is this kind of appeal to party-spirit. Party-spirit may, indeed, be considered in another point of view, as one of the Passions which may be *directly* appealed to, when it can be brought to operate in the direction required; i. e. when the conduct the writer or speaker is recommending appears likely to gratify party-spirit; but it is the *indirect* appeal

Party-spirit

to it which is now under consideration; viz. the favour, credit, and weight which the speaker will derive from appearing to be of the same party with the hearers, or at least not opposed to it. And this is a sort of credit which he may claim more openly and avowedly than any other; and he may likewise throw discredit on his opponent in a less offensive, but not less effectual manner. A man cannot say in direct terms, "I am a wise and worthy man, and my adversary the reverse;" but he is allowed to say, "I adhere to the principles of Mr. Pitt or of Mr. Fox;" "I am a friend to Presbyterianism, or to Episcopacy," (as the case may be,) and "my opponent, the reverse;" which is not regarded as an offence against modesty, and yet amounts virtually to as strong a self-commendation, and as decided vituperation, in the eyes of those imbued with party-spirit, as if every kind of merit and of demerit had been enumerated: for to zealous party-men, zeal for their party will very often either imply, or stand as a substitute for, every other kind of worth.

Hard, indeed, therefore is the task of him whose object is to counteract party-spirit and to soften the violence of those prejudices which spring from it.* His only resource must be to take care that he give no ground for being supposed imbued with the violent and unjust prejudices of the opposite party, — that he give

* "Of all the prepossessions in the minds of the hearers, which tend to impede or counteract the design of the speaker, party-spirit, where it happens to prevail, is the most pernicious; being at once the most inflexible, and the most unjust. * * * * Violent party-men not only lose all sympathy with those of the opposite side, but even contract an antipathy to them. This, on some occasions, even the divinest eloquence will not surmount." Campbell's *Rhetoric.*

his audience credit, (since it rarely happens but that each party has some tenets that are reasonable,) for whatever there may be that deserves praise, — that he proceed gradually and cautiously in removing the errors in which they are infected, — and above all, that he studiously disclaim and avoid the appearance of any thing like a feeling of *personal* hostility, or personal contempt.

A character for integrity requisite.

If the orator's character can be sufficiently established in respect of Ability, and also of Good-will towards the hearers, it might at first sight appear as if this would be sufficient; since the former of these would imply the Power, and the latter the Inclination, to give the best advice, whatever might be his Moral character; but Aristotle (in his *Politics*) justly remarks that this last is also requisite to be insisted on, in order to produce entire confidence; for, says he, though a man cannot be suspected of wanting Good-will towards *himself*, yet many very able men act most absurdly, even in their own affairs, for want of Moral virtue; being either blinded or overcome by their Passions, so as to sacrifice their own most important interests to their present gratification; and much more, therefore, may they be expected to be thus seduced by personal temptations, in the advice they give to others. Pericles, accordingly, in the speech which has been already referred to, is represented by Thucydides as insisting not only on his political ability and his patriotism, but also on his unimpeached integrity, as a qualification absolutely necessary to entitle him to their confidence; "for the man," says he, "who possesses every other requisite, but is overcome by the temptation of interest, will be ready to sell every thing for the gratification of his avarice."

§ 4.

Character of opponent.

From what has been said of the speaker's recommendation of himself to the audience, and establishment of his authority with them, sufficient rules may readily be deduced for the analogous process,—the depreciation of an opponent. Both of these, and especially the latter, under the offensive title of *personality*, are by many indiscriminately decried as unfair Rhetorical artifices; and doubtless they are, in the majority of cases, sophistically employed; and by none more effectually than by those who are perpetually declaiming against such Fallacies; the unthinking hearers not being prepared to expect any from those who represent themselves as holding them in such abhorrence. But surely it is not in itself an unfair topic of argument, in cases not admitting of decisive and unquestionable proof, to urge that the one party deserves the hearers' confidence, or that the other is justly an object of their distrust. "If the measure is a good one," it has been said, "will it become bad because it is supported by a bad man? if it is bad, will it become good, because supported by a good man? If the measure be really inexpedient, why not at once shew that it is so? Your producing these irrelevant and inconclusive arguments, in lieu of direct ones, though not sufficient to prove that the measure you thus oppose is a good one, contributes to prove that you yourself regard it as a good one." Now to take thus for granted, that in every case, decisive arguments to prove a measure bad or good, independent of all consideration of the character of its advocates, could be found, and could be made *clear to the persons addressed*, is a manifest petitio principii. There is no

doubt that the generality of men are too much disposed to consider more, *who* proposes a measure, than *what* it is that is proposed; and probably would continue to do so, even under a system of annual Parliaments and universal suffrage; and if a warning be given against an excessive tendency to this way of judging, it is reasonable, and may be useful; nor should any one escape censure who *confines* himself to these topics, or dwells principally on them, in cases where "direct" arguments are to be expected; but they are not to be condemned *in toto* as "irrelevant and inconclusive," because they are only probable, and not in themselves decisive; it is only in matters of strict science, and that too, in arguing to scientific men,* that the character of the advisers (as well as all other *probable* Arguments) should be wholly put out of the question.

And it is remarkable that the necessity of allowing some weight to this consideration, in political matters, increases in proportion as any country enjoys a *free government*. If all the power be in the hands of a few of the higher orders, who have the opportunity at least of obtaining education, it is conceivable, whether probable or not, that they may be brought to try each proposed measure exclusively on its intrinsic merits, by abstract arguments; but can any man, in his senses, really believe that the great mass of the *people*, or even any considerable portion of them, can ever possess so much political knowledge, patience in investigation, and sound Logic, (to say nothing of candour,) as to be able

* Qu. Is every one chargeable with weakness or absurdity who believes that the earth moves round the Sun, on the authority of Astronomers, without having himself scientifically demonstrated it?

and willing to judge, and to judge correctly, of every proposed political measure, in the abstract, without any regard to their opinion of the persons who propose it? And it is evident that in every case in which the hearers are *not* completely competent judges, they not only will, but must, take into consideration the characters of those who propose, support, or dissuade any measure; — the persons they are connected with,— the designs they may be supposed to entertain, &c.; though, undoubtedly, an *excessive* and *exclusive* regard to Persons rather than Arguments, is one of the chief Fallacies against which men ought to be cautioned.

But if the opposite mode of judging in every case were to be adopted without limitation, it is plain that *children* could not be educated. Indeed, happily for the world, most of them, who were allowed to proceed on this plan, would in consequence perish in childhood. A pious Christian again has the same implicit reliance on his God, even where unable to judge of the reasonableness of his commands and dispensations, as a dutiful and affectionate child has on a tender parent. Now though such a man is of course regarded by an Atheist as weak and absurd, it is surely on account of his *belief*, not of his *consequent conduct*, that he is so regarded. Even Atheists would in general admit that he is acting reasonably, on the *supposition* that there is a God, who has revealed himself to man.

§ 5.

Authority derived from supposed experience.

In no way, perhaps, are men, not bigoted to party, more likely to be misled by their favourable or unfavourable judgment of their advisers, than in what relates to the authority derived

from *Experience*. Not that Experience ought not to be allowed to have great weight; but that men are apt not to consider with sufficient attention, what it is that constitutes Experience, in each point: so that frequently one man shall have credit for much Experience, in what relates to the matter in hand, and another, who, perhaps, possesses as much, or more, shall be underrated as wanting it. The vulgar, of all ranks, need to be warned first, that *time* alone does not constitute Experience; so that many years may have passed over a man's head, without his even having had the same opportunities of acquiring it, as another, much younger: secondly, that the longest practice in conducting any business in *one* way, does not necessarily confer any Experience in conducting it in a different way; e. g. an experienced Husbandman, or Minister of State, in Persia, would be much at a loss in Europe: and if they had some things less to learn than an entire novice, on the other hand they would have much to unlearn: and, thirdly, that merely being conversant about a certain class of *subjects*, does not confer Experience in a case where the *Operations*, and the *End* proposed, are different. It is said that there was an Amsterdam merchant, who had dealt largely in corn all his life, who had never seen a field of wheat growing; this man had doubtless acquired, by Experience, an accurate judgment of the qualities of each description of corn,— of the best methods of storing it,— of the arts of buying and selling it at proper times, &c.; but he would have been greatly at a loss in its cultivation; though he had been, in a certain way, long *conversant* about corn. Nearly similar is the Experience of a practised Lawyer, (supposing him to be nothing more,) in a

case of *Legislation;* because he has been long *conversant about Law*, the unreflecting attribute great weight to his judgment; whereas his constant habits of fixing his thoughts on what the law *is*, and withdrawing it from the irrelevant question of what the law *ought* to be;—his careful observance of a multitude of rules, (which afford the more scope for the display of his skill, in proportion as they are arbitrary, unreasonable, and unaccountable,) with a studied indifference as to that which is foreign from his business, the *convenience* or *inconvenience* of those Rules,—may be expected to operate unfavourably on his judgment in questions of Legislation: and are likely to counterbalance the advantages of his superior knowledge, even in such points as do bear on the question.

In matters connected with Political-economy, the *experience* of *practical* men is often appealed to in opposition to those who are called Theorists; even though the latter perhaps are deducing conclusions from a wide induction of facts, while the experience of the others will often be found only to amount to their having been long conversant with the details of office, and having all that time gone on in a certain beaten track, from which they never tried, or witnessed, or even imagined, a deviation.

So also the authority derived from experience of a *practical* Miner, i. e. one who has wrought all his life in one mine, will sometimes delude a speculator into a vain search for metal or coal, against the opinion perhaps of *Theorists*, i. e. persons of extensive geological observation.

The consideration then of the character of the speaker, and of his opponent, being of so much importance,

both as a legitimate source of Persuasion, in many instances, and also as a topic of Fallacies, it is evidently incumbent on the orator to be well versed in this branch of the art, with a view both to the justifiable advancement of his own cause, and to the detection and exposure of unfair artifice in an opponent. It is neither possible, nor can it in justice be expected, that this mode of persuasion should be totally renounced and exploded, great as are the abuses to which it is liable: but the speaker is bound, in conscience, to abstain from those abuses himself; and, in prudence, to be on his guard against them in others.

To enumerate the various kinds of impressions, favourable and unfavourable, that hearers or readers may entertain concerning any one, would be tedious and superfluous. But it may be worth observing, that a charge of *inconsistency*, as it is one of the most disparaging, is also one that is perhaps the most frequently urged with effect, on insufficient grounds. Strictly speaking, inconsistency (such at least as a wise and good man is exempt from) is the maintaining *at the same time* two contradictory propositions; whether expressed in language, or implied in sentiments or conduct. As, e. g. if an author, in an argumentative work, while he represents every syllogism as futile and fallacious reasoning, admits that all reasoning may be exhibited in the form of syllogisms; or, if the same person censures and abhors oppression, yet practises it towards others; or if he prescribes two medicines which neutralize each other's effects, &c.

But a man is often censured as inconsistent, if he changes his plans or his opinions on any point. And certainly if he does this often, and lightly, that is good

ground for withholding confidence from him. But it would be more precise to characterize him as fickle and unsteady, than as inconsistent; because this use of the term tends to confound one fault with another; viz. with holding two incompatible opinions *at once*.

But moreover a man is often charged with inconsistency for approving some parts of a book, — system, — character, &c. and disapproving others; — for being now an advocate for peace, and now for war; — in short, for accommodating his judgment or his conduct to the circumstances before him, as the mariner sets his sails to the wind. In this case there is not even any change of mind implied; yet for this a man is often taxed with inconsistency; though in many instances there would even be an inconsistency in the opposite procedure; e. g. in *not* shifting the sails, when the wind changes.

In the other case indeed, — when a man does change his mind, — he implies some error, either first or last. But some errors every man is liable to, who is not infallible. He therefore who prides himself on his consistency, on the ground of resolving never to change his plans or opinions, does virtually (unless he means to proclaim himself either too dull to detect his mistakes, or too obstinate to own them) lay claim to infallibility. And if at the same time he ridicules (as is often done) the absurdity of a claim to infallibility, he is guilty of a gross inconsistency in the proper and primary sense of the word. But it is much easier to boast of consistency than to preserve it. For, as, in the dark, adverse troops may take post near each other, without mutual recognition, and consequently without contest, but as soon as daylight comes, the weaker give place to the stronger;

so, in a misty and darkened mind, the most incompatible opinions may exist together, without any perception of their discrepancy; till the understanding becomes sufficiently enlightened to enable the man to reject the less reasonable opinions, and retain the opposites.

It may be added, that it is a very fair ground for disparaging any one's judgment, if he maintains any doctrine or system, *avowedly* for the sake of consistency. That must always be a bad reason. If the system, &c. is *right*, you should pursue it *because* it is right, and not because you have pursued it hitherto; if it is wrong, your having once committed a fault is a poor reason to give for persisting in it.

It only remains to observe, on this head, that (as Aristotle teaches) the *place* for the disparagement of an opponent is, for the first speaker, near the close of his discourse, to weaken the force of what may be said in reply: and, for the opponent, near the opening, to lessen the influence of what has been already said.

§ 6.

Unfavourable prejudices to be allayed or diverted.

Either a personal prejudice, such as has been just mentioned, or some other passion unfavourable to the speaker's object, may already exist in the minds of the hearers, which it must be his business to allay.

It is obvious that this will the most effectually be done, not by endeavouring to produce a state of perfect calmness and apathy, but by exciting some contrary emotion. And here it is to be observed that some passions may be, Rhetorically speaking, opposite to each other, though in strictness they are not so; viz. whenev

er they are incompatible with each other: e. g. the opposite, strictly speaking, to Anger, would be a feeling of Good-will and approbation towards the person in question; but it is not by the excitement of this, alone, that Anger may be allayed; for Fear is, practically, contrary to it also; as is remarked by Aristotle; who philosophically accounts for this, on the principle that Anger, implying a desire to inflict *punishment*, must imply also a supposition that it is *possible* to do so; and accordingly men do not, he says, feel Anger towards one who is so much superior as to be manifestly out of their reach; and the object of their Anger ceases to be so, as soon as he becomes an object of Apprehension. Of course the converse also of this holds good; Anger, when it prevails, in like manner subduing Fear. Savage nations accordingly, having no military discipline, are accustomed to work themselves up into a phrensy of rage by their war-songs and dances, in order to excite themselves to courage. * Compassion, likewise, may be counteracted either by Disapprobation, by Jealousy, by Fear, or by Disgust and Horror; and Envy, either by Good-will, or by Contempt.

This is the more necessary to be attended to in order that the Orator may be on his guard against inadvertently defeating his own object, by exciting feelings at variance with those he is endeavouring to produce, though not strictly contrary to them. Aristotle accordingly notices, with this view, the difference between the "Pitiable," (ἐλεεινὸν,) and the "Horrible or Shocking," (δεινὸν,) which, as he observes, excite different feelings,

* See Arist. *Rhet.* b. ii. in his Treatises on Ὀργὴ and Φόβος.

destructive of each other; so that the Orator must be warned, if the former is his object, to keep clear of any thing that may excite the latter.

It will often happen that it will be easier to give a *new direction* to the unfavourable passion, than to subdue it; e. g. to *turn* the indignation or the laughter of the hearers against a different object. Indeed, whenever the case will admit of this, it will generally prove the more successful expedient, because it does not imply the accomplishment of so great a change in the minds of the hearers.

PART III.

OF STYLE

CHAP. I.

Of Perspicuity.

§ 1.

Style not to be treated of generally.

THOUGH the consideration of Style has been laid down as holding a place in a Treatise of Rhetoric, it would be neither necessary nor pertinent, to enter fully into a *general* discussion of the subject; which would evidently embrace much that by no means *peculiarly* belongs to our present enquiry. It is requisite for an Orator, e. g. to observe the rules of Grammar; but the same may be said of the Poet, and the Historian, &c. nor is there any *peculiar* kind of grammatical propriety belonging to Persuasive or Argumentative compositions; so that it would be a departure from our subject to treat at large, under the head of Rhetoric, of such rules as equally concern every other of the purposes for which Language is employed.

Conformably to this view I shall, under the present head, notice but slightly such principles of composition as do not exclusively or peculiarly belong to the present subject; confining my attention chiefly to such observations on Style as have an especial reference to Argumentative and Persuasive works.

§ 2.

Perspicuity a relative quality.

It is sufficiently evident (though the maxim is often practically disregarded) that the first requisite of Style not only in Rhetorical, but in all compositions,* is Perspicuity; since, as Aristotle observes, language which is not intelligible, or not clearly and readily intelligible, fails, in the same proportion, of the purpose for which language is employed. And it is equally self-evident (though this truth is still more frequently overlooked) that Perspicuity is a *relative* quality, and consequently cannot properly be predicated of any work, without a tacit reference to the class of readers or hearers for whom it is designed. Nor is it enough that the Style be such as they are *capable* of understanding, *if* they bestow their utmost attention: the degree and the kind of attention, which they have been *accustomed*, or are *likely* to bestow, will be among the circumstances that are to be taken into the account, and provided for. I say the *kind*, as well as the degree, of attention, because some hearers and readers will be found slow of apprehension indeed, but capable of taking in what is very copiously and gradually explained to them; while others, on the contrary, who are much quicker at catching the sense of what is expressed in a short compass, are incapable of *long* attention, and are

* In Poetry, perspicuity is indeed by no means unimportant; but the most perfect degree of it is by no means so essential as in Prose-works. See Part iii. ch. iii. § 3.

not only wearied, but absolutely bewildered, by a diffuse Style.

When a numerous and very mixed audience is to be addressed, much skill will be required in adapting the Style, (both in *this*, and in other respects,) and indeed the Arguments also, and the whole structure of the discourse, to the various minds which it is designed to impress; nor can the utmost art and diligence prove, after all, more than partially successful in such a case; especially when the diversities are so many and so great, as exist in the congregations to which most Sermons are addressed, and in the readers for whom popular works of an argumentative, instructive, and hortatory character are intended. It is possible, however, to approach indefinitely to an object which cannot be completely attained; and to adopt such a Style, and likewise such a mode of Reasoning, as shall be level to the comprehension of the greater part, at least, even of a promiscuous audience, without being distasteful to any.

It is obvious, and has often been remarked, that extreme conciseness is ill suited to hearers or readers, whose intellectual powers and cultivation are but small: the usual expedient, however, of employing a *prolix* Style by way of accommodation to such minds, is seldom successful: most of those who could have comprehended the meaning, if more briefly expressed, and many of those who could not do so, are likely to be bewildered by tedious expansion; and being unable to maintain a steady attention to what is said, they forget part of what they have heard before the whole is completed. Add to which, that the feebleness produced by excessive dilution, (if such an expression

Brevity and prolixity.

may be allowed,) will occasion the attention to languish; and what is imperfectly attended to, however clear in itself, will usually be but imperfectly understood. Let not an author, therefore, satisfy himself by finding that he has expressed his meaning so that, *if* attended to, he cannot fail to be understood; he must consider also (as was before remarked) *what* attention is likely to be paid to it. If on the one hand much matter is expressed in very few words, to an unreflecting audience, or if, on the other hand, there is a wearisome prolixity, the requisite attention may very probably not be bestowed.*

The best general rule for avoiding the disadvantages both of conciseness and of prolixity, is to employ ***Repetition***: to repeat, that is, the same sentiment and argument in many different forms of expression; each, in itself brief, but all, together, affording such an expansion of the sense to be conveyed, and so detaining the mind upon it, as the case may require.

Repetition

* It is remarked by Anatomists, that the nutritive quality is not the only requisite in food;— that a certain degree of *distention* of the stomach is required, to enable it to act with its full powers;— and that it is for this reason hay and straw must be given to horses, as well as corn, in order to supply the necessary bulk. Something analogous to this takes place with respect to the generality of minds, which are incapable of thoroughly digesting and assimilating what is presented to them, however clearly, in a very small compass. Many a one is capable of deriving that instruction from a moderate sized volume, which he could not receive from a very small pamphlet, even more perspicuously written, and containing every thing that is to the purpose. It is necessary that the attention should be detained for a certain time on the subject; and persons of unphilosophical mind, though they can attend to what they read or hear, are unapt to dwell upon it in the way of subsequent meditation.

Cicero among the ancients, and Burke among the modern writers, afford, perhaps, the most abundant practical exemplifications of this rule. The latter sometimes shews a deficiency in correct taste, and lies open to Horace's censure of an author, "*Qui variare cupit rem prodigialiter unam:*" but it must be admitted that he seldom fails to make himself thoroughly understood, and does not often weary the attention, even when he offends the taste, of his readers.

Care must of course be taken that the repetition may not be too glaringly apparent; the variation must not consist in the mere use of other, synonymous, words; but what has been expressed in appropriate terms may be repeated in metaphorical; the antecedent and consequent of an argument, or the parts of an antithesis, may be transposed; or several different points that have been enumerated, presented in a varied order, &c.

Words derived from Saxon better understood by the lower classes.

It is not necessary to dwell on that obvious rule laid down by Aristotle, to avoid uncommon, and, as they are vulgarly called, *hard* words, i. e. those which are such to the persons addressed; but it may be worth remarking, that to those who wish to be understood by the lower orders, one of the best principles of selection is to prefer terms of *Saxon* origin, which will generally be more familiar to them, than those derived from the Latin, (either directly, or through the medium of the French,) even when the latter are more in use among persons of education.*

* A remarkable instance of this is, that while the children of the higher classes always call their parents "Papa!" and "Mamma!" the children of the peasantry usually call them by the titles of "Father!" and "Mother!"

Our language being (with very trifling exceptions) made up of these elements, it is very easy for any one, though unacquainted with Saxon, to observe this precept, if he has but a knowledge of French or of Latin; and there is a remarkable scope for such a choice as I am speaking of, from the multitude of synonymes derived, respectively, from those two sources. The compilers of our Liturgy being anxious to reach the understandings of all classes, at a time when our language was in a less settled state than at present, availed themselves of this circumstance in employing many synonymous, or nearly synonymous, expressions, most of which are of the description just alluded to. Take, as an instance, the Exhortation: "acknowledge" and "confess;" "dissemble" and "cloke;" "humble" and "lowly;" "goodness" and "mercy;" "assemble" and "meet together." And here it may be observed, that, as in this last instance, a word of French origin will very often not have a *single word* of Saxon derivation corresponding to it, but may find an exact equivalent in a *phrase* of two or more words: e. g. "constitute," "go to make up;" "arrange," "put in order;" "substitute," "put in the stead," &c. &c.*

* It is worthy of notice, that a Style composed chiefly of the words of French origin, while it is less intelligible to the lowest classes, is characteristic of those who in cultivation of taste are below the highest. As in dress, furniture, deportment, &c. so also in language, the dread of vulgarity constantly besetting those who are half conscious that they are in danger of it, drives them into the extreme of affected finery. So that the precept, which has been given with a view to perspicuity, may, to a certain degree, be observed with an advantage in point of elegance also.

In adapting the Style to the comprehension of the illiterate,* a caution is to be observed against the ambiguity of the word "*Plain;*" which is opposed sometimes to *Obscurity*, and sometimes to *Ornament;* the vulgar require a perspicuous, but by no means a dry and unadorned Style; on the contrary, they have a taste rather for the over-florid, tawdry, and bombastic: nor are the ornaments of style by any means necessarily inconsistent with perspicuity; Metaphor, which is among the principal of them, is indeed, in many cases, the clearest mode of expression that can be adopted; it being usually much easier for uncultivated minds to comprehend a similitude or analogy, than an abstract term. And hence the language of savages, as has often been remarked, is highly metaphorical; and such appears to have been the case with all languages in their earlier, and consequently ruder and more savage state; all terms relating to the mind and its operations, being, as appears from the etymology of most of them, originally metaphorical, though by long use they have ceased to be so: e. g. the words "ponder," "deliberate," "reflect," and many other such, are evidently drawn by analogy from external sensible bodily actions.

Perspicuity not inconsistent with ornament.

§ 3.

In respect to the Construction of sentences, it is an obvious caution to abstain from such as are too long; but it is a mistake to suppose that the

Construction of sentences.

* See Elements of Logic, Fallacies, Book iii. § 5, p. 132.

obscurity of many long sentences depends on their length alone; a well constructed sentence of very considerable length may be more readily understood, than a shorter one which is more awkwardly framed. If a sentence be so constructed that the meaning of each part can be taken in as we proceed, (though it be evident that the sense is not brought to a close,) its length will be little or no impediment to perspicuity; but if the former part of the sentence convey no distinct meaning till we arrive nearly at the end, (however plain it may then appear,) it will be, on the whole, deficient in perspicuity; for it will need to be read over, or *thought over*, a second time, in order to be fully comprehended; which is what few readers or hearers are willing to be burthened with. Take as an instance such a sentence as this: "It is not without a degree of patient attention and persevering diligence, greater than the generality are willing to bestow, though not greater than the object deserves, that the habit can be acquired of examining and judging of our own conduct with the same accuracy and impartiality as of that of another:" this labours under the defect I am speaking of; which may be remedied by some such alteration as the following: "the habit of examining our own conduct as accurately as that of another, and judging of it with the same impartiality, cannot be acquired without a degree of patient attention and persevering diligence, not greater indeed than the object deserves, but greater than the generality are willing to bestow." The two sentences are nearly the same in length, and in the words employed; but the alteration of the arrangement allows the latter to be un-

derstood, clause by clause, as it proceeds.* The caution just given is the more necessary to be insisted on, because an author is apt to be misled by reading over a sentence to himself, and being satisfied on finding it perfectly intelligible; forgetting that he himself has the advantage, which a hearer has not, of knowing at the beginning of the sentence what is coming in the close.

Clear ideas do not imply clearness of expression.

Universally, indeed, an unpractised writer is liable to be misled by his own knowledge of his own meaning, into supposing those expressions clearly intelligible, which are so to himself; but which may not be so to the reader, whose thoughts are not in the same train. And hence it is that some do not write or speak with so much perspicuity on a subject which has long been very familiar to them, as on one, which they understand indeed, but with which they are less intimately acquainted, and in which their knowledge has been more recently acquired. In the former case it is a matter of some difficulty to keep in mind the necessity of carefully and copiously explaining principles which by long habit have come to assume in our minds the appearance of self-evident truths. So far is Blair's notion from being correct, that obscurity of Style necessarily springs from indistinctness of Conception.

* Care must be taken however, in applying this precept, not to let the beginning of a sentence so *forestall* what follows as to render it apparently feeble and impertinent: e. g. "Solomon, one of the most celebrated of men for wisdom and for prosperity," . . . . . "why who needs" (the hearer will be apt to say to himself) "to be told that?" and yet it may be important to the purpose in hand to fix the attention on these circumstances: let the description come *before* the name, and the sentence, while it remains equally perspicuous, will be free from the fault complained of.

§ 4.

The foregoing rules have all, it is evident, proceeded on the supposition that it is the writer's *intention* to be understood; and this cannot but be the case in every legitimate exercise of the Rhetorical art: and generally speaking, even where the design is Sophistical. For, as Dr. Campbell has justly remarked, the Sophist may employ for his purpose what are in themselves real and valid arguments; since probabilities may lie on opposite sides, though truth can be but on one; his fallacious artifice consisting only in keeping out of sight the stronger probabilities which may be urged against him, and in attributing an undue weight to those which he has to allege. Or again he may, either directly or indirectly, assume as self-evident a premiss which there is no sufficient ground for admitting; or he may draw off the attention of the hearers to the proof of some irrelevant point, &c. according to the various modes described in the Treatise on FALLACIES; but in all this there is no call for any departure from perspicuity of Style, properly so called; not even when he avails himself of an ambiguous term. "For though," as Dr. Campbell says, "a Sophism can be mistaken for an Argument only where it is not rightly understood," it is the aim of him who employs it, rather that the matter should be *misunderstood*, than *not* understood;—that his language should be deceitful, rather than obscure or unintelligible. The hearer must not indeed form a

correct, but he must form some, and if possible, a distinct, though erroneous idea of the arguments employed, in order to be misled by them. The obscurity in short, if it is to be so called, must not be obscurity of *Style;* it must be, not like a mist which dims the appearance of objects, but like a coloured glass which disguises them.

Spurious Oratory.

There are, however, certain spurious kinds, as they may be called, of writing or speaking, (distinct from what is strictly termed Sophistry,) in which obscurity of Style may be apposite. The *Object* which has all along been supposed, is that of convincing or persuading; but there are some kinds of Oratory, if they are to be so named, in which some *different* End is proposed.

Appearing to urge something.

One of these Ends is, (when the cause is such that it cannot be sufficiently supported even by specious Fallacies,) to *appear to say something*, when there is in fact nothing to be said: so as at least to avoid the ignominy of being silenced. To this end, the more confused and unintelligible the language, the better, provided it carry with it the appearance of profound wisdom, and of being something to the purpose.

"Now though nothing (says Dr. Campbell) would seem to be easier than this kind of Style, where an Author falls into it naturally; that is, when he deceives himself as well as his reader, nothing is more difficult when attempted of design. It is beside requisite, if this manner must be continued for any time, that it be artfully blended with some glimpses of meaning; else, to persons of discernment, the charm will at length be dissolved, and the nothingness of what has been spoken will be detected; nay even the attention of the unsuspecting multitude, when not relieved by any thing that is level to their comprehension, will infallibly flag. The Invocation in the Dunciad admirably suits the Orator who is unhappily reduced to the necessity of taking shelter in the unintelligible:

> 'Of darkness visible so much he lent,
> As half to shew, half veil the deep intent.'
> Chap. viii. sec. 1. p. 119.

This artifice is distinguished from Sophistry, properly so called, (with which Dr. Campbell seems to confound it,) by the circumstance that its tendency is not, as in Sophistry, to convince, but to have the appearance of arguing, when in fact nothing is urged; for in order for men to be convinced, on however insufficient grounds, they must (as was remarked above) understand *something* from what is said, though, if it be fallacious, they must not understand it *rightly;* but if this cannot be accomplished, the Sophist's next resort is the unintelligible; which indeed is very often intermixed with the Sophistical, when the latter is of itself too scanty or too weak. Nor does the adoption of this Style serve merely to save his credit as an Orator or Author; it frequently does more: ignorant and unreflecting persons, though they cannot be, strictly speaking, convinced, by what they do not understand, yet will very often suppose, each, that the rest understand it; and each is ashamed to acknowledge, even to himself, his own darkness and perplexity; so that if the speaker with a confident air announces his conclusion as established, they will often,

according to the maxim "*omne ignotum pro mirifico*," take for granted that he has advanced valid arguments, and will be loth to seem behind-hand in comprehending them. It usually requires that a man should have some confidence in his own understanding, to venture to say, "what has been spoken is unintelligible to me."

Another purpose sometimes answered by a discourse of this kind is, that it serves to furnish an excuse, flimsy indeed, but not unfrequently sufficient, for men to vote or act according to their own inclinations; which they would perhaps have been ashamed to do, if strong arguments had been urged on the other side, and had remained *confessedly* unanswered; but they satisfy themselves, if something has been said in favour of the course they wish to adopt; though that something be only fair-sounding sentences that convey no distinct meaning. They are content that *an answer* has been made, without troubling themselves to consider what it is.

§ 5.

Occupying time.

Another end, which in speaking is sometimes proposed, and which is, if possible, still more remote from the legitimate province of Rhetoric, is to *occupy time*. When an unfavourable decision is apprehended, and the protraction of the debate may afford time for fresh voters to be summoned, or may lead to an adjournment, which will afford scope for some other manœuvre; — when there is a chance of so wearying out the attention of the hearers, that they will listen with languor and impatience to what shall be

urged on the other side, — when an advocate is called upon to plead a cause in the absence of those whose opinion it is of the utmost importance to influence, and wishes to reserve all his Arguments till they arrive, but till then, must apparently proceed in his pleading; in these and many similar cases, which it is needless to particularize, it is a valuable talent to be able to pour forth with fluency an unlimited quantity of well-sounding language which has little or no meaning; — which shall not strike the hearers as unintelligible or nonsensical, though it convey to their minds no distinct idea.

Perspicuity of Style, — real, not apparent, perspicuity, — is in this case never necessary, and sometimes, studiously avoided. If any distinct meaning were conveyed, and that which was said were irrelevant, it would be perceived to be so, and would produce impatience in the hearers, or afford an advantage to the opponents; if, on the other hand, the speech were relevant, and there were no arguments of any force to be urged, except such as either had been already dwelt on, or were required to be reserved (as in the case last alluded to) for a fuller audience, the speaker would not further his cause by bringing them forward. So that the usual resource on these occasions, of such orators as thoroughly understand the tricks of their art, and do not disdain to employ them, is to amuse their audience with specious emptiness.*

* It is most unfortunate, that in Sermons there should be so much temptation to fall into the first two (to say nothing of the third) of these kinds of spurious oratory: when it is *appointed* that a Sermon shall be preached, and custom *requires* that it shall be of a certain length, there cannot but be more danger that the preacher should chiefly consider himself as bound *to say something*, and to *occupy the time*

§ 6.

Display of eloquence.

Another kind of spurious Oratory, and the last that will be noticed, is that which has for its object to gain the hearer's admiration of the Eloquence displayed. This, indeed, constitutes one of the three kinds of Oratory enumerated by Aristotle,* and is regularly treated of by him, along with the Deliberate and Judicial branches; though it hardly deserves the place he has bestowed on it.

When this is the end pursued, perspicuity is not indeed to be avoided, but it may often without detriment be disregarded.† Men frequently admire as eloquent, and sometimes admire the most, what they do not at all, or do not fully, comprehend, if elevated and high sounding words be arranged in graceful and sonorous periods. Those of uncultivated minds especially, are apt to think meanly of any thing that is brought down perfectly to the low level of their capacity; though to do this with respect to valuable Truths which are not trite, is one of the most admirable feats of genius. They admire the profundity of one who is mystical and obscure; mistaking the muddiness of the water for depth; and magnifying in their imaginations what is viewed through a fog; and they conclude that brilliant language must represent

prescribed, without keeping in mind the object of leaving his hearers wiser or better, than if he were to preach solely in consequence of his having such a specific object to accomplish. See note, part iii. chap. iii. § 2.

* For he says, that in each of the two other kinds, the hearer is a "judge;" in the first of the "expedient," in the other, of the "just;" but in the third kind he is only θεωρὸς, literally, a Spectator; and is a judge merely (τῆς δυνάμεως) of the ability of the Orator.

† See Appendix [G.]

some brilliant ideas, without troubling themselves to inquire what those ideas are.

Many an enthusiastic admirer of a fine "discourse," or a piece of "fine writing," would be found on examination to retain only a few sonorous, but empty phrases; and not only to have no notion of the general drift of the Argument, but not even to have ever considered whether the Author had any such drift or not.

It is not meant to be insinuated that in every such case the composition is in itself unmeaning, or that the Author had no other object than the credit of Eloquence; he may have had a higher End in view; and he may have expressed himself very clearly to *some* hearers, though not to all: but it is most important to be fully aware of the fact, that it is possible to obtain the highest applause from those who not only receive no edification from what they hear, but absolutely do not understand it So far is popularity from being a safe criterion of the usefulness of a preacher.

CHAP. II.

Of Energy.

§ 1.

The next quality of Style to be noticed is what may by called Energy; the term being used in a wider sense than the Ἐνέργεια of Aristotle, and nearly corresponding with what Dr. Campbell calls Vivacity; so as to comprehend every thing that may conduce to stimulate

attention, — to impress strongly on the mind the Arguments adduced, — to excite the Imagination, and to arouse the Feelings.

This Energy then, or Vivacity of Style, must depend (as is likewise the case in respect of Perspicuity) on three things; 1st, the *Choice* of words, 2d, their *Number*, and 3d, their *Arrangement*.

Choice of words with a view to energy.

With respect to the Choice of words, it will be most convenient to consider them under those two classes which Aristotle has described under the titles of Κύρια and Ξένα, for which our language does not afford precisely corresponding names: "Proper," "Appropriate," or "Ordinary," terms will the most nearly designate the former; the latter class including all others; — all that are in any way removed from common use; — whether uncommon terms, or ordinary terms, either transferred to a different meaning from that which strictly belongs to them, or employed in a different manner from that of common discourse. All the Tropes and Figures, enumerated by Grammatical and Rhetorical Writers, will of course fall under this head.

Caution against general terms.

With respect then to "Proper" terms, the principal rule for guiding our Choice with a view to Energy, is to prefer, ever, those words which are the least *abstract* and *general*. Individuals alone having a real existence,* the terms denoting them (called by Logicians "Singular terms") will of course make the most vivid impression on the mind, and exercise most the power of conception; and the less remote any term is from these, i. e. the more *specific*, the more Energy it will possess, in comparison of such as are more general. The impression produced on the mind by a Singular term, may be compared to the distinct view taken in by the eye, of any object (suppose some particular man) near at hand, in a clear light, which enables us to distinguish the features of the *individual*; in a fainter light, or rather further off, we merely perceive that the object is *a man*; this corresponds with the idea conveyed by the name of the Species; yet further off, or in a still feebler light, we can distinguish merely some *living object*; and at length, merely *some object*; these views corresponding respectively with the terms denoting the genera, less or more remote: and as each of these views conveys, as far as it goes, an equally *correct* impression to the mind, (for we are equally certain that the object at a distance is *something*, as that the one close to us is such and such an individual,) though each, successively, is less *vivid*; so, in language, a General term may be as clearly *understood*, as a Specific, or a Singular term, but will convey a much less *forcible* impression to the hearer's mind. "The more General the terms are," (as Dr. Campbell

* Thence called by Aristotle, (*Categ.* sec. 3.) "primary substances," (πρῶται οὐσίαι,) Genus and Species, being denominated "secondary," as not properly denoting a "really-existing thing," (τόδε τι,) but rather an attribute. He has, indeed, been considered as the great advocate of the opposite doctrine; i. e. the system of "Realism;" which was certainly embraced by many of his professed followers; but his own language is sufficiently explicit. Πᾶσα δὴ οὐσία δοκεῖ τόδε τι σημαίνειν. Ἐπὶ μὲν οὖν τῶν πρώτων οὐσιῶν ἀναμφισβήτητον καὶ ἀληθές ἐστιν, ὅτι τόδε τι σημαίνει· ἄτομον γὰρ, καὶ ἓν ἀριθμῷ τὸ δηλούμενόν ἐστιν. Ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν δευτέρων οὐσιῶν ΦΑΙΝΕΤΑΙ μὲν ὁμοίως τῷ σχήματι τῆς προσηγορίας τόδε τι σημαίνειν, ὅταν εἴπῃ, ἄνθρωπος ἢ ζῶον· ΟΥ ΜΗΝ ΓΕ ΑΛΗΘΕΣ· ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ποιόν τι σημαίνει· κ. τ. λ. Aristotle, *Categ.* sec. 3. See Logic, Dissertation, c. v.

justly remarks,) "the picture is the fainter; the more Special they are, the brighter. The same sentiment may be expressed with equal justness, and even equal perspicuity, in the former way, as in the latter; but as the colouring will in that case be more languid, it cannot give equal pleasure to the fancy, and by consequence will not contribute so much either to fix the attention, or to impress the memory."

It might be supposed at first sight, that an Author has little or no choice on this point, but must employ either more or less general terms according to the objects he is speaking of. There is, however, in almost every case, great room for such a choice as we are speaking of; for in the first place, it depends on our choice whether or not we will employ terms *more* general than the subject requires; which may almost always be done consistently with Truth and Propriety, though not with Energy; if it be true that a man has committed *murder*, it may be correctly asserted, that he has committed a *crime*: if the Jews were "exterminated," and "Jerusalem demolished" by "Vespasian's army," it may be said, with truth, that they were "subdued" by "an Enemy," and their "Capital" taken. This substitution then of the General for the Specific, or of the Specific for the Singular, is always within our reach; and many, especially unpractised Writers, fall into a feeble Style by resorting to it unnecessarily; either because they imagine there is more appearance of refinement or of profundity in the employment of such terms as are in less common use among the vulgar, or, in some cases with a view to give greater comprehensiveness to their reasonings, and to increase the utility of what they say, by enlarging the field of its

application. Inexperienced Preachers frequently err in this way, by dwelling on Virtue and Vice, — Piety and Irreligion, in the abstract, without particularizing; forgetting that while they *include* much, they *impress* little or nothing.

The only appropriate occasion for this Generic language, (as it may be called,) is when we wish to *avoid* giving a vivid impression, — when our object is to soften what is offensive, disgusting, or shocking; as when we speak of an "execution," for the infliction of the sentence of death on a criminal: of which kind of expressions, common discourse furnishes numberless instances. On the other hand, in Antony's speech over Cæsar's body, his object being to *excite* horror, Shakspeare puts into his mouth the most *particular* expressions; "those honourable men (not, who *killed* Cæsar, but) whose *daggers* have *stabbed* Cæsar."

§ 2.

Tropes.

But in the second place, not only does a regard for Energy require that we should not use terms *more* general than are exactly adequate to the objects spoken of, but we are also allowed, in many cases, to employ *less* general terms than are exactly Appropriate. In which case we are employing words not "Appropriate," but belonging to the second of the two classes just mentioned. The use of this Trope* (enumerated by Aristotle among the Metaphors, but since more commonly called Synecdoche) is very frequent; as it conduces much to the energy of the expression, without

* From τρεπω; any word *turned* from its primary signification.

occasioning, in general, any risk of its meaning being mistaken. The passage cited by Dr. Campbell,* from one of our Lord's discourses, (which are in general of this character,) together with the remarks made upon it, will serve to illustrate what has been just said: "'Consider,' says our Lord, 'the lilies how they grow: they toil not, they spin not; and yet I say unto you, that Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. If then God so clothe the grass, which to-day is in the field, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, how much more will he clothe you?'† Let us here adopt a little of the tasteless manner of modern paraphrasts, by the substitution of more General terms, one of their many expedients of infrigidating, and let us observe the effect produced by this change. 'Consider the flowers, how they gradually increase in their size; they do no manner of work, and yet I declare to you, that no king whatever, in his most splendid habit, is dressed up like them. If then God in his providence doth so adorn the vegetable productions, which continue but little time on the land, and are afterwards devoted to the meanest uses, how much more will he provide clothing for you?' How spiritless is the same sentiment rendered by these small variations? The very particularizing of *to-day* and *to-morrow*, is infinitely more expressive of transitoriness, than any description wherein the terms are general, that can be substituted in its room." It is a remarkable circumstance that this

* The ingenious Author cites this in the Section treating of "*Proper* terms," which is a trifling oversight; as it is plain that "lily" is used for the Genus "flower,"—"Solomon, for the Species "King," &c.

† Luke xii. 27, 28.

characteristic of style is perfectly retained in *translation*, in which every other excellence of expression is liable to be lost; so that the prevalence of this kind of language in the Sacred writers may be regarded as something providential. It may be said with truth, that the book which it is the most necessary to translate into every language, is chiefly characterized by that kind of excellence in diction which is least impaired by translation.

§ 3.

Metaphor and Simile.

But to proceed with the consideration of Tropes; the most employed and most important of all those kinds of expressions which depart from the plain and strictly Appropriate Style,—all that are called by Aristotle, Ξένα,—is the Metaphor, in the usual and limited sense; viz. a word substituted for another, on account of the Resemblance or Analogy between their significations. The Simile or Comparison may be considered as differing in form only from a Metaphor; the resemblance being in that case *stated*, which in the Metaphor is implied.* Each may be founded either on resemblance, strictly so called, i. e. *direct* resemblance between the objects themselves in question, (as when we speak of "*table*-land," or compare great waves to *mountains*,) or on Analogy, which is the resemblance of Ratios,—a similarity of the relations they bear to certain other objects; as when we speak of the "*light* of reason," or of "revelation," or compare a wounded and captive warrior to a stranded ship.† The Analogical Metaphors and Com-

* See Logic, chap. iii.

† Rhoderic Dhu, in the *Lady of the Lake*.

parisons are both the more frequent and the more striking. They are the more frequent, because almost every object has such a multitude of relations, of different kinds, to many other objects; and they are the more striking, because (as Dr. A. Smith has well remarked) the more remote and unlike in themselves any two objects are, the more is the mind impressed and gratified by the perception of some point in which they agree.

It has been already observed, under the head of Example, that we are carefully to distinguish between an *Illustration*, (i. e. an *Argument* from analogy or resemblance,) and what is properly called a Simile or Comparison, introduced merely to give force or beauty to the *expression*. The aptness and beauty of an Illustration sometimes leads men to overrate, and sometimes to underrate, its force as an Argument.*

With respect to the *choice* between the Metaphorical form and that of Comparison, it may be laid down as a general rule, that the former is always to be preferred,† wherever it is sufficiently simple and plain to be immediately comprehended; but that which as a Metaphor would sound obscure and enigmatical, may be well received if expressed as a Comparison. We may say, e. g. with propriety, that "Cromwell *trampled* on the laws:" it would sound feeble to say that "he treated the laws with the same contempt as a man does any thing which he tramples under his feet." On the other hand it would be harsh and obscure to say, "the stranded

* See Part i. chap. iii. § 2.

† Ἐστιν ἡ εἰκὼν μεταφορὰ, διαφέρουσα προσθέσει· διὸ ἧττον ἡδύ, ὅτι μακροτέρως· κ. τ. λ. Aristotle, *Rhet.* book iii. chap. 10.

vessel lay shaken by the waves," meaning, the wounded Chief tossing on the bed of sickness; it is therefore necessary in such a case to *state* the resemblance. But this is never to be done more fully than is necessary to perspicuity; because all men are more gratified at catching the Resemblance for themselves, than at having it pointed out to them.* And accordingly the greatest masters of this kind of style, when the case will not admit of pure Metaphor, generally prefer a mixture of Metaphor with Simile; first pointing out the similitude, and afterwards employing metaphorical terms which imply it; or, *vice versâ*, explaining a Metaphor by a statement of the Comparison. To take examples of both kinds from an Author who particularly excels in this point; (speaking of morbid Fancy.) Metaphorical Simile.

> —— like the bat of Indian brakes,
> Her pinions fan the wound she makes,
> And soothing thus the dreamer's pain,
> She drinks the life-blood from the vein. †

The word "*like*" makes this a Comparison; but the three succeeding lines are Metaphorical. Again, to take an instance of the other kind,

> They *melted* from the field, *as* snow,
> When streams are swoln, and south winds blow,
> Dissolves in silent dew. ‡

Of the words here put in italics, the former is a Metaphor, the latter introduces a Comparison. Though the instances here adduced are taken from a Poet, the

* Τὸ μανθάνειν ῥᾳδίως ἡδὺ φύσει. Aristotle, *Rhet.* book iii. chap. 5.

† *Rokeby.*

‡ *Marmion.*

judicious management of Comparison which they exemplify, is even more essential to a Prose-writer, to whom less license is allowed in the employment of it. It is a remark of Aristotle, (*Rhet.* book iii. chap. 4.) that the Simile is more suitable in Poetry, and that Metaphor is the only ornament of language in which the Orator may freely indulge. He should therefore be the more careful to bring a Simile as near as possible to the Metaphorical form. The following is an example of the same kind of expression: "These metaphysic rights entering into common life, like rays of light which pierce into a dense medium, are, by the laws of nature, refracted from their straight line. Indeed, in the gross and complicated mass of human passions and concerns, the primitive rights of man undergo such a variety of refractions, and reflections, that it becomes absurd to talk of them as if they continued in the simplicity of their original direction."*

Elevating or degrading Metaphors.

Metaphors may be employed, as Aristotle observes, either to elevate or to degrade the subject, according to the design of the Author; being drawn from similar or corresponding objects of a higher or lower character. Thus a loud and vehement Speaker may be described either as *bellowing*, or as *thundering* And in both cases, if the Metaphor is apt and suitable to the purpose designed, it is alike conducive to Energy. He remarks that the same holds good with respect to Epithets also, which may be drawn either from the highest or the lowest attributes of the thing spoken of.† Metonymy likewise (in which a part is put for a

* Burke, *On the French Revolution.*

† A happier example cannot be found than the one which Aristotle cites from Simonides, who, when offered a small price for an Ode to

whole, a cause for an effect, &c.) admits of a similar variety in its applications.

Any *Trope* (as is remarked by Dr. Campbell) adds force to the expression, when it tends to fix the mind on that part, or *circumstance*, in the object spoken of, which is most essential to the purpose in hand. Thus, there is an Energy in Abraham's Periphrasis for "God," when he is speaking of the allotment of Divine punishment: "shall not the *Judge of all the earth* do right?" If again we were alluding to His *omniscience*, it would be more suitable to say, "this is known only to the *Searcher of hearts:*" if, to his *power*, we should speak of Him as "the *Almighty*," &c.

Of Metaphors, those generally conduce most to that Energy or Vivacity of Style we are speaking of, which illustrate an *intellectual* by a *sensible* object; the latter being always the most early familiar to the mind, and generally giving the most distinct impression to it. Thus we speak of "*unbridled* rage," "*deep-rooted* prejudice," "*glowing* eloquence," a "*stony* heart," &c. And a similar use may be made of Metonymy also; as when we speak of the "*Throne*," or the "*Crown*" for "Royalty,"—the "*sword*" for "military violence," &c.

Personifying Metaphors.

But the highest degree of Energy (and to which Aristotle chiefly restricts the term) is produced by such Metaphors as attribute *life* and *action* to things inanimate; and that, even when by this means

celebrate a victory in a *mule*-race, expressed his contempt for *half-asses*, (ἡμίονοι,) as they were commonly called; but when a larger sum was offered, addressed them in an Ode as "Daughters of Steeds swift-as-the-storm." *θελλοπόδων θύγατερς ἵππων.*

the last-mentioned rule is violated, i. e. when sensible objects are illustrated by intellectual. For the disadvantage is overbalanced by the vivid impression produced by the idea of *personality* or *activity*; * as when we speak of the *rage* of a torrent, a *furious* storm, a river *disdaining* to endure its bridge, &c.† Many such expressions, indeed, are in such common use as to have lost all their Metaphorical force, since they cease to suggest the idea belonging to their primary signification, and thus are become, practically, Proper terms. But a new, or at least unhackneyed, Metaphor of this kind, if it be not far-fetched and obscure, adds greatly to the force of the expression. This was a favourite figure with Homer, from whom Aristotle has cited several examples of it; as "the *raging* arrow," "the darts *eager* to taste of flesh,"‡ "the *shameless*" (or, as it might be rendered with more exactness, though with less dignity, "the *provoking*) stone," (λᾶας ἀναιδὴς,) which mocks the efforts of Sisyphus, &c.

Our language possesses one remarkable advantage, with a view to this kind of Energy, in the constitution of its *genders*. All nouns in English, which express objects that are really neuter, are considered as strictly of the neuter gender; the Greek and Latin, though

* The figure called by Rhetoricians Prosopopœia (literally, Personification) is, in fact, no other than a Metaphor of this kind: thus, in Demosthenes, *Greece* is represented as *addressing* the Athenians. So also in the book of Genesis, (chap. iv. ver. 10,) "the *voice* of thy brother's blood *crieth* unto me from the ground."

† *Pontem indignatus.*

‡ There is a peculiar aptitude in some of these expressions which the modern student is very likely to overlook; an arrow or dart, from its flying with *a spinning* motion, *quivers* violently when it is fixed; thus suggesting the idea of a person *trembling with eagerness*.

possessing the advantage (which is wanting in the languages derived from them) of having a neuter gender, yet lose the benefit of it, by fixing the masculine or feminine genders upon many nouns denoting things inanimate; whereas in English, when we speak of any such object in the masculine or feminine gender, that form of expression at once confers *personality* upon it. When "Virtue," e. g. or our "Country," are spoken of as females, or "Ocean" as a male, &c. they are, by that very circumstance, *personified*; and a stimulus is thus given to the imagination, from the very circumstance that in calm discussion or description, all of these would be neuter; whereas in Greek or Latin, as in French or Italian, no such distinction could be made. The employment of "*Virtus*," and "Ἀρετὴ," in the feminine gender, can contribute, accordingly, no animation to the Style, when they could not, without a Solecism, be employed otherwise.

Novelty in Metaphor.

There is, however, very little, comparatively, of Energy produced by any Metaphor or Simile that is in common use, and already familiar to the hearer. Indeed, what were originally the boldest Metaphors, are become, by long use, virtually, Proper terms; as is the case with the words "source," "reflection," &c. in their transferred senses; and frequently are even nearly obsolete in the literal sense, as in the words "ardour," "acuteness," "ruminate," &c. If, again, a Metaphor or Simile that is not so hackneyed as to be considered common property, be taken from any known Author, it strikes every one, as no less a plagiarism than if an entire argument or description had been thus transferred. And hence it is, that, as

Aristotle remarks, the skilful employment of these, more than of any other, ornaments of language, may be regarded as a mark of genius: (*εὐφυΐας σημεῖον*) not that he means to say, as some interpreters suppose, that this power is entirely a gift of nature, and in no degree to be learnt; on the contrary, he expressly affirms, that the "perception of Resemblances," * on which it depends, is the fruit of "Philosophy;" † but he means that Metaphors are not to be, like other words and phrases, selected from common use, and transferred from one composition to another, ‡ but must be formed for the occasion. Some care is accordingly requisite, in order that they may be readily comprehended, and may not have the appearance of being far-fetched and extravagant. For this purpose it is usual to combine with the Metaphor a Proper term which explains it; viz. either attributing to the term in its *transferred* sense, something which does not belong to it in its *literal* sense; or *vice versâ*, denying of it in its transferred sense, something which *does* belong to it in its literal sense. To call the Sea the "*watery* bulwark" of our island, would be an instance of the former kind; an example of the latter is the expression of a writer who speaks of the dispersion of some hostile fleet, by the winds and waves, "those ancient and *unsubsidized* allies of England."

It is hardly necessary to mention the obvious and hackneyed cautions against *mixture* of Metaphors; § and

* *Τὸ ὅμοιον ὁρᾷν.* Aristotle, *Rhet.* book ii.

† *Ῥᾴον ἐκ φιλοσοφίας.* Aristotle, *Rhet.* book ii. and iii.

‡ *Οὐκ ἔστι παρ' ἄλλου λαβεῖν.* Ibid. book iii.

§ Dr. Johnson justly censures Addison for speaking of "*bridling* in his muse, who longs to *launch* into a nobler strain;" "which," says the Critic, "is an act that was never restrained by a bridle." Some, however, are too fastidious on this point. Words, which by long use in a transferred sense, have lost nearly all their metaphorical force, may fairly be combined in a manner which, taking them literally, would be incongruous. It would savour of hypercriticism to object to such an expression as "fertile source."

against any that are complex and far-pursued, so as to approach to Allegory. In this last case, the more apt and striking is the Analogy suggested, the more will it have of an artificial appearance; and will draw off the reader's attention from the subject, to admire the ingenuity displayed in the Style. Young writers, of genius, ought especially to be admonished to ask themselves frequently, not whether this or that is a *striking expression*, but whether it makes the *meaning* more striking than another phrase would,—whether it impresses more forcibly the *sentiment* to be conveyed.

§ 4.

It is a common practice with some writers to endeavour to add force to their expressions by accumulating high-sounding Epithets,* denoting the greatness, beauty, or other admirable qualities of the things spoken of; but the effect is generally the reverse of what is intended. Most readers, except those of a very vulgar or puerile taste, are disgusted at studied efforts to point out and force upon their attention what- Epithets.

* Epithets, in the Rhetorical sense, denote, not every adjective, but those only which do not add to the sense, but signify something already implied in the noun itself; as, if one says, "the *glorious* sun:" on the other hand, to speak of the "*rising*" or "*meridian* sun" would not be considered as, in this sense, employing an Epithet.

ever is remarkable; and this, even when the ideas conveyed are themselves striking. But when an attempt is made to cover poverty of thought with mock sublimity of language, and to set off trite sentiments and feeble arguments by tawdry magnificence, the only result is, that a kind of indignation is superadded to contempt; as when (to use Quinctilian's comparison) an attempt is made to supply, by paint, the natural glow of a youthful and healthy complexion.*

Frigid Style.

We expect, indeed, and excuse in ancient writers, as a part of the unrefined simplicity of a ruder language, such a redundant use of Epithets as would not be tolerated in a modern, even in a translation of their works; the "white milk," and "dark gore," &c. of Homer, must not be retained; at least, not so frequently as they occur in the original. Aristotle, indeed, gives us to understand that in his time this liberty was still allowed to Poets; but later taste is more fastidious. He censures, however, the adoption, by prose-writers, of this, and of every other kind of ornament that might seem to border on the *poetical;* and he bestows on such a style the appellation of "*frigid*," (ψυχρὸν,) which at first sight may appear somewhat remarkable, (though the same expression, "frigid," might very properly be so applied by us,) because "*warm*," "*glowing*,"

* "A principal device in the fabrication of this Style," (the mock-eloquent,) "is to multiply epithets,— dry epithets, laid on the outside, and into which none of the vitality of the sentiment is found to circulate. You may take a great number of the words out of each page, and find that the sense is neither more nor less for your having cleared the composition of these Epithets of chalk of various colours, with which the same thoughts had submitted to be rubbed over, in order to be made fine." Foster, *Essay* iv.

and such-like Metaphors, seem naturally applicable to poetry. This very circumstance, however, does in reality account for the use of the other expression. We are, in poetical prose, *reminded* of, and for that reason disposed to *miss*, the "warmth and glow" of poetry: it is on the same principle that we are disposed to speak of *coldness* in the rays of the *moon*, because they *remind* us of sunshine, but want its warmth; and that (to use an humbler and more familiar instance) an empty fireplace is apt to suggest an idea of cold.

The use of Epithets however, in prose composition, is not to be proscribed; as the judicious employment of them is undoubtedly conducive to Energy. It is extremely difficult to lay down any precise rules on such a point. The only safe guide in practice must be a taste formed from a familiarity with the best Authors, and from the remarks of a skilful Critic on one's own compositions. It may, however, be laid down as a general caution, more particularly needful for young writers, that an excessive luxuriance of style, and especially a redundancy of Epithets, is the worse of the two extremes; as it is a positive fault, and a very offensive one; while the opposite is but the absence of an excellence.

Caution against uniform brilliancy.

It is also an important rule, that the boldest and most striking, and almost poetical, turns of expression, should be reserved (as Aristotle has remarked, book iii, chap. 7.) for the most impassioned parts of a discourse; and that an Author should guard against the vain ambition of expressing *every thing* in an *equally* high-wrought, brilliant, and forcible Style. The neglect of this caution often occasions the imitation of the best models, to prove detri-

mental. When the admiration of some fine and animated passages leads a young writer to take those passages for his *general* model, and to endeavour to make every sentence he composes equally fine, he will, on the contrary, give a flatness to the whole, and destroy the effect of those portions which would have been forcible, if they had been allowed to stand *prominent*. To brighten the dark parts of a picture, produces much the same result as if one had darkened the bright parts; in either case there is a want of *relief* and *contrast*; and Composition, as well as Painting, has its lights and shades, which must be distributed with no less skill, if we would produce the desired effect.*

Uses of epithets.

In no place, however, will it be advisable to introduce any Epithet which does not fulfil one of these two purposes; 1st, to *explain a Metaphor*; a use which has been noticed under that head, and which will justify, and even require, the introduction of an Epithet, which, if it had been joined to the *Proper* term, would have been glaringly superfluous; thus, Æschylus† speaks of the "*winged hound* of Jove," meaning the Eagle: to have said the "*winged eagle*," would have had a very different effect; 2dly, when the Epithet expresses something which, though *implied* in the subject, would not have been likely to occur at once spontaneously to the hearer's mind, and yet is important to be noticed with a view to the purpose in hand. Indeed it will generally happen, that the Epithets employed by a skilful Orator, will be found to be, in fact,

* Omnia *vult belle Matho dicere; dic aliquando*
Et bene, dic neutrum: dic aliquando male.

† *Prometheus*

so many *abridged arguments*, the force of which is sufficiently conveyed by a mere hint; e. g. if any one says, "we ought to take warning from the *bloody* revolution of France," the Epithet suggests one of the reasons for our being warned; and that, not less clearly, and more forcibly, than if the argument had been stated at length.

§ 5.

Uncommon expressions.

With respect to the use of Antiquated, Foreign, New-coined, or New-compounded words,* or words applied in an unusual sense, it may be sufficient to observe, that all writers, and prose-writers most, should be very cautious and sparing in the use of them; not only because in excess they produce a barbarous dialect, but because they are so likely to suggest the idea of *artifice*; the perception of which is most especially adverse to Energy. The occasional apt introduction of such a term will sometimes produce a powerful effect; but whatever may seem to savour of affectation, or even of great solicitude and study in the choice of terms, will effectually destroy the true effect of eloquence. The language which betrays art, and carries not an air of simplicity and sincerity, may, indeed, by some hearers, be thought not only very fine, but even very energetic;

* It is a curious instance of whimsical inconsistency, that many who, with justness, censure as *pedantic* the frequent introduction of *Greek* and *Latin* words, neither object to, nor refrain from, a similar pedantry with respect to *French* and *Italian*.

This kind of affectation is one of the "dangers" of "a *little* learning: those who are really good linguists are seldom so anxious to display their knowledge.

this very circumstance, however, may be taken for a proof that it is not so; for if it *had* been, *they would not have thought about it*, but would have been occupied, exclusively, with the *subject*. An unstudied and natural air, therefore, is an excellence to which the true orator, i. e. he who is aiming to *carry his point*, will be ready to sacrifice any other that may interfere with it.

Words considered as sounds.

The principle here laid down will especially apply to the choice of words, with a view to their Imitative, or otherwise appropriate *Sound*. The attempt to make "the sound an echo to the sense," is indeed more frequently to be met with in poets than in prose writers; but it may be worth remarking, that an evident *effort* after this kind of excellence, as it is offensive in any kind of composition, would in prose appear peculiarly disgusting. Critics treating on this subject have gone into opposite extremes; some fancifully attributing to words, or combinations of words, an imitative power far beyond what they can really possess,* and representing this kind of Imitation as deserving to be studiously aimed at; and others, on the contrary, considering nearly the whole of this kind of excellence as no better than imaginary, and regarding the examples which do occur, and have been cited, of a congruity between the sound and the sense, as purely accidental.

* Pope has accordingly been justly censured for his inconsistency in making the Alexandrine represent both a quick and a slow motion

1. "Flies o'er the unbending corn, and skims along the main."
2. "Which, like a wounded snake, drags its slow length along."

In the first instance, he forgot that an *Alexandrine* is long, from containing more *feet* than a common verse; whereas a long *hexameter* has but the same number of feet as a short one, and therefore being pronounced in the same *time*, seems to move more rapidly.

The truth probably lies between these two extremes.

In the first place, that words denoting *sounds*, or employed in describing them, may be Imitative of those sounds, must be admitted by all; indeed this kind of Imitation is, to a certain degree, almost unavoidable, in our language at least; which abounds perhaps more than any other, in these, as they may be called, naturally expressive terms; such as "hiss," "rattle," "clatter," "splash," and many others.*

In the next place, it is also allowed by most, that quick or slow *motion* may, to a certain degree at least, be imitated or represented by words; many short syllables (unincumbered by a clash either of vowels, or of consonants coming together) being pronounced in the same time with a smaller number of long syllables, abounding with these incumbrances, the former seems to have a natural correspondence to a quick, and the latter to a slow motion; since in the one a greater, and in the other a less space, seem to be passed over in the same time. In the ancient Poets, their hexameter verses being always considered as of the same *length*, i. e. in respect of the *time* taken to pronounce them, whatever proportion of dactyls or spondees they contained, this kind of Imitation of quick or slow motion, is the more apparent; and after making all allowances for fancy, it seems impossible to doubt that in many instances it does exist; as, e. g. in the often-cited line which expresses the rolling of Sisyphus's stone down the hill:

Αὖθις ἔπειτα πέδονδε κυλίνδετο λᾶας ἀναιδής.

* See Wallis, Gram. Anglic

The following passage from the *Æneid* can hardly be denied to exhibit a correspondence with the slow and quick *motions* at least, which it describes; that of the Trojans laboriously hewing the foundations of a tower on the top of Priam's palace, and that of its sudden and violent fall:

*"Ăggrĕssī fĕrrō cīrcūm, quā sūmma labantes,**
Jūnctūrās tabulata dabat, divellimus altis
Sedĭbŭs, impŭlīmusque, ĕă lapsă rĕpentĕ rŭīnam
Cum sŏnĭtu trăhĭt, et Dănăum sŭpĕr agmĭnă late
Incĭdit."——

But, lastly, it seems not to require any excessive exercise of fancy to perceive, if not, properly speaking, an *Imitation*, by words, of other things besides sound and motion, at least, an Analogical aptitude. That there is at least an apparent Analogy between things sensible, and things intelligible, is implied by numberless Metaphors: as when we speak of "*rough*, or *harsh*, *soft*, or *smooth*, manners," "*turbulent* passions," the "*stroke*, or the *storms*, of adversity," &c. Now if there are any words, or combinations of words, which have in their sound a congruity with certain sensible objects, there is no reason why they should not have the same congruity with those *emotions*, *actions*, &c. to which these sensible objects are analogous. Especially, as it is universally

* The slow movement of this line would be much more perceptible, if we pronounced (as doubtless the Latins did) the *doubled consonants*; "*ag-gres-si fer-ro —— sum-ma*:" but in English, and consequently in the English way of reading Latin or Greek, the doubling of a consonant only serves to fix the place of the accent; the latter of the two being never pronounced, except in a very few compound words: as "innate," "connatural," "poor-rate," "hop-pole."

allowed that certain musical combinations are, respectively, appropriate to the expression of grief, anger, agitation, &c.

On the whole, the most probable conclusion seems to be, that many at least of the celebrated passages that are cited as Imitative in sound, were, on the one hand, not the result of *accident*, nor yet, on the other hand, of *study*; but that the idea in the author's mind spontaneously suggested appropriate sounds: thus, when Milton's mind was occupied with the idea of the opening of the infernal gates, it seems natural that his expression,

"And on their hinges grate harsh thunder,"

should have occurred to him without any distinct intention of imitating sounds.

It will be the safest rule, therefore, for a prose-writer at least, never to make any distinct effort after this kind of Energy of Expression, but to trust to the spontaneous occurrence of suitable sounds on every occasion where the introduction of them is likely to have a good effect.

§ 6.

Technical language.

It is hardly necessary to give any warning, generally, against the unnecessary introduction of *Technical* language of any kind, when the meaning can be adequately, or even tolerably, expressed in common, i. e. unscientific words. The terms and phrases of Art have an air of pedantic affectation, for which they do not compensate, by even the smallest appearance of increased Energy.* But there is an apparent exception

* Of course this rule does not apply to avowedly technical systems of instruction. In such works the usual and the best rule is, to em

to this rule, in the case of what may be called the "Theological Style;" a peculiar phraseology, adopted more or less by a large proportion of writers of Sermons and other religious works; consisting partly of peculiar terms, but chiefly of common words used in a peculiar sense or combination, so as to form altogether a kind of diction widely differing from the classical standard of the language. This phraseology having been formed partly from the style of some of the most eminent Divines, partly, and to a much greater degree, from that of the Scriptures, i. e. of our Version, has been supposed to carry with it an air of appropriate dignity and sanctity, which greatly adds to the force of what is said. And this may, perhaps, be the case when what is said is of little or no intrinsic weight, and is only such meagre common-place as many religious works consist of: the associations which such language will excite in the minds of those accustomed to it, supplying in some degree the deficiencies of the matter. But this diction, though it may serve as a veil for poverty of thought, will

Theological style.

ploy as far as possible such technical terms as custom has already established; defining, modifying, restricting, extending, &c these, if necessary, as the occasion may require. Sometimes however the introduction of new ones will be called for, either in addition to the others, or in their stead, when there are very strong objections against these.

It is no uncommon trick with some writers to invent and adopt, on the slightest pretext, complete new sets of technical terms, the more strange and uncouth, the better for their purpose; and thus to pass off long-known truths for prodigious discoveries, and gain the credit of universal originality by the boldness of their innovations in language: like some voyagers of discovery, who *take possession* of countries, whether before-visited or not, by formally giving them *new names*.

be found to produce no less the effect of obscuring the lustre of what is truly valuable: if it adds an appearance of strength to what is weak, it adds weakness to what is strong; and if pleasing to those of narrow and ill-cultivated minds, it is in a still higher degree repulsive to persons of taste.

It may be said, indeed, with truth, that the improvement of the majority is a higher object than the gratification of a refined taste in a few; but it may be doubted whether any real Energy, even with respect to any class of hearers, is gained by the use of such a diction as that of which I am speaking. For it will often be found that what is received with great approbation, is yet, even if, strictly speaking, understood, but very little attended to, or impressed upon the minds of the hearers. Terms and phrases which have been long familiar to them, and have certain vague and indistinct notions associated with them, men often suppose themselves to understand much more fully than they do; and still oftener give a sort of indolent assent to what is said, without making any effort of thought.

It is justly observed by Mr. Foster, (*Essay* iv.) when treating on this subject, that "with regard to a considerable proportion of Christian readers and hearers, a reformed language would be excessively strange to them;" but that "its *being* so strange to them, would be a proof of the necessity of adopting it, at least, in part, and by degrees. For the manner in which some of them would receive this altered diction, would prove that the customary phraseology had scarcely given them any clear ideas. It would be found that the peculiar phrases had been not so much the vehicles of ideas, as the sub-

stitutes for them. These readers and hearers have been accustomed to chime to the sound, without apprehending the sense; insomuch, that if they hear the very ideas which these phrases signify, expressed ever so simply in other language, they do not recognise them."

He observes also, with much truth, that the studied incorporation and imitation of the language of the Scriptures in the texture of any Discourse, neither indicates reverence for the sacred composition, nor adds to the dignity of that which is human: but rather diminishes that of such passages as might be introduced from the sacred writings in pure and distinct quotation, standing contrasted with the general Style of the work.

Of the Technical terms, as they may be called, of Theology, there are many, the place of which might easily be supplied by corresponding expressions in common use; there are others, doubtless, which, denoting ideas exclusively belonging to the subject, could not be avoided without a tedious circumlocution; these, therefore, may be admitted as allowable peculiarities of diction; and the others, perhaps, need not be entirely disused: but it is highly desirable that *both* should be very frequently exchanged for words or phrases entirely free from any Technical peculiarity, even at the expense of some circumlocution. Not that this should be done so constantly as to render the terms in question obsolete; but by introducing frequently both the term, and a sentence explanatory of the same idea, the evil just mentioned,—the habit of not thinking, or not thinking attentively, of the meaning of what is said, will be, in great measure, guarded against,—the Technical words themselves will make a more forcible impression,—and the

danger of sliding into unmeaning *cant* will be materially essened. Such repetitions, therefore, will more than compensate for or rather will be exempt from, any appearance of tediousness, by the addition both of Perspicuity and Energy.*

It may be asserted, with but too much truth, that a very considerable proportion of Christians have a habit of laying aside in a great degree their *common sense*, and letting it, as it were, lie dormant, when points of Religion come before them;—as if Reason were utterly at variance with religion, and the ordinary principles of sound Judgment were to be completely superseded on that subject; and accordingly it will be found, that there

* "It must indeed be acknowledged, that in many cases innovations have been introduced, partly by the ceasing to employ the words designating those doctrines which were designed to be set aside: but it is probable they may have been still more frequently and successfully introduced under the advantage of *retaining the terms*, while the principles were gradually subverted. And therefore, since the peculiar words can be kept to one invariable signification only by keeping that signification clearly in sight, by means of something separate from these words themselves, it might be wise in Christian authors and speakers sometimes to express the ideas in common words, either in connexion with the peculiar terms, or occasionally, instead of them. Common words might less frequently be applied, as affected denominations of things, which have their own direct and common denominations, and be less frequently combined into uncouth phrases. Many peculiar and antique words might be exchanged for other single words of equivalent signification, and in common use. And the small number of peculiar terms acknowledged and established, as of permanent use and necessity, might, even separately from the consideration of modifying the diction, be, occasionally with advantage to the explicit declaration and clear comprehension of Christian truth, made to give place to a fuller expression, in a number of common words, of those ideas of which they are the single signs." Foster, *Essay* iv. p. 304.

are many errors which are adopted, — many truths which are overlooked, or not clearly understood, — and many difficulties which stagger and perplex them, — for want, properly speaking, of the exercise of their common sense; i. e. in cases precisely *analogous* to such as daily occur in the ordinary affairs of life; in which those very same persons would form a correct, clear, prompt, and decisive judgment. It is well worthy of consideration, how far the tendency to this habit might be diminished by the use of a diction conformable to the suggestions which have been here thrown out.

§ 7.

Energy as dependent on the number of the words.

With respect to the *Number* of words employed, "it is certain," as Dr. Campbell observes, "that of whatever kind the sentiment be, witty, humorous, grave, animated, or sublime, the more *briefly* it is expressed, the Energy is the greater." — "As when the rays of the sun are collected into the focus of a burning-glass, the smaller the spot is which receives them, compared with the surface of the glass, the greater is the splendour, so, in exhibiting our sentiments by speech, the narrower the compass of words is, wherein the thought is comprised, the more energetic is the expression. Accordingly, we find that the very same sentiment expressed diffusely, will be admitted barely to be just; — expressed concisely, will be admired as spirited." He afterwards remarks, that though a languid redundancy of words is in all cases to be avoided, the energetic brevity which is the most contrary to it, is not adapted alike to every subject and

occasion. "The kinds of writing which are less susceptible of this ornament, are, the Descriptive, the Pathetic, the Declamatory,* especially the last. It is, besides, much more suitable in writing than in speaking. A reader has the command of his time; he may read fast or slow, as he finds convenient; he can peruse a sentence a second time when necessary, or lay down the book and think. But if, in haranguing the people, you comprise a great deal in few words, the hearer must have uncommon quickness of apprehension to catch the meaning, before you have put it out of his power, by engaging his attention to something else."

The mode in which this inconvenience should be obviated, and in which the requisite expansion may be given to any thing which the persons addressed cannot comprehend in a very small compass, is, as I have already remarked, not so much by increasing the number of words in which the sentiment is conveyed in each sentence, (though in this, some variation must of course be admitted,) as by *repeating* it in various forms. The uncultivated and the dull will require greater expansion, and more copious illustration of the same thought, than the educated and the acute; but they are even still more liable to be wearied or bewildered by prolixity. If the material is too stubborn to be speedily cleft, we must patiently continue our efforts for a longer time, in order to accomplish it; but this is to be done, not by making each blow fall *more slowly*, which would only enfeeble them, but by *often-repeated* blows.

* This remark is made, and the principle of it (which Dr. Campbell has omitted) subjoined, in Part ii. chap. ii. § 2. of this Treatise

Verbosity adverse to perspicuity and to Energy.

It is needful to insist the more on the energetic effect of Conciseness, because so many, especially young writers and speakers, are apt to fall into a style of pompous verbosity, not from negligence, but from an idea that they are adding both Perspicuity and Force to what is said, when they are only incumbering the sense with a needless load of words. And they are the more likely to commit this mistake, because such a style will often appear not only to the author, but to the vulgar, (i. e. the vulgar in *intellect*,) among his hearers, to be very majestic and impressive. It is not uncommon to hear a speaker or writer of this class, mentioned as having a "very fine command of language," when, perhaps, it might be said with more correctness, that "his language has a command of him;" i. e. that he follows a train of words rather than of thought, and strings together all the striking expressions that occur to him on the subject, instead of first forming a clear notion of the sense he wishes to convey, and then seeking for the most appropriate vehicle in which to convey it.

If, indeed, any class of men are found to be the most effectually *convinced*, *persuaded*, or *instructed*, by a turgid amplification, it is the orator's business, true to his object, not to criticise or seek to improve their taste, but to accommodate himself to it. But it will be found that this is not near so often the case as many suppose. The orator may often by this kind of style gain great *admiration*, without being the nearer to his proper end, which is to *carry his point*. It will frequently happen that not only the approbation, but the whole attention of the hearers will have been confined to the Style,

which will have drawn their minds, not *to* the subject, but *from* it. In those spurious kinds of oratory, indeed, which have been above mentioned, (P. iii. chap. ii. § 4, 5, 6.) in which the inculcation of the Subject-matter is not the principal object proposed, a redundancy of words may often be very suitable; but in all that comes within the legitimate province of Rhetoric, there is no fault to be more carefully avoided.*

It will therefore be advisable for a tyro in composition to look over what he has written, and to strike out every word and clause which he finds will leave the passage neither less perspicuous nor less forcible than it was before; "*quamvis invita recedant*;" remembering that, as has been aptly observed, "nobody knows what good things you leave out;" if the general effect

* "By a multiplicity of words the sentiment is not set off and accommodated, but like David, in Saul's armour, it is incumbered and oppressed.

"Yet this is not the only, or perhaps the worst, consequence resulting from this manner of treating Sacred writ:" [*paraphrasing*] "we are told of the torpedo, that it has the wonderful quality of numbing every thing it touches; a paraphrase is a torpedo. By its influence the most vivid sentiments become lifeless, the most sublime are flattened, the most fervid chilled, the most vigorous enervated. In the very best compositions of this kind that can be expected, the Gospel may be compared to a rich wine of a high flavour, diluted in such a quantity of water as renders it extremely vapid." Campbell, *Rhetoric*, book iii. chap. ii. sec. 2.

It should be observed, however, that to some palates or stomachs a dilution may be necessary. Nor does Dr Campbell mean, I apprehend, that there are not many passages in Scripture which require expansion with a view to their being fully comprehended by an ordinary reader. But a regular paraphrase generally expands *every* passage, easy or hard, nearly to the same degree: it applies a magnifying-glass of equal power to the gnat and to the camel.

is improved, that advantage is enjoyed by the reader, unalloyed by the regret which the author may feel at the omission of any thing which he may think in itself excellent. But this is not enough; he must study contraction, as well as omission. There are many sentences which would not bear the *omission* of a single word consistently with perspicuity, which yet may be much more concisely expressed, with equal clearness, by the employment of different words, and by *recasting* a great part of the expression. Take for example such a sentence as the following: "A severe and tyrannical exercise of power must become a matter of necessary policy with Kings, when their subjects are imbued with such principles as justify and authorize rebellion;" this sentence could not be advantageously, nor to any considerable degree, abridged, by the mere *omission* of any of the words; but it may be expressed in a much shorter compass, with equal clearness and far greater energy, thus; "Kings will be tyrants from policy, when subjects are rebels from principle."*

The hints I have thrown out on this point coincide pretty nearly with Dr. Campbell's remark on "*Verbosity*," as contradistinguished from "*Tautology*,"† and from

* Burke.

† Tautology, which he describes as "either a repetition of the same sense in different words, or a representation of any thing as the cause, condition, or consequence, of itself," is, in most instances, (of the latter kind at least,) accounted an offence rather against *correctness* than *brevity*: the example he gives from Bolingbroke, "how many are there by whom these *tidings* of good *news* were never heard," would usually be reckoned a *blunder* rather than an instance of *prolixity*; like the expression of "*Sinecure* places which have no duty annexed to them." "The Pleonasm," he observes, "implies merely superfluity. Though the words do not, as in the Tautology, repeat the sense, they add nothing to it; e. g. They returned [back again] to the [same] city [from] whence they came [forth.]" Campb. *Rhet.* book iii. chap. ii. sec. 2.

"*Pleonasm*." "The third and last fault I shall mention against vivid Conciseness is *Verbosity*. This, it may be thought, coincides with the Pleonasm already discussed. One difference however is this; in the Pleonasm there are words which add nothing to the sense; in the Verbose manner, not only single words, but whole clauses, may have a meaning, and yet it were better to omit them, because what they mean is unimportant. Instead, therefore, of enlivening the expression, they make it languish. Another difference is, that in a proper Pleonasm, a complete correction is always made by razing. This will not always answer in the Verbose style; it is often necessary to alter as well as blot."*

§ 8.

Conciseness to be reconciled with perspicuity.

It is of course impossible to lay down precise rules as to the degree of Conciseness which is, on each occasion that may arise, allowable and desirable; but to an author who is, in his expression of any sentiment, wavering between the demands of Perspicuity and of Energy, (of which the former of course requires the first care, lest he should fail of both,) and doubting whether the phrase which has the most forcible brevity, will be readily taken in, it may be recommended to use *both* expressions;—first to expand the sense, sufficiently to be clearly understood, and then to contract it into the most compendious and striking form. This expedient might seem at first sight the most decidedly

* Campbell, *Rhetoric*, book iii. chap. ii. sec. 2. part iii.

adverse to the brevity recommended; but it will be found in practice, that the addition of a compressed and pithy expression of the sentiment, which has been already stated at greater length, will produce the *effect* of brevity. For it is to be remembered that it is not on account of the actual *number of words* that diffuseness is to be condemned, (unless one were limited to a certain space, or time,) but to avoid the flatness and tediousness resulting from it; so that if this appearance can be obviated by the insertion of such an abridged repetition as is here recommended, which adds poignancy and spirit to the whole, Conciseness will be, practically, promoted by the addition. The hearers will be struck by the forcibleness of the sentence which they will have been prepared to comprehend; they will *understand* the longer expression, and *remember* the shorter. But the force will, in general, be totally destroyed, or much enfeebled, if the order be reversed;—if the brief expression be put first, and afterwards expanded and explained; for it loses much of its force if it be not clearly understood the moment it is uttered; and if it be, there is no need of the subsequent expansion. The sentence recently quoted from Burke, as an instance of Energetic brevity, is in this manner brought in at the close of a more expanded exhibition of the sentiment, as a condensed conclusion of the whole. "Power, of some kind or other, will survive the shock in which manners and opinions perish; and it will find other and worse means for its support. The usurpation which, in order to subvert ancient institutions, has destroyed ancient principles, will hold power by arts similar to those by which it has acquired it. When the old feudal and chivalrous spirit of *fealty*, which, by freeing

kings from fear, freed both kings and subjects from the precaution of tyranny, shall be extinct in the minds of men, plots and assassinations will be anticipated by preventive murder and preventive confiscation, and that long roll of grim and bloody maxims, which form the political code of all Power, not standing on its own honour, and the honour of those who are to obey it. Kings will be tyrants from policy, when subjects are rebels from principle." Burke, *Reflections on the Revolution in France Works*, vol. v. p. 153.

The same writer, in another passage of the same work, has a paragraph in like manner closed and summed up by a striking metaphor,* (which will often prove the most *concise*, as well as in other respects striking, form of expression,) such as would not have been so readily taken in if placed at the beginning. "To avoid therefore the evils of inconsistency and versatility, ten thousand times worse than those of obstinacy and the blindest prejudice, we have consecrated the State, that no man should approach to look into its defects or corruptions but with due caution; that he should never dream of beginning its reformation by its subversion; that he should approach to the faults of the State as to the wounds of a father, with

* This however, being an instance of what may be called the *classical* Metaphor, no preparation or explanation, even though sufficient to make it *intelligible*, could render it very *striking* to those not thoroughly and early familiar with the ancient fables of Medea.

The Preacher has a considerable resource, of an analogous kind, in similar allusions to the history, descriptions, parables, &c. of SCRIPTURE, which will often furnish useful illustrations and forcible metaphors, in an address to those well acquainted with the Bible, though these would be frequently unintelligible, and always comparatively feeble to persons not familiar with Scripture. (See Appendix, [H.])

pious awe and trembling solicitude. By this wise prejudice we are taught to look with horror on those children of their country who are prompt rashly to hack that aged parent in pieces, and put him into the kettle of magicians, in hopes that by their poisonous weeds, and wild incantations, they may regenerate the paternal constitution, and renovate their father's life." Burke, *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, *Works*, vol. v. p. 183.

Style of Dr Johnson.

So great, indeed, is the effect of a skilful interspersion of short, pointed, forcible sentences, that even a considerable violation of some of the foregoing rules may be, by this means, in a great degree, concealed; and vigour may thus be communicated (if vigour of thought be not wanting) to a style chargeable even with tautology. This is the case with much of the language of Dr. Johnson, who is certainly on the whole an energetic writer; though he would have been much more so, had not an over-attention to the roundness and majestic sound of his sentences, and a delight in balancing one clause against another, led him so frequently into a faulty redundancy. Take, as an instance, a passage in his life of Prior, which may be considered as a favourable specimen of his style: "Solomon is the work to which he intrusted the protection of his name, and which he expected succeeding ages to regard with veneration. His affection was natural; it had undoubtedly been written with great labour: and who is willing to think that he has been labouring in vain? He had infused into it much knowledge, and much thought; had often *polished* it to *elegance*, often *dignified* it with *splendour*, and sometimes *heightened* it to *sublimity*; he perceived in it

many excellences, and did not discover that it wanted that without which all others are of small avail, the power of *engaging attention and alluring curiosity*. Tediousness is the most fatal of all faults; negligences or errors are single and local; but tediousness pervades the whole; other faults are censured and forgotten, but the power of tediousness propagates itself. He that is weary the first hour, is more weary the second; as bodies forced into motion contrary to their tendency, pass more and more slowly through every successive interval of space. Unhappily this pernicious failure is that which an author is least able to discover. We are seldom tiresome to ourselves; and the act of composition fills and delights the mind with change of language and succession of images; every couplet when produced is new; and novelty is the great source of pleasure. Perhaps no man ever thought a line superfluous when he first wrote it; or contracted his work till his ebullitions of invention had subsided."

It would not have been just to the author, nor even so suitable to the present purpose, to cite less than the whole of this passage, which exhibits the characteristic merits, even more strikingly than the defects, of the writer. Few could be found in the works of Johnson, and still fewer in those of any other writer, more happily and forcibly expressed: yet it can hardly be denied that the parts here distinguished by italics are chargeable, more or less, with Tautology.

Imitation of Johnson.

It happens, unfortunately, that Johnson's style is particularly easy of imitation, even by writers utterly destitute of his vigour of thought; and such imitators are intolerable. They bear the same

resemblance to their model, that the armour of the Chinese, as described by travellers, consisting of thick quilted cotton covered with stiff glazed paper, does to that of the ancient knights; equally glittering, bulky, and cumbersome, but destitute of the temper and firmness which was its sole advantage. At first sight, indeed, this kind of style appears far from easy of attainment, on account of its being remote from the colloquial, and having an elaborately artificial appearance; but in reality, there is none less difficult to acquire. To string together *substantives*, connected by conjunctions, which is the characteristic of Johnson's style, is, in fact, the rudest and clumsiest mode of expressing our thoughts: we have only to find *names* for our ideas, and then put them together by connectives, instead of interweaving, or rather *felting* them together, by a due admixture of verbs, participles, prepositions, &c. So that this way of writing, as contrasted with the other, may be likened to the primitive rude carpentry, in which the materials were united by coarse external implements, pins, nails, and cramps, when compared with that art in its most improved state, after the invention of dovetail-joints, grooves, and mortices, when the junctions are effected by forming properly the extremities of the pieces to be joined, so as at once to consolidate and conceal the juncture.

Various proportions of substantives in different styles.

If any one will be at the pains to compare a few pages, taken from almost any part of Johnson's Works, with the same quantity from any other of our admired writers, noting down the number of *substantives* in each, he will be struck with the disproportion. This would be still greater, if he were to examine with the same view an equal portion of

Cicero; but it must be acknowledged, that the genius of the Latin language allows and requires a much smaller proportion of substantives than are necessary in our own; especially such as express qualities in the abstract.

§ 9.

Suggestive style.

In aiming at a Concise Style, however, care must of course be taken that it be not *crowded*. The frequent recurrence of considerable ellipses, even when obscurity does not result from them, will produce an appearance of affected and laborious compression, which is offensive. The author who is studious of Energetic brevity, should aim at what may be called a ***Suggestive*** style; such, that is, as, without making a distinct, though brief, mention of a multitude of particulars, shall put the hearer's mind into the same *train of thought* as the speaker's, and suggest to him more than is actually expressed.* Aristotle's style, which is frequently so elliptical as to be dry and obscure, is yet often, at the very same time, unnecessarily diffuse, from his enumerating much that the reader would easily have supplied, if the rest had been fully and forcibly stated. He seems to have regarded his readers as capable of going *along with him* readily, in the deepest discussions, but not, of going *beyond him*, in the most simple; i. e. of filling up his meaning, and inferring what he does not actually ex-

* Such a style may be compared to a good map, which marks distinctly the great outlines, setting down the principal rivers, towns, mountains, &c. leaving the imagination to supply the villages, hillocks, and streamlets; which, if they were all inserted in their due proportions, would crowd the map, though after all they could not be discerned without a microscope.

press ; so that in many passages a free translator might convey his sense in a shorter compass, and yet in a less cramped and elliptical diction. A *particular* statement, example, or proverb, of which the general application is obvious, will often save a long abstract rule, which needs much explanation and limitation ; and will thus suggest much that is not actually said ; thus answering the purpose of a mathematical diagram, which, though itself an individual, serves as a representative of a class. Slight *hints* also respecting the subordinate branches of any subject, and notices of the principles that will apply to them, &c. may often be substituted for digressive discussions, which, though laboriously compressed, would yet occupy a much greater space. Judicious divisions likewise and classifications, save much tedious enumeration ; and, as has been formerly remarked, a well-chosen epithet may often suggest, and therefore supply the place of, an entire Argument.

It would not be possible, within a moderate compass, to lay down precise rules for the Suggestive kind of writing I am speaking of: but if the slight hints here given are sufficient to convey an idea of the object to be aimed at, practice will enable a writer gradually to form the habit recommended. It may be worth while, however, to add, that those accustomed to rational *conversation*, will find in that, a very useful exercise, with a view to this point, (as well as to almost every other connected with Rhetoric ;) since, in conversation, a man naturally tries first one and then another mode of expressing his thoughts, and stops as soon as he perceives that his companion fully comprehends his sentiments, and is sufficiently impressed with them.

§ 10.

I have dwelt the more earnestly on the head of Conciseness, because it is a quality in which young writers (who are the most likely to seek for practical benefit in a Treatise of this kind) are usually most deficient; and because it is commonly said that in them, exuberance is a promising sign; without sufficient care being taken to qualify this remark, by adding, that this over-luxuriance must be checked by judicious pruning. If an early proneness to redundancy be an indication of natural genius, those who possess this genius should be the more sedulously on their guard against that fault. And those who do not, should be admonished that the want of a *natural* gift cannot be supplied by copying its attendant defects.

Copiousness dependent on precision.

The praises which have been bestowed on *Copiousness* of diction, have probably tended to mislead authors into a cumbrous verbosity. It should be remembered, that there is no real Copiousness in a multitude of synonymes and circumlocutions. A house would not be the better furnished for being stored with ten times as many of some kinds of articles as were needed, while it was perhaps destitute of those required for other purposes; nor was Lucullus's wardrobe, which, according to Horace, boasted five thousand mantles, necessarily well stocked, if other articles of dress were wanting. The completeness of a library does not consist in the number of volumes, especially if many of them are *duplicates;* but in its containing copies of all the most valuable works. And in like manner, true Copiousness of language consists in having at command,

as far as possible, a suitable expression for each *different* modification of thought. This, consequently, will often *save* much circumlocution; so that the greater our command of language, the more concisely we shall be enabled to write. In an author who is attentive to these principles, diffuseness may be accounted no dangerous fault of style, because practice will gradually correct it; but it is otherwise with one who *pleases himself* in stringing together well-sounding words into an easy, flowing, and (falsely-called) copious style, destitute of nerve: and who is *satisfied* with a small portion of matter; seeking to increase, as it were, the appearance of his wealth by hammering out his metal thin. *This* is far from a curable fault. When the style is fully formed in other respects, pregnant fulness of meaning is seldom superadded; but when there is a basis of energetic condensation of thought, the faults of harshness, baldness, or even obscurity, are much more likely to be remedied. Solid gold may be new moulded and polished: but what can give solidity to gilding?

§ 11.

Energy dependent on the arrangement.

Lastly, the *Arrangement* of words may be made highly conducive to Energy. The importance of an attention to this point, with a view to Perspicuity, has been already noticed: but of two sentences equally perspicuous, and consisting of the very same words, the one may be a feeble and languid, the other a striking and Energetic expression, merely from the difference of Arrangement.

Natural order of words.

Some, among the moderns, are accustomed to speak of the *Natural* order of the words in a sentence, and to consider, each, the established arrangement of his own language as the nearest to such a natural order; regarding that which prevails in Latin and in Greek as a sort of deranged and irregular structure. We are apt to consider that as most natural and intrinsically proper, which is the most familiar to ourselves; but there seems no good ground for asserting, that the customary structure of sentences in the ancient languages is less natural, or less suitable for the purposes for which language is employed, than in the modern. Supposing the established order in English or in French, for instance, to be more closely conformed to the grammatical or logical analysis of a sentence, than that of Latin or Greek, because we place the Subject first, the Copula next, and the Predicate last, &c. it does not follow that such an arrangement is necessarily the best fitted, in every case, to excite the attention, — to direct it to the most essential points, — to gratify the imagination, — or to affect the feelings. It is, surely, the natural object of language to express as strongly as possible the speaker's sentiments, and to convey the same to the hearers; and that arrangement of words may fairly be accounted the most natural, by which all men are naturally led, as far as the rules of their respective languages allow them, to accomplish this object. The rules of many of the modern languages do indeed frequently confine an author to an order which he would otherwise never have chosen; but what translator of any taste would ever *voluntarily* alter the arrangement of the words in such a sentence, as *Μεγάλη ἡ Ἄρτεμις Ἐφεσίων*,

which our language allows us to render exactly, "*Great* is Diana of the Ephesians!" How feeble in comparison is the translation of Le Clerc, "*La Diane des Ephésiens est une grande Déesse!*" How imperfect that of Beausobre, "*La grande Diane des Ephésiens!*" How undignified that of Saci, "*Vive la grande Diane des Ephésiens!*"

Advantage in point of arrangement in the ancient languages.

Our language indeed is, though to a less degree, very much hampered by the same restrictions; it being in general necessary, for the expression of the sense, to adhere to an order which may not be in other respects the most eligible: "Cicero praised Cæsar," and "Cæsar praised Cicero," would be two very different propositions; the situation of the words being all that indicates (from our want of *Cases*,) *which* is to be taken as the nominative, and which as the accusative; but such a restriction is far from being an advantage. The transposition of words which the ancient languages admit of, conduces, not merely to variety, but to Energy, and even to Precision. If, for instance, a Roman had been directing the attention of his hearers to the circumstance that even *Cæsar* had been the object of Cicero's praise, he would, most likely, have put "*Cæsarem*" first; but he would have put "Cicero" first, if he had been remarking that not only others, but even *he*, had praised Cæsar.

It is for want of this liberty of Arrangement that we are often compelled to mark the *emphatic* words of our sentences by the voice, in speaking, and by italics, in writing; which would, in Greek or in Latin, be plainly indicated, in most instances, by the collocation alone. The sentence which has been often brought forward as

an example of the varieties of expression which may be given to the same words, "Will you ride to London to-morrow?" and which may be pronounced and understood in at least five different ways, according as the first, second, &c. of the words is printed in italics, would be, by a Latin or Greek writer, arranged in as many different orders, to answer these several intentions. The advantage thus gained must be evident to any one who considers how important the object is which is thus accomplished, and for the sake of which we are often compelled to resort to such clumsy expedients; it is like the proper distribution of the *lights* in a picture; which is hardly of less consequence than the correct and lively representation of the objects.*

Italics and underscoring.

It must be the aim then of an author, who would write with Energy, to avail himself of all the liberty which our language does allow, so to arrange his words that there shall be the least possible occasion for underscoring and italics; and this, of course, must be more carefully attended to by the *writer* than by the *speaker*, who may, by his mode of utterance, conceal, in great measure, a defect in this point. It may be worth observing, however, that some writers, having been taught that it is a fault of style to require many of the words to be in italics, fancy they avoid the fault, by omitting those indications where they are really needed;

* The 4th book of Q. Curtius begins with a passage which affords a good instance of the energetic effect produced by a skilful use of the license of the Latin arrangement: "Darius tanti modo exercitus rex, qui triumphantis magis quam dimicantis more, curru sublimis inierat prœlium, per loca quæ prope immensis agminibus compleverat, jam inania, et ingenti solitudine vasta, fugiebat." The effect of the concluding verb, placed where it is, is most striking.

which is no less absurd than to attempt remedying the intricacies of a road by removing the direction-posts.* The proper remedy is, to endeavour so to construct the style, that the collocation of the words may, as far as is possible, direct the attention to those which are emphatic. And the general maxim that should chiefly guide us, is, as Dr. Campbell observes, the homely saying, "Nearest the heart, nearest the mouth;" the idea, which is the most forcibly impressed on the author's mind, will naturally claim the first utterance, as nearly as the rules of the language will permit. And it will be found that, in a majority of instances, the most Emphatic word will be the *Predicate;* contrary to the rule which the nature of our language compels us, in most instances, to observe. It will often happen, however, that we do place the Predicate first, and obtain a great increase of Energy by this Arrangement. Of this license our translators of the Bible have in many instances, very happily availed themselves; as, e. g. in the sentence lately cited, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians;" so also, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord:" it is evident how much this would be enfeebled by altering the Arrangement into "He that cometh in the name of the Lord is blessed." And, again, "Silver and Gold have I none; but what I have that give I unto thee."† Another passage, in which they might advantageously have adhered to the order of the original, is, "Ἔπεσεν, ἔπεσε

*The censure of frequent and long Parentheses also leads some writers into the like preposterous expedient of leaving out the marks ( ) by which they are indicated, and substituting commas; instead of so framing each sentence that they shall not be needed. It is no cure to a lame man, to take away his crutches.

† Acts v. 6.

Βαβυλὼν, ἡ μεγάλη," * which would certainly have been rendered as correctly, and more forcibly, as well as more closely, "Fallen, fallen is Babylon, that great city," than, "Babylon is fallen, is fallen."

The word "IT" is frequently very serviceable in enabling us to alter the arrangement: thus, the sentence, "Cicero praised Cæsar," which admits of at least two modifications of sense, may be altered so as to express either of them, by thus varying the order: "It was Cicero that praised Cæsar," or, "It was Cæsar that Cicero praised." "IT" is, in this mode of using it, the *representative* of the Subject,† which it thus enables us to place, if we will, after the Predicate. Use of the Word IT.

§ 12.

With respect to *Periods*, it would be neither practically useful, nor even suitable to the present object, to enter into an examination of the different senses in which various authors have employed the word. A technical term may allowably be employed in a scientific work, in any sense not very remote from common usage, (especially when common usage is not uniform and invariable, in the meaning affixed to it,) provided it be clearly defined, and the definition strictly adher Periods.

* Rev. xviii. 2.

† Of whatever *gender* or *number* the subject referred to may be, "IT" may, with equal propriety, be employed to represent it. Our translators of the Bible have not scrupled to make "IT" refer to *a masculine* noun: "It is I, be not afraid;" but they seem to have thought it not allowable, as perhaps it was not, at the time when they wrote, to make such a reference to a *plural* noun. "Search the Scriptures—*they are they* which testify of Me:" we should now say, without any impropriety, "*IT is they*," &c.

ed to. By a Period, then, is to be understood in this place, any sentence, whether simple or complex, which is so framed that the Grammatical construction will not admit of a close, before the end of it; in which, in short, the meaning remains suspended, as it were, till the whole is finished. A *loose* sentence, on the contrary, is, any that is not a Period; any, whose construction will allow of a stop, so as to form a perfect sentence at one or more places, before we arrive at the end. E. g. "We came to our journey's end — at last — with no small difficulty — after much fatigue — through deep roads — and bad weather." This is an instance of a *very* loose sentence; (for it is evident that this kind of structure admits of degrees,) there being no less than five places, marked by dashes, at any one of which the sentence might have terminated, so as to be grammatically perfect. The same words may be formed into a Period, thus: "At last, after much fatigue, through deep roads, and bad weather, we came, with no small difficulty, to our journey's end." Here, no stop can be made at any part, so that the preceding words shall form a sentence before the final close. These are both of them *simple* sentences; i. e. not consisting of several causes, but having only a single verb; so that it is plain we ought not, according to this view, to confine the name of Period to *complex* sentences; as Dr. Campbell has done, notwithstanding his having adopted the same definition as has been here laid down.

Loose Sentences.

Periods, or sentences nearly approaching to Periods, have certainly, when other things are equal, the advantage in point of Energy. An unexpected continuation of a sentence, which the reader had supposed to be concluded, especially if in reading aloud, he had, under that supposition, dropped his voice, is apt to produce a sensation in the mind of being disagreeably balked; analogous to the unpleasant jar which is felt, when in ascending or descending stairs, we meet with a step more than we expected: and if this be often repeated, as in a *very* loose sentence, a kind of weary impatience results from the uncertainty when the sentence is to close. The objection however to loose sentences and consequent tendency towards the periodic structure, must have been greater among the Ancients than the Moderns, because the variety of arrangement which the ancient languages permitted, and, in particular, the liberty of reserving the *verb*, on which the whole sense depends, to the end, made that structure natural and easy, in many instances in which, in our language, it would appear forced, unnatural, and affected. But the agreeableness of a certain degree, at least, of Periodic structure, in all languages, is apparent from this; that they all contain words which may be said to have no other use or significations but to *suspend the sense*, and lead the hearer of the first part of the sentence to expect the remainder. He who says, "The world is not eternal, nor the work of chance;" expresses the same sense as if he said, "The world is *neither* eternal, nor the work of chance;" yet the latter would be generally preferred. So also, "The vines afforded *both* a refreshing shade, and a delicious fruit;" the word "both" would be missed, though it adds nothing to the sense. Again, "While all the Pagan nations consider Religion as one part of Virtue, the Jews, on

Tendency towards the periodic structure.

the contrary, regard Virtue as a part of Religion;"* the omission of the first word would not alter the sense, but would destroy the Period; to produce which is its only use. The *MEN*, *ΔE*, and *TE* of the Greek are, in many places, subservient to this use alone.

The modern languages do not indeed admit, as was observed above, of so Periodic a Style as the ancient do: but an author, who does but clearly understand what a Period is, and who applies the test I have laid down, will find it very easy, after a little practice, to compose in Periods, even to a greater degree than, in an English writer, good taste will warrant. His skill and care will be chiefly called for in avoiding all appearance of stiffness and affectation in the construction of them, — in not departing, for the sake of a Period, too far from colloquial usage, — and in observing such moderation in the employment of this style, as shall prevent any betrayal of artifice, — any thing savouring of elaborate stateliness; which is always to be regarded as a worse fault than the slovenliness and languor which accompany a very loose style.

§ 13.

Loose and periodic clauses.

It should be observed, however, that, as a sentence which is not *strictly* a Period, according to the foregoing definition, may yet approach indefinitely near to it, so as to produce nearly the same effect, so, on the other hand, periods may be so constructed as to produce much of the same feeling of weariness and impatience which results from an excess

* Jos plus.

of loose sentences. If the clauses be very long, and contain an enumeration of many circumstances, though the sentence be so framed, that we are still kept in expectation of the conclusion, yet it will be an impatient expectation; and the reader will feel the same kind of uneasy uncertainty *when* the *clause* is to be finished, as would be felt respecting the *sentence*, if it were loose. And this will especially be the case, if the rule formerly given with a view to Perspicuity be not observed,* of taking care that each part of the sentence be understood, as it proceeds. Each clause, if it consist of several parts, should be continued with the same attention to their mutual connection, so as to suspend the sense, as is employed in the whole sentence; that it may be, as it were, a *Periodic* clause. And if one clause be long and another short, the *shorter* should, if possible, be put *last*. Universally indeed a sentence would often be, practically, too long, i. e. will have a tedious, dragging effect, merely from its concluding with a much longer clause than it began with; so that a composition which most would censure as abounding too much in long sentences, may often have its defects, in great measure, remedied, without shortening any of them; merely by reversing the order of each. This of course holds good with respect to all complex sentences of any considerable length, whether periods, or not. An instance of the difference of effect produced by this means, may be seen in such a sentence as the following: "The State was made, under the pretence of serving it, in reality, the prize of

Precedence of the longer or shorter clause.

* Part iii. chap. i. § 3.

their contention, to each of those opposite parties, who professed in specious terms, the one, a preference for moderate Aristocracy, the other, a desire of admitting the people at large to an equality of civil privileges." This may be regarded as a complete Period; and yet for the reason just mentioned, has a tedious and cumbrous effect. Many critics might recommend, and perhaps with reason, to break it into two or three; but it is to our present purpose to remark, that it might be, in some degree at least, decidedly improved, by merely reversing the clauses; as thus: "The two opposite parties, who professed in specious terms, the one, a preference for moderate Aristocracy, the other, a desire of admitting the people at large to an equality of civil privileges, made the State, which they pretended to serve, in reality the prize of their contention." *

Another instance may be cited from a work, in which any occasional awkwardness of expression is the more conspicuous, on account of its general excellence, the Church Liturgy; the style of which is so justly admired for its remarkable union of energy with simplicity, smoothness, and elegance: the following passage from the Exhortation is one of the very few, which, from the fault just noticed, it is difficult for a good reader to deliver with spirit; "And although we ought at all times humbly to acknowledge our sins before God, || yet ought we most chiefly so to do, || when we assemble — and meet together — to render thanks for the great benefits that we have received at his hands, — to set forth his most worthy praise, to hear his most holy word, and to

* Thucydides, on the Corcyrean sedition.

ask those things which are requisite and necessary,— as well for the body as the soul." This is evidently a very loose sentence, as it might be supposed to conclude at any one of the three places which are marked by dashes (—); this disadvantage, however, may easily be obviated by the suspension of voice, by which a good reader, acquainted with the passage, would indicate that the sentence was not concluded; but the great fault is the length of the *last* of the three principal clauses, in comparison of the former two: (the conclusions of which are marked ||) by which a dragging and heavy effect is produced, and the sentence is made to appear longer than it really is. This would be more manifest to any one not familiar, as most are, with the passage; but a good reader of the Liturgy will find hardly any sentence in it so difficult to deliver to his own satisfaction. It is perhaps the more profitable to notice a blemish occurring in a composition so well known, and so deservedly valued for the excellence, not only of its sentiments, but of its language.

It is a useful admonition to young writers, with a view to what has lately been said, that they should always attempt to *recast* a sentence which does not please; altering the arrangement and entire construction of it, instead of merely seeking to change one word for another. This will give a great advantage in point of *Copiousness* also; for there may be, suppose, a *substantive*, which, either because it does not fully express our meaning, or for some other reason, we wish to remove, but can find no other to supply its place; but the object may perhaps be easily accomplished by means of a *verb*, adverb, or some other part of speech, the substitution of

which implies an alteration of the construction. It is an exercise accordingly which may be recommended as highly conducive to the improvement of Style, to practise casting a sentence into a variety of different forms

Difference of structure for the writer and the speaker.

It is evident, from what has been said, that in compositions intended to be delivered, the Periodic style is much less necessary, and therefore much less suitable, than in those designed for the closet. The speaker may, in most instances, by the skilful suspension of his voice, give to a loose sentence the effect of a Period: and though, in both species of composition, the display of art is to be guarded against, a more unstudied air is looked for in such as are spoken.

The study of the best Greek and Latin writers may be of great advantage towards the improvement of the Style in the point concerning which I have now been treating, (for the reason lately mentioned,) as well as in most others: and there is this additional advantage, (which, at first sight, might appear a disadvantage,) that the style of a foreign writer cannot be so *closely* imitated as that of one in our own language: for this reason there will be the less danger of falling into an *obvious* and *servile* imitation.*

§ 14.

Antithesis.

Antithesis has been sometimes reckoned as one form of the Period; but it is evident that, according to the view here taken, it has no necessary connection with it. One clause may be *opposed* to another, by means of some *contrast* between corresponding words in each, whether or not the clauses be so connected that the former could not, by itself, be a complete sentence. Tacitus, who is one of the most Antithetical, is at the same time one of the least Periodic, of all the Latin writers.

* Bolingbroke may be noted as one of the most Periodic of English writers; Swift and Addison (though in other respects very different from each other) are among the most loose.

There can be no doubt that this figure is calculated to add greatly to Energy. Every thing is rendered more striking by contrast; and almost every kind of subject-matter affords *materials* for contrasted expressions. Truth is *opposed* to error; wise conduct to foolish; different causes often produce opposite effects; different circumstances dictate to prudence opposite conduct; opposite impressions may be made by the same object, on different minds; and every extreme is opposed both to the Mean, and to the other extreme. If, therefore, the language be so constructed as to contrast together these opposites, they throw light on each other by a kind of mutual reflection, and the view thus presented will be the more striking. By this means also we may obtain, consistently with Perspicuity, a much greater degree of conciseness; which in itself is so conducive to Energy; e. g. "When Reason is against a man, he will be against Reason;"* it would be hardly possible to express this sentiment not Antithetically, so as to be clearly intelligible, except in a much longer sentence. Again, "Words are the Counters of wise men, and the Money of fools;"* here we have an instance of the combined effect of Antithesis and Metaphor in producing in-

* Hobbes

creased Energy, both directly, and at the same time, (by the Conciseness resulting from them,) indirectly; and accordingly in such pointed and pithy expressions, we obtain the gratification which, as Aristotle remarks, results from "the act of *learning* quickly and easily." The Antithetical expression, "Party is the madness of many for the gain of a few," affords an instance of this construction in a sentence which does not contain two distinct clauses. Frequently the same words, placed in different relations with each other, will stand in contrast to themselves; as in the expression, "A fool with judges; among fools, a judge;"* and in that given by Quinctilian, "*Non ut edam vivo, sed ut vivam edo;*" "I do not live to eat, but eat to live:" again, "Persecution is not wrong because it is cruel; but it is cruel because it is wrong:" and again, in the beautiful lines, from the Arabic, by Sir W. Jones:

> On Parent knees, a naked new-born child
> Weeping thou sat'st while all around thee smil'd;
> So live, that sinking in thy last long sleep,
> Thou then may'st smile, while all around thee weep.

All of these are instances also of perfect Antithesis, without Period; for each of these sentences might, grammatically, be concluded in the middle. So also, "It is [indeed] a just maxim, that honesty is the best policy; but he who is governed by that maxim is not an honest man." This antithetical sentence is or is not a Period, according as the word "indeed" is inserted or omitted. Of the same kind is an expression in a Speech of Mr. Wyndham's, "Some contend that I disapprove of this plan, because it is not my own; it would be more correct to say, that it is not my own, because I disapprove it."*

* Cowper.

The use of Antithesis has been censured by some, as if it were a paltry and affected decoration, unsuitable to a chaste, natural, and masculine style. Pope, accordingly, himself one of the most antithetical of our writers, speaks of it in the *Dunciad* with contempt:

> I see a Chief who leads my chosen sons,
> All armed with Points, Antitheses, and Puns.

Caution against excess in Antithesis.

The excess, indeed, of this style, by betraying artifice, effectually destroys Energy; and draws off the attention, even of those who are *pleased* with effeminate glitter, from the matter, to the style. But, as Dr. Campbell observes, "the excess itself into which some writers have fallen, is an evidence of its value — of the lustre and emphasis which Antithesis is calculated to give to the expression. There is no risk of intemperance in using a liquor which has neither spirit nor flavour."

It is, of course, impossible to lay down precise rules for determining, *what* will amount to excess, in the use of this, or of any other figure: the great safeguard will be the formation of a pure taste, by the study of the most chaste writers, and unsparing self-correction. But one rule always to be observed in respect to the antithetical construction, is to remember that in a true Antithesis the opposition is always in the *ideas* expressed. Some writers abound with a kind of mock-antithesis, in which the same, or nearly the same sentiment which is express-

* Great pointedness and force is added to the argument from *contraries* (Part i. chap. ii. § 6.) by the antithetical form of expression. See note to Part v. chap. iv. § 1.

ed by the first clause, is repeated in a second; or at least, in which there is but little of real contrast between the clauses which are expressed in a contrasted form. This kind of style not only produces disgust instead of pleasure, when once the artifice is detected, which it soon must be, but also, instead of the brevity and vigour resulting from true Antithesis, labours under the fault of prolixity and heaviness. Sentences which might have been expressed as simple ones, are expanded into complex, by the addition of clauses, which add little or nothing to the sense; and which have been compared to the false handles and keyholes with which furniture is decorated, that serve no other purpose than to *correspond to the real ones*. Much of Dr. Johnson's writing is chargeable with this fault.

Bacon, in his Rhetoric, furnishes, in his commonplaces, (i. e. heads of arguments, *pro* and *contra*, on a variety of subjects,) some admirable specimens of compressed and striking Antitheses; many of which are worthy of being enrolled among the most approved proverbs; e. g. "He who dreads new remedies, must abide old evils." "Since things alter for the worse spontaneously, if they be not altered for the better designedly, what end will there be of the evil?" "The humblest of the virtues the vulgar praise, the middle ones they admire, of the highest they have no perception," &c.

Antithesis without period

It will not unfrequently happen that an Antithesis may be even more happily expressed by the sacrifice of the Period, if the clauses are by this means made of a more convenient length and a resting-place provided at the most suitable point: e. g. "The persecutions undergone by the Apostles, furnished both a trial to *their* faith, and a confirmation to *ours*:—a trial to them, because if human honour and rewards had attended them, they could not, even themselves, have been certain that these were not their object; and a confirmation to us, because they would not have encountered such sufferings in the cause of imposture." If this sentence were not broken as it is, but compacted into a Period, it would have more heaviness of effect, though it would be rather shorter: e. g. "The persecutions undergone by the Apostles, furnished both a trial of their faith, since if human honours, &c. &c. and also a confirmation of ours, because," &c. Universally, indeed, a complex sentence, whether Antithetical or not, will often have a degree of spirit and liveliness from the latter clause being made to *turn back*, as it were, upon the former, by containing, or referring to, some word that had there been mentioned: e. g. "The introducers of the now-established principles of political economy may fairly be considered to have made a great *discovery*; a *discovery* the more creditable, from the circumstance that the facts on which it was founded had long been well known to all." This kind of style also may, as well as the Antithetical, prove offensive if carried to such an excess, as to produce an appearance of affectation or mannerism.

§ 15.

Lastly, to the *Speaker* especially, the occasional employment of the *Interrogative* form, will often prove serviceable with a view to Energy. It calls the hearer's attention more forcibly to some important point, by a personal appeal to each individual, either

Interrogation

to assent to what is urged, or to frame a reasonable objection; and it often carries with it an air of triumphant defiance of an opponent to refute the argument if he can. Either the Premiss * or the Conclusion, or both, of any argument, may be stated in this form; but it is evident, that if it be introduced too frequently, it will necessarily fail of the object of directing a *particular* attention to the most important points. To attempt to make every thing emphatic, is to make nothing emphatic. The utility, however, of this figure, to the Orator at least, is sufficiently established by the single consideration, that it abounds in the Speeches of Demosthenes.

CHAP. III.

Of Elegance.

§ 1.

ON the last quality of Style to be noticed, Elegance or Beauty, it is the less necessary to enlarge, both because the most appropriate and characteristic excellence of the class of compositions here treated of, is, that Energy of which I have been speaking, and also, because many of the rules laid down under that head, are equally applicable with a view to Elegance; the same Choice, Number, and Arrangement of words, will, for the most

* The interrogative form is particularly suitable to the minor premiss of a Dilemma, because that does not categorically assert, but leaves an opponent his choice of several alternatives. See Logic, Supp. to Part iii. § 5.

part, conduce both to Energy and to Beauty. The two qualities however are by no means undistinguishable: a Metaphor, for instance, may be apt, and striking, and consequently conducive to Energy of expression, even though the new image, introduced by it, have no intrinsic beauty, or be even unpleasant; in which case it would be at variance with Elegance, or at least would not conduce to it. Elegance requires that all homely and coarse words and phrases should be avoided, even at the expense of circumlocution; though they may be the most apt and forcible that language can supply. And elegance implies a smooth and easy flow of words in respect of the sound of the sentences; though a more harsh and abrupt mode of expression may often be, at least, equally energetic.

Elegance and Energy not the same.

Accordingly, many are generally acknowledged to be forcible writers, to whom no one would give the credit of Elegance; and many others, who are allowed to be elegant, are yet by no means reckoned among the vigorous and energetic.

§ 2.

When the two excellences of Style are at variance, the general rule to be observed by the orator is to prefer the energetic to the elegant. Sometimes, indeed, a plain, or even a somewhat homely expression, may have even a *more* energetic effect, from that very circumstance, than one of more studied refinement; since it may convey the idea of the speaker's being thoroughly in earnest, and anxious to convey his sentiments, where he uses an expression that can have no other recommendation; whereas a strikingly elegant

Preference of Energy.

expression may sometimes convey a suspicion that it was introduced *for the sake* of its Elegance; which will greatly diminish the force of what is said.

Universally, a writer or speaker should endeavour to maintain the appearance of expressing himself, not, as if he *wanted to say something*, but as if he *had something to say:* i. e. not as if he had a subject set him, and was anxious to compose the best essay or declamation on it that he could; but as if he had some ideas to which he was anxious to give utterance;—not as if he wanted to compose (for instance) a sermon, and was desirous of performing that task satisfactorily, but as if there was something in his mind which he was desirous of communicating to his hearers.* This is prob-

It is an admonition which probably will give offence to some, and excite the scorn of others, but which I cannot but think may sometimes prove useful to a young preacher, that he should ask himself, at the beginning, and in the course, of his composition, "For *what purpose* am I going to preach? Wherein would any one be a loser if I were to keep silence? Is it likely that any one will learn something he was ignorant of, or be reminded forcibly of something he had forgotten, or that something he was familiar with shall be set before him in a new and striking point of view, or that some difficulty will have been explained, or some confused ideas rendered clear; or, in short, that I shall at all have edified any one? Let it not be said, that I preached because there *was to be* a Sermon, and concluded when I had said enough to—occupy the requisite *time;* careful only to avoid any thing that could excite censure, and content to leave the hearers just as I found them. Let me be not satisfied with the thousandth iteration of common-places, on the ground that it is all very *true*, and that it is the fault of the congregation if they do not believe and practise it; for all this is equally the case, whether I preach or not; and if all I say is what they not only knew before, but had heard in the same trite and general statements an hundred times before, I might as well hold my peace. I ought not to be considering merely whether these arguments—motives—doctrines, &c. are *themselves* likely to produce an effect; but whether *my urging* them will be likely to make any difference as to the effect. Am I then about to preach merely because I want to say something, or because I have something to say?'

It is true, a man cannot expect constant success in his endeavours; but he is not very likely to succeed in any thing that is not even the object of his endeavours. See note Part iii. chap. i. § 5.

ably what Bp. Butler means when he speaks of a man's writing "with simplicity and in earnest." *His* manner has this advantage, though it is not only inelegant, but often obscure: Dr. Paley's is equally earnest, and very perspicuous; and though often homely, is more impressive than that of many of our most polished writers. It is easy to discern the prevalence of these two different manners in different authors, respectively, and to perceive the very different effects produced by them; it is not so easy for one who is not really writing "with simplicity and in earnest," to assume the appearance of it.* But certainly nothing is more adverse to this appearance than over-refinement. Any expression indeed that is vulgar, in bad taste, and unsuitable to the dignity of the subject, or of the occasion, is to be avoided; since, though it might have, with some hearers, an Energetic effect, this would be more than counterbalanced by the disgust produced in others; and where a *small* accession of Energy is to be gained at the expense of a *great* sacrifice of Elegance, the latter will demand a preference. But still, the general rule is not to be lost sight of by him who is in earnest aiming at the true ultimate end of the orator, to which all others are to be made subservient; viz. not the amusement of his

* This may be one reason why an Author's notes are often more spirited and more interesting than the rest of his work.

hearers, nor their admiration of himself, but their Conviction or Persuasion. It is from this view of the subject that I have dwelt most on that quality of style which seems most especially adapted to that object. Perspicuity is required in *all* compositions; and may even be considered as the *ultimate* end of a *Scientific* writer, considered as such; he may indeed practically increase his utility by writing so as to excite curiosity, and recommend his subject to general attention; but in doing so, he is, in some degree, superadding the office of the Orator to his own; as a Philosopher, he may *assume* the existence in his reader of a desire for knowledge, and has only to convey that knowledge, in language that may be *clearly understood*. Of the style of the Orator, (in the wide sense in which I have been using this appellation, as including all who are aiming at Conviction,) the appropriate object is to *impress* the meaning strongly upon men's minds. Of the Poet, as such,* the ultimate end is to *give pleasure;* and accordingly Elegance or Beauty (in the most extensive sense of those terms) will be the appropriate qualities of *his* language.

§ 3.

Beauty of Style the appropriate character of Poetical Diction.

Some indeed have contended, that to give pleasure is not the ultimate end of Poetry;† not distinguishing between the object which the Poet may have in view, *as a man*, and that which is the object of Poetry, as Poetry. Many,

* See Dr. Copleston's Lectures on Poetry.

† Supported in some degree by the authority of Horace

Aut prodesse volunt, aut delectare Poëtæ.

no doubt, may have proposed to themselves the far more important object of producing moral improvement in their hearers through the medium of Poetry; and so have others, the inculcation of their own political or philosophical tenets, or, (as is supposed in the case of the *Georgics*,) the encouragement of Agriculture: but if the views of the individual are to be taken into account, it should be considered that the personal fame or emolument of the author is very frequently *his* ultimate object. The true test is easily applied: that which to competent judges affords the appropriate *pleasure* of Poetry, is *good* poetry, whether it answer any other purpose or not; that which does *not* afford this pleasure, however instructive it may be, is not good *Poetry*, though it may be a valuable *work*.

Poetry not constituted such by the thoughts.

It may be doubted, however, how far these remarks apply to the question respecting Beauty of *style;* since the chief gratification afforded by Poetry arises, it may be said, from the beauty of the *thoughts*. And undoubtedly if these be mean and common-place, the Poetry will be worth little; but still, it is not any quality of the thoughts that *constitutes* Poetry. Notwithstanding all that has been advanced by some French critics,* to prove that a work, not in metre, may be a Poem, (which doctrine was partly derived from a misinterpretation of a passage in Aristotle's *Poetics*,) † universal opinion has always given a contrary decision. Any composition in *verse*, (and none

* See Preface to *Télémaque*.

† *Ψιλοὶ λόγοι* has been erroneously interpreted language *without metre*, in a passage where it certainly means metre *without music;* or, as he calls it in another passage of the same work, *ψιλομετρία*.

that is not,) is always called, whether good or bad, a Poem, by all who have no favourite hypothesis to maintain. It is indeed a common figure of speech to say, in speaking of any work that is deficient in the qualities which Poetry *ought* to exhibit, that it is not a Poem; just as we say of one who wants the characteristic excellences of the species, or the sex, that he is *not a man*;* and thus some have been led to confound together the appropriate *excellence* of the thing in question, with its *essence*; but the use of such an expression as, an "*indifferent*" or "a *dull Poem*," shews plainly that the title of Poetry does not necessarily imply the requisite *Beauties* of Poetry.

Distinction of poetry and prose.

Poetry is not distinguished from Prose by superior Beauty of thought or of expression, but is a distinct kind of composition;† and they produce, when each is excellent in its kind, distinct kinds of pleasure. Try the experiment, of merely breaking up the metrical structure of a fine Poem, and you will find it *inflated and bombastic* Prose:‡ remove this de-

* I dare do all that may become a *man*;
Who dares do more, is *none*. — *Macbeth*.

† It is hardly necessary to remark, that I am not defending or seeking to introduce any *unusual* or *new* sense of the word Poetry; but, on the contrary, explaining and vindicating that which is the most customary among all men who have no particular theory to support. The mass of mankind often need, indeed, to have the meaning of a word (i. e. their *own* meaning) *explained* and *developed*; but not to have it determined *what* it shall mean, since *that* is determined by their use; the true sense of each word being, *that which is understood by it*.

‡ Hence the impropriety of the practice, by no means uncommon, of *learning a language* from its poetry. It is like learning Botany *in a flower-garden*; which is filled with what are, to the Botanist's eye, *beautiful monsters*;—every variety of curious and ornamental deviation from the simple forms.

fect by altering the words and the arrangement; and it will be *better* Prose than before; then, arrange this again into metre, without any other change, and it will be *tame* and *dull* Poetry; but still it will *be* Poetry, as is indicated by the very censure it will incur; for if it were not, there would be no fault to be found with it; since, while it remained Prose, it was (as we have supposed) unexceptionable. The circumstance that the same Style which was even required in one kind of composition, proved offensive in the other, shews that a different kind of language is suitable for a composition in metre.

Poetry not translatable.

Another indication of the essential difference between the two kinds of composition, and of the superior importance of the *expression* in Poetry, is, that a good *translation* of a Poem, (though, perhaps, strictly speaking, what is so called is rather an *imitation*,)* is read by one well-acquainted with the original, with equal or even superior pleasure to that which it affords to one ignorant of that original; whereas the best translation of a Prose-work, (at least of one not principally valued for beauty of style,) will seldom be read by one familiar with the original. And for the same reason, a fine passage of Poetry will be reperused, with unabated pleasure, for the twentieth time, even by one who knows it by heart.†

* And accordingly it should be observed, that, as all admit, none but a poet can be qualified to translate a poem.

† Hence it is that the want of *complete* Perspicuity (such i. e. as puts the reader *instantly* in possession of the whole sense) is a far

According to the views here taken, good Poetry might be defined, "*Elegant and decorated language, in metre, expressing* such and such thoughts:" and good Prose composition, "*such and such thoughts expressed in* good language:" that which is primary in each, being subordinate in the other.

§ 4.

Analogy between Prose and Poetry, Walking and Dancing, Speaking and Singing.

What has been said may be illustrated as fully, not as it might be, but as is suitable to the present occasion, by the following passages from Dr. A. Smith's admirable fragment of an *Essay on the Imitative Arts:* "Were I to attempt to discriminate between Dancing and any other kind of movement, I should observe, that though in performing any ordinary action,— in walking, for example, across the room, a person may manifest both grace and agility, yet if he betrays the least intention of shewing either, he is sure of offending more or less, and we never fail to accuse him of some degree of vanity and affectation. In the performance of any such ordinary action, every one wishes to appear to be solely occupied about the proper purpose of the action; if he means to shew either grace or agility, he is careful to conceal that meaning; and in proportion as he betrays it, which he almost always does, he offends. In Dancing, on the contrary, every one professes and avows, as it were, the intention of displaying some degree either of grace or of agility, or of both. The display of one or other, or both of these

less fault in Poetry than in Prose. For Poetry, if it be worth reading at all, is worth reading over and over; which it *will* be, if it be sufficiently intelligible, on a first perusal, to excite vivid and pleasing emotions.

qualities, is, in reality, the proper purpose of the action; and there can never be any disagreeable vanity or affectation in following out the proper purpose of any action. When we say of any particular person, that he gives himself many affected airs and graces in Dancing, we mean either that he exhibits airs and graces unsuitable to the nature of the Dance, or that he exaggerates those which are suitable. Every Dance is, in reality, a succession of airs and graces of some kind or other, which, if I may say so, profess themselves to be such. The steps, gestures, and motions which, as it were, avow the intention of exhibiting a succession of such airs and graces, are the steps, gestures, and motions which are peculiar to Dancing. * * * * * The distinction between the sounds or tones of Singing, and those of Speaking, seems to be of the same kind with that between the step, &c. of Dancing, and those of any other ordinary action. Though in Speaking a person may shew a very agreeable tone of voice, yet if he seems to *intend* to shew it,— if he appears to listen to the sound of his own voice, and as it were to tune it into a pleasing modulation, he never fails to offend, as guilty of a most disagreeable affectation. In Speaking, as in every other ordinary action, we expect and require that the speaker should attend only to the proper purpose of the action, — the clear and distinct expression of what he has to say. In Singing, on the contrary, every one professes the intention to please by the tone and cadence of his voice; and he not only appears to be guilty of no disagreeable affectation in doing so, but we expect and require that he should do so. To please by the Choice and Arrangement of agreeable sounds, is the proper purpose of all music, vocal, as

well as instrumental; and we always expect that every one should attend to the proper purpose of whatever action he is performing. A person may appear to sing, as well as to dance, affectedly; he may endeavour to please by sounds and tones which are unsuitable to the nature of the song, or he may dwell too much on those which are suitable to it. The disagreeable affectation appears to consist always, not in attempting to please by a proper, but by some improper modulation of the voice." It is only necessary to add, (what seems evidently to have been in the author's mind, though the Dissertation is left unfinished,) that Poetry has the same relation to Prose, as Dancing to Walking, and Singing to Speaking; and that what has been said of *them*, will apply exactly, *mutatis mutandis*, to the other. It is needless to state this at length; as any one, by going over the passages just cited, merely substituting for "Singing," "Poetry," —for "Speaking," "Prose,"—for "Voice," "Language," &c. will at once perceive the coincidence.*

What has been said will not be thought an unnecessary digression, by any one who considers (not to mention the direct application of Dr. Smith's remarks, to *Elocution*) the important principle thus established in respect of the decorations of style: viz. that though it is possible for a poetical style to be affectedly and offensively ornamented, yet the same degree and kind of decoration which is not only allowed, but required, in Verse, would in Prose be disgusting; and that the *appearance of attention* to the Beauty of the expression, and to the Arrangement of the words, which in verse is essential, is to be carefully avoided in Prose.

* This probably was in Aristotle's mind when he reckoned Poetry among the *imitative* arts; viz. that it is imitative of Prose-composition, in the same manner is Singing, of ordinary Speaking; and Dancing, of ordinary Action

And since, as Dr. Smith observes, "such a design, when it exists, is almost always betrayed;" the safest rule is, never, during the act of composition, to study Elegance, or think about it at all. Let an author study the best models — mark their beauties of style, and dwell upon them, that he may insensibly catch the habit of expressing himself with Elegance; and when he has completed any composition, he may revise it, and cautiously alter any passage that is awkward and harsh, as well as those that are feeble and obscure: but let him never, *while writing*, think of any beauties of style; but content himself with such as may occur spontaneously. He should carefully study *Perspicuity* as he goes along; he may also, though more cautiously, aim in like manner, at Energy; but if he is endeavouring after Elegance, he will hardly fail to betray that endeavour; and in proportion as he does this, he will be so far from giving pleasure, to good judges, that he will offend more than by the rudest simplicity.

Elegance of style in prose not to be thought of during the act of writing.

PART IV

OF ELOCUTION.

CHAP. I.

General Considerations relative to Elocution.

§ 1.

On the importance of this branch, it is hardly necessary to offer any remark. Few need to be told that the effect of the most perfect composition may be entirely destroyed, even by a Delivery which does not render it unintelligible; — that one, which is inferior both in matter and style, may produce, if better spoken, a more powerful effect than another which surpasses it in both those points; and that even such an Elocution as does not spoil the effect of what is said, may yet fall far short of doing full justice to it. "What would you have said," observed Æschines, when his recital of his great rival's celebrated Speech on the Crown was received with a burst of admiration, — "what would you have said, had you heard *him* speak it?"

The subject is far from having failed to engage attention: of the prevailing deficiency of this, more than of any other qualification of a perfect Orator, many have complained; and several have laboured to remove it · but it may safely be asserted, that their endeavours have been, at the very best, entirely unsuccessful. Probably not a single instance could be found of any one who has attained, by the study of any system of instruction that has appeared, a really good Delivery; but there are many, probably nearly as many as have fully tried the experiment, who have by this means been totally spoiled; — who have fallen irrecoverably into an affected style of *spouting*, worse, in all respects, than their original mode of Delivery. Many accordingly have, not unreasonably, conceived a disgust for the subject altogether; considering it hopeless that Elocution should be *taught* by any rules; and acquiescing in the conclusion that it is to be regarded as entirely a gift of nature, or an accidental acquirement of practice. It is to counteract the prejudice which may result from these feelings, that I profess in the outset a dissent from the principles generally adopted, and lay claim to some degree of originality in my own. Novelty affords at least an opening for hope; and the only opening, when former attempts have met with total failure.

§ 2.

Requisites of Elocution.

The requisites of Elocution correspond in great measure with those of Style: *Correct Enunciation*, in opposition both to *indistinct* utterance, and to *vulgar* and *dialectic* pronunciation, may be considered as answering to Purity, Grammatical Propriety, and absence of Obsolete or otherwise *Unintelligible* words. These qualities of Style, and of Elocution, being equally required in common conversation, do not properly fall within the province of Rhetoric.

The three qualities, again, which have been treated of under the head of Style, viz. Perspicuity, Energy, and Elegance, may be regarded as equally requisites of Elocution: which, in order to be perfect, must convey the meaning *clearly*, *forcibly*, and *agreeably*.

§ 3.

Reading and Speaking.

Before however I enter upon any separate examination of these requisites, it will be necessary to premise a few remarks on the distinction between the two branches of Delivery, viz. *Reading* aloud, and *Speaking*. The object of *correct* Reading is, to convey to the hearers, through the medium of the ear, what is conveyed to the reader by the eye;—to put them in the same situation with him who has the book before him;—to exhibit to them, in short, by the voice, not only each word, but also all the stops, paragraphs, italic characters, notes of interrogation, &c.*

* It may be said, indeed, that even tolerable Reading aloud, supplies more than is exhibited by a book to the eye; since though italics e. g. indicate which word is to receive the emphasis, they do not point out the *tone* in which it is to be pronounced; which may be essential to the right understanding of the sentence; e. g. in such a sentence as in Genesis i, "God said, Let there be light; and there *was* light:" here we can indicate indeed to the eye that the stress is to be upon "*was*;" but it may be pronounced in different tones; one of which would alter the sense, by implying that there *was* light *already*. This is true indeed; and it is also true, that the very words themselves are not always presented to the eye with the same distinctions as are to be conveyed to the ear; as, e. g. "abuse," "refuse," "project," and many others, are pronounced differently, as nouns and as verbs. This ambiguity however in our written signs, as well as the other relative to emphatic words, are imperfections which will not mislead a moderately practised reader. My meaning in saying that such Reading as I am speaking of puts the hearers in the same situation as if

which his sight presents to him. His voice seems to indicate to them, "thus and thus it is written in the book or manuscript before me." *Impressive* reading superadds to this, some degree of adaptation of the tones of voice to the character of the subject, and of the style. What is usually termed *fine* reading seems to convey, in addition to these, a kind of admonition to the hearers respecting the feelings which the composition ought to excite in them: it appears to say, "this deserves your admiration;—this is sublime;—this is pathetic, &c." But Speaking, i. e. *natural* speaking, when the Speaker is uttering his own sentiments, and is thinking exclusively of *them*, has something in it distinct from all this: it conveys, by the sounds which reach the ear, the idea, that what is said is the effusion of the Speaker's own mind, which he is desirous of imparting to others. A decisive proof of which is, that if any one overhears the voice of another, to whom he is an utter stranger—suppose in the next room—without being able to catch the sense of what is said, he will hardly ever be for a moment at a loss to decide whether he is *Reading* or *Speaking*; and this, though the hearer may not be one who has ever paid any critical attention to the various modulations of the human voice. So wide is the difference of the tones employed on these two occasions, be the subject what it may.*

the book were before them, is to be understood on the supposition of their being able not only to read, but to read so as to take in the full sense of what is written.

* "At every sentence let them ask themselves this question; How should I utter this, were I Speaking it as my own immediate sentiments?——I have often tried an experiment to shew the great

The difference of effect produced is proportionably great: the personal *sympathy* felt towards one who appears to be delivering his own sentiments is such, that it usually rivets the attention, even involuntarily, though to a discourse which appears hardly worthy of it. It is not easy for an auditor to fall asleep while he is hearing even perhaps feeble reasoning, clothed in indifferent language, delivered extemporaneously, and in an unaffected style; whereas it is common for men to find a difficulty in keeping themselves awake, while listening even to a good dissertation, of the same length, or even shorter, on a subject, not uninteresting to them, when *read*, though with Propriety, and not in a languid manner. And the thoughts, even of those not disposed to be drowsy, are apt to wander, unless they use an effort from time to time to prevent it; while, on the other hand, it is notoriously difficult to withdraw our attention, even from a trifling talker, of whom we are weary, and to occupy the mind with reflections of its own.

Attention connected with Sympathy.

Of the two branches of Elocution which have been just mentioned, it might at first sight appear as if one

difference between these two modes of utterance, the natural and the artificial; which was, that when I found a person of vivacity delivering his sentiments with energy, and of course with all that variety of tones which nature furnishes, I have taken occasion to put something into his hand to read, as relative to the topic of conversation; and it was surprising to see what an immediate change there was in his Delivery, from the moment he began to read. A different pitch of voice took place of his natural one, and a tedious uniformity of cadence succeeded to a spirited variety; insomuch that a blind man could hardly conceive the person who read to be the same who had just been speaking." Sheridan, *Art of Reading*.

only, that of the Speaker, came under the province of Rhetoric. But it will be evident, on consideration, that both must be, to a certain extent, regarded as connected with our present subject; not merely because many of the same principles are applicable to both, but because any one who delivers (as is so commonly the case) a written composition of his own, may be reckoned as belonging to either class: as a Reader who is the author of what he reads, or as a Speaker who supplies the deficiency of his memory by writing. And again, in the (less common) case where a Speaker is delivering without book, and from memory alone, a written composition, either his own or another's, though this cannot in strictness be called Reading, yet the tone of it will be very likely to resemble that of Reading. In the other case,—that where the author is actually reading his own composition, he will be still more likely, notwithstanding its being his own, to approach, in the Delivery of it, to the Elocution of a Reader; and, on the other hand, it is possible for him, even without actually deceiving the hearers into the belief that he is speaking extempore, to approach indefinitely near to that style.

The difficulty however of doing this to one who has the writing actually before him, is considerable; and it is of course far greater when the composition is *not* his own. And as it is evident from what has been said, that this (as it may be called) Extemporaneous style of Elocution, is much the more impressive, it becomes an interesting inquiry, how the difficulty in question may best be surmounted.

§ 4.

Artificial style of Elocution.

Little, if any, attention has been bestowed on this point by the writers on Elocution; the distinction above pointed out between Reading and Speaking having seldom, or never, been precisely stated and dwelt on. Several however have written elaborately on "good Reading," or on Elocution, *generally*; and it is not to be denied, that some ingenious and (in themselves) valuable remarks have been thrown out relative to such qualities in Elocution as might be classed under the three heads I have laid down, of Perspicuity, Energy, and Elegance: but there is one principle running through all their precepts, which being, according to my views, radically erroneous, must (if those views be correct) vitiate every system founded on it. The principle I mean is, that in order to acquire the best style of Delivery, it is requisite to study analytically the emphases, tones, pauses, degrees of loudness, &c. which give the proper effect to each passage that is well delivered — to frame *rules* founded on the observation of these — and then, in practice, deliberately and carefully to conform the utterance to these rules, so as to form a complete artificial system of Elocution.

That such a plan not only directs us into a circuitous and difficult path, towards an object which may be reached by a shorter and straighter, but also, in most instances, completely fails of that very object, and even produces, oftener than not, effects the very reverse of what is designed, is a doctrine for which it will be necessary to offer some reasons; especially as it is undeniable that

the system here reprobated, as employed in the case of Elocution, is precisely that recommended and taught in this very Treatise, in respect of the conduct of *Arguments*. By analyzing the best compositions, and observing what kinds of arguments, and what modes of arranging them, in each case, prove most successful, general rules have been framed, which an author is recommended studiously to observe in Composition: and this is precisely the procedure which, in Elocution, I deprecate. The reason for making such a difference in these two cases is this: whoever (as Dr. A. Smith remarks in the passage lately cited) * appears to be attending to his own utterance, which will almost inevitably be the case with every one who *is* doing so, is sure to give offence, and to be censured for an affected delivery; because every one is expected to attend exclusively to the proper object of the action he is engaged in; which, in this case, is the expression of the thoughts — not the sound of the expressions. Whoever therefore learns, and endeavours to apply in practice, any artificial rules of Elocution, so as deliberately to modulate his voice conformably to the principles he has adopted, (however just they may be in themselves,) will hardly ever fail to betray his intention; which always gives offence when perceived. Arguments, on the contrary, *must* be deliberately framed: whether any one's course of reasoning be sound and judicious, or not, it is necessary, and it is expected, that it should be the result of thought. No one, as Dr. Smith observes, is charged with affecta-

Excellence in matter and in delivery to be aimed at in opposite ways.

* See Part iii. ch. iii. § 4. p. 250.

tion for giving his attention to the proper object of the action he is engaged in. As therefore the proper object of the Orator is to adduce convincing Arguments, and topics of Persuasion, there is nothing offensive in his appearing deliberately to aim at this object. He may indeed weaken the force of what is urged by *too great* an appearance of elaborate composition, or by exciting suspicion of Rhetorical *trick*; but he is so far from being expected to pay no attention to the sense of what he says, that the most powerful argument would lose much of its force, if it were supposed to have been thrown out casually, and at random. *Here* therefore the employment of a regular system (if founded on just principles) can produce no such ill effect as in the case of Elocution: since the habitual attention which that implies to the choice and arrangement of arguments, is such as *must* take place, at any rate; whether it be conducted on any settled principles or not. The only difference is, that he who proceeds on a correct system, will think and deliberate concerning the course of his Reasoning to *better purpose* than he who does not: he will do *well* and *easily*, what the other does ill, and with more labour. Both alike must bestow their attention on the *Matter* of what they say, if they would produce any effect; both are not only allowed, but expected to do so.

The two opposite modes of proceeding therefore which are recommended in respect of these two points, (the Argument and the Delivery,) are, in fact, both the result of the same circumstance; viz. that the speaker is expected to bestow his whole attention on the proper

business of his speech, which is, not the Elocution, but the Matter.*

§ 5.

Natural style of Elocution.

When however I protest against all artificial systems of Elocution, and all *direct* attention to Delivery, *at the time*, it must not be supposed that a *general* inattention to that point is recommended; or that the most perfect Elocution is to be attained by never thinking at all on the subject; though it may safely be affirmed that even this negative plan would succeed far better than a studied modulation. But it is evident that if any one wishes to *assume the Speaker* as far as possible, i. e. to deliver a written composition with some degree of the manner and effect of one that is extemporaneous, he will have a considerable difficulty to surmount: since though this may be called, in a certain sense, the NATURAL MANNER, it is far from being what he will naturally, i. e. *spontaneously*, fall into. It is by no means natural for any one to *read* as if he were *not* reading, but speaking. And again, even when any one is reading what he does not wish to deliver as his own composition, as, for instance, a portion of the Scriptures, or the Liturgy, it is evident that this may be done better or worse, in infinite degrees; and that though (according to the views here taken) a studied attention to the sounds uttered, at the

* Style occupies in some respects an intermediate place between these two; in what degree each quality of it should or should not be made an object of attention *at the time of composing*, and how far the appearance of such attention is tolerated, has been already treated of in the preceding Part.

time of uttering them, leads to an affected and offensive delivery, yet, on the other hand, an utterly careless reader cannot be a good one.

CHAP. II.

Artificial and Natural Methods compared.

§ 1.

Reading. With a view to Perspicuity then, the first requisite in all Delivery, viz. that quality which makes the meaning fully understood by the hearers, the great point is that the Reader (to confine our attention for the present to that branch) should appear to *understand* what he reads. If the composition be, in itself, intelligible to the persons addressed, he will make them fully understand it, by so delivering it. But to this end, it is not enough that he should himself *actually* understand it; it is possible, notwithstanding, to read it as if he did not. And in like manner with a view to the quality, which has been here called Energy, it is not sufficient that he should himself feel, and be impressed with the force of what he utters: he may, notwithstanding, deliver it as if he were unimpressed.

§ 2.

Sheridan The remedy that has been commonly proposed for these defects, is to point out in such a work, for instance, as the Liturgy, *which* words ought

to be marked as emphatic, — in what places the voice is to be suspended, raised, lowered, &c. One of the best writers on the subject, Sheridan, in his *Lectures on the Art of Reading*,* (whose remarks on many points coincide with the principles here laid down, though he differs from me on the main question — as to the System to be practically followed with a view to the proposed object,) adopts a peculiar set of marks for denoting the different pauses, emphases, &c. and applies these, with accompanying explanatory observations, to the greater part of the Liturgy, and to an Essay subjoined;† recommending that the habit should be formed of regulating the voice by his marks; and that afterwards readers should "write out such parts as they want to deliver properly, without any of the usual stops; and, after having considered them well, mark the pauses and emphases by the new signs which have been annexed to them, according to the best of their judgment," &c.

To the adoption of any such artificial scheme there are three weighty objections; first, that the proposed system must necessarily be *imperfect*; secondly, that if it were perfect, it would be a circuitous path to the object in view; and thirdly, that even if both those objections were removed, the object would not be effectually obtained

* See note p. 256. It is to be observed, however, that most of the objections I have adduced do not apply to this or that system in particular; to Sheridan's, for instance, as distinguished from Walker's; but, to *all* such systems generally; as may be seen from what is said in the present section.

† See Appendix, [I.]

Imperfection of the artificial system.

First, such a system must necessarily be imperfect, because, though the *emphatic* word in each sentence may easily be pointed out in writing, no variety of marks, that could be invented,— not even musical notation,— would suffice to indicate the different *tones** in which the different emphatic words should be pronounced; though on this depends frequently the whole force, and even sense of the expression. Take, as an instance, the words of Macbeth in the witches' cave, when he is addressed by one of the Spirits which they raise, "Macbeth! Macbeth! Macbeth!" on which he exclaims, "Had I three ears I'd hear thee;" no one would dispute that the stress is to be laid on the word "three;" and thus much might be indicated to the reader's eye; but if he had nothing else to trust to, he might chance to deliver the passage in such a manner as to be utterly absurd; for it is possible to pronounce the emphatic word "three," in such a tone as to indicate that "since he has but *two* ears he cannot hear." Again, the following passage, (Mark iv. 21.) "Is a candle brought to be put under a bushel, or under a bed," I have heard so pronounced as to imply that there is *no other alternative*: and yet the emphasis was laid on the right words. It would be nearly as hopeless a task to attempt adequately to convey, by any written marks, precise directions as to the *rate*,— the degree of rapidity or slowness,— with which each sentence and clause should be delivered. Longer and shorter pauses may indeed be easily denoted; and marks may be used, similar to those in music, to indicate, generally, quick, slow, or moderate time; but it is

* See note, p. 256.

evident that the variations which actually take place are infinite — far beyond what any marks could suggest; and that much of the force of what is said depends on the degree of rapidity with which it is uttered; chiefly on the *relative* rapidity of one part in comparison of another: for instance, in such a sentence as the following, in one of the Psalms, which one may usually hear read at one uniform rate; "all men that see it shall say, this hath God done; for they shall perceive that it is his work;" the four words "this hath God done," though monosyllables, ought to occupy very little less time in utterance than all the rest of the verse together.

Circuitousness of the artificial system.

2dly, But were it even possible to bring to the highest perfection the proposed system of marks, it would still be a circuitous road to the desired end. Suppose it could be completely indicated to the eye, in what tone each word and sentence should be pronounced according to the several occasions, the learner might ask, "but *why* should this tone suit the awful, — this, the pathetic, — this, the narrative style? *why* is this mode of delivery adopted for a command, — this, for an exhortation, — this, for a supplication?" &c. The only answer that could be given, is, that these tones, emphases, &c. are a part of the language; — that nature, or custom, which is a second nature, suggest spontaneously these different modes of giving expression to the different thoughts, feelings, and designs, which are present to the mind of any one who, without study, is speaking in earnest his own sentiments. Then, if this be the case, why not leave nature to do her own work? Impress but the mind fully with the sentiments, &c. to be uttered; withdraw the attention from the sound, and

fix it on the sense; and nature, or habit, will spontaneously suggest the proper Delivery. That this will be the case is not only true, but is the very supposition on which the artificial system proceeds; for it professes to teach the mode of Delivery *naturally* adapted to each occasion. It is surely, therefore, a circuitous path that is proposed, when the learner is directed, first to consider how each passage ought to be read; i. e. what mode of delivering each part of it would *spontaneously* occur to him, if he were attending exclusively to the matter of it; then to observe all the modulations, &c. of voice, which take place in such a Delivery: then, to note these down, by established marks, in writing; and, lastly, to pronounce according to these marks. This seems like recommending, for the purpose of raising the hand to the mouth, that he should first observe, when performing that action without thought of any thing else, what muscles are contracted, — in what degrees, — and in what order; then, that he should note down these observations; and lastly that he should, in conformity with these notes, contract each muscle in due degree, and in proper order; to the end that he may be enabled, after all, to — lift his hand to his mouth; which, by supposition, he had already done. Such instruction is like that bestowed by Moliere's pedantic tutor upon his *Bourgeois Gentilhomme*, who was taught, to his infinite surprise and delight, what configurations of the mouth he employed in pronouncing the several letters of the alphabet, which he had been accustomed to utter all his life, without knowing how.*

* "*Qu'est ce que vous faites quand vous prononcez O? Mais je dis, O!*" — An answer which, if not savouring of Philosophical analysis, gave at least a good practical solution of the problem.

3. Lastly, waiving both the above objections, if a person could learn thus to read and speak, as it were, *by note*, with the same fluency and accuracy as are attainable in the case of singing, still the desired object of a perfectly *natural* as well as correct Elocution, would never be in this way attained. The reader's attention being fixed on his own voice, (which in singing, and there only, is allowed and expected,) the inevitable consequence would be that he would betray more or less his studied and artificial Delivery; and would, in the same degree, manifest an offensive affectation.*

Appearance of affectation resulting from the artificial system.

§ 3.

The practical rule then to be adopted, in conformity with the principles here maintained, is, not only to pay no studied attention to the voice, but studiously to *withdraw* the thoughts from it, and to dwell as intently as possible on the Sense, trusting to nature to suggest spontaneously the proper emphases and tones.† He who not only understands

Natural manner how to be secured.

* It should be observed, however, that, in the reading of the Liturgy especially, so many gross faults are become quite familiar to many, from what they are accustomed to hear, if not from their own practice, as to render it peculiarly difficult to unlearn, or even detect them; and as an aid towards the exposure of such faults, there may be great advantage in studying Sheridan's observations and directions respecting the delivery of it; provided care be taken, *in practice*, to keep clear of his faulty principle, by withdrawing the attention from the sound of the voice, as carefully as he recommends it to be directed to that point.

† Many persons are so far impressed with the truth of the doctrine here inculcated, as to acknowledge that "it is a great fault for a reader to be *too much* occupied with thoughts respecting his own voice;" and thus they think to steer a middle course between oppo

fully what he is reading, but is earnestly occupying his mind with the matter of it, will be likely to read as if he understood it, and thus, to make others understand it;* and in like manner, with a view to the impressiveness of the Delivery, he who not only feels it, but is exclusively absorbed with that feeling, will be likely to read as if he felt it, and to communicate the impression to his hearers. But this cannot be the case if he is occupied with the thought of what their opinion will be of his reading, and, how his voice ought to be regulated; — if, in short, he is thinking of *himself*, and, of course, in the same degree, abstracting his attention from that which ought to occupy it exclusively.

It is not, indeed, desirable, that in reading the Bible, for example, or any thing which is not intended to appear as his own composition, he should deliver what are,

site extremes. But it should be remembered that this middle course entirely nullifies the whole advantage proposed by the plan recommended. A reader is sure to pay *too much* attention to his voice, not only if he pays *any at all*, but if he does not strenuously *labour to withdraw* his attention from it altogether.

* Who, for instance, that was really *thinking* of a resurrection from the dead, would ever tell any one that our Lord "rose *again* from the dead;" (which is so common a mode of reading the Creed,) as if He had done so more than once? It is to be observed, however, that it is not enough for a reader to have his mind fixed on the *subject*; without regard to the *occasion*, &c. It is possible to *read* a prayer well, with the tone and manner of a man who is not *praying*, i. e. addressing the Deity, but addressing the *audience* and *reciting* a form of words for their instruction: and such is generally the case with those who are commended as "fine readers" of the Liturgy. Extemporaneous prayers are generally delivered, with spirit indeed, but (after the few first sentences) not *as* prayers, but as *exhortations* to the congregation

avowedly, another's sentiments, in the same style, as if they were such as arose in his own mind; but it is desirable that he should deliver them as if he were *reporting* another's sentiments, which were both fully understood, and felt in all their force by the reporter; and the only way to do this effectually, — with such modulations of voice, &c. as are suitable to each word and passage, — is to fix his mind earnestly on the *meaning*, and leave nature and habit to suggest the utterance.

§ 4.

Difficulties in the natural manner.

Some may, perhaps, suppose that this amounts to the same thing as *taking no pains at all;* and if, with this impression, they attempt to try the experiment of a natural delivery, their ill-success will probably lead them to censure the proposed method, for the failure resulting from their own mistake. In truth, it is by no means a very easy task, to fix the attention on the meaning, in the manner and to the degree now proposed. The thoughts of one who is reading any thing very familiar to him, are apt to wander to *other* subjects, though perhaps such as are connected with that which is before him; if, again, it be something new to him, he is apt (not indeed to wander to *another* subject, but) to get the start, as it were, of his readers, and to be thinking, while uttering each sentence, not, of that, but of the sentence which comes next. And in both cases, if he is careful to avoid those faults, and is desirous of reading well, it is a matter of no small difficulty, and calls for a constant effort, to prevent the mind from wandering in another direction; viz. into thoughts respecting his own voice, — respecting the effect produced by each sound, —

the approbation he hopes for from the hearers, &c. And this is the prevailing fault of those who are commonly said to take *great pains* in their reading; pains which will always be taken in vain, with a view to the true object to be aimed at, as long as the effort is thus applied in a wrong direction. With a view, indeed, to a very different object, the approbation bestowed on the reading, this artificial delivery will often be more successful than the natural. Pompous spouting, and many other descriptions of unnatural tone and measured cadence, are frequently admired by many as excellent reading; which admiration is itself a proof that it is not deserved; for when the Delivery *is really* good, the hearers (except any one who may deliberately set himself to observe and criticise) never think about it, but are exclusively occupied with the sense it conveys, and the feelings it excites.

Still more to increase the difficulty of the method here recommended, (for it is no less wise than honest to take a fair view of difficulties,) this circumstance is to be noticed, that he who is endeavouring to bring it into practice, is in a great degree precluded from the advantage of *imitation*. A person who hears and approves a good *reader in the Natural manner*, may, indeed, so far imitate him with advantage, as to *adopt his plan*, of fixing his attention on the matter, and not thinking about his voice; but this very plan, evidently, by its nature, precludes any further imitation; for if, while reading, he is thinking of copying the manner of his model, he will, for that very reason, be unlike that model; the main principle of the proposed method being, carefully to exclude every such

Advantages of imitation precluded by the adoption of the natural manner.

thought. Whereas, any artificial system may as easily be learned by imitation as the notes of a song.

Practice also (i. e. private practice for the sake of learning) is much more difficult in the proposed method; because the rule being to use such a delivery as is suited, not only to the *matter* of what is said, but also, of course, to the *place*, and *occasion*, and this, not by any studied modulations, but according to the spontaneous suggestions of the matter, place, and occasion, to one whose mind is fully and exclusively occupied with these, it follows, that he who would practise this method in *private*, must, by a strong effort of a vivid imagination, figure to himself a place and an occasion which are not present; otherwise, he will either be *thinking of his delivery*, (which is fatal to his proposed object,) or else will use a delivery suited to the situation in which he actually *is*, and not, to that for which he would prepare himself. Any system, on the contrary, of studied emphasis and regulation of the voice, may be learned in private practice, as easily as singing.

Advantages of practice precluded by the adoption of the Natural manner.

CHAP. III.

Considerations arising from the differences between Reading and Speaking.

§ 1.

Some additional objections to the method I have recommended, and some further remarks on the counterbal

ancing advantages of it, will be introduced presently, when I shall have first offered some observations on *Speaking*, and on that branch of Reading which the most nearly approaches to it.

When any one delivers a written composition, of which he is, or is supposed to profess himself, the author, he has peculiar difficulties to encounter,* if his object be to approach as nearly as possible to the extemporaneous style.

*It must be admitted, however, that (to the members of our Church) the difficulty of reading the Liturgy with spirit, and even with propriety, is something peculiar, on account of (what has been already remarked) the inveterate and long-established faults to which almost every one's ears are become familiar; so that such a delivery as would shock any one of even moderate taste, in any other composition, he will, in this, be likely to tolerate, and to practise. Some, e. g. in the Liturgy, read, "have mercy *upon* us, miserable sinners" and others, "have mercy upon *us*, miserable sinners;" both laying the stress on a wrong word, and making the pause in the wrong place, so as to disconnect "us" and "miserable sinners," which the context requires us to combine. Every one, in expressing his own natural sentiments, would say "have *mercy*, upon us-miserable-sinners."

Many are apt even to commit so gross an error, as to lay the chief stress on the words which denote the *most important things*; without any consideration of the emphatic *word* of each sentence: e. g. in the Absolution many read, "let us beseech Him to grant us *true repentance*;" because forsooth "true repentance" is an important thing; not considering that, as it has been just mentioned, it is not the *new idea*, and that to which the attention should be directed by the emphasis; the sense being, that since God pardoneth all that have true repentance, therefore, we should "beseech Him to *grant* it to *us*."

In addition to the other difficulties of reading the Liturgy well, it should be mentioned, that prayer, thanksgiving, and the like, even when avowedly not of our own composition, should be delivered as (what in truth they ought to *be*) the genuine sentiments of our own minds at the moment of utterance; which is not the case with the Scriptures, or with any thing else that is read, not professing to be the speaker's own composition.

It is indeed impossible to produce the *full* effect of that style, while the audience are aware that the words he utters are before him: but he may approach indefinitely near to such an effect; and in proportion as he succeeds in this object, the impression produced will be the greater. It has been already remarked, how easy it is for the hearers to keep up their attention, — indeed, how difficult for them to withdraw it, — when they are addressed by one who is *really speaking* to them in a natural and earnest manner; though perhaps the discourse may be incumbered with a good deal of the repetition, awkwardness of expression and other faults incident to extemporaneous language; and though it be prolonged for an hour or two, and yet contain no more matter than a good *writer* could have clearly expressed in a discourse of half an hour; which last, if read to them, would not, without some effort on their part, have so fully detained their attention. The advantage in point of style, arrangement, &c. of written, over extemporaneous discourses, (such at least as any but the most accomplished orators can produce,) is sufficiently evident: * and it is evident also that

Comparative advantages of written and extemporary addresses.

*Practice in public speaking, generally, — practice in speaking on the particular subject in hand, — and (on each occasion) premeditation of the matter and arrangement, are all circumstances of great consequence to a speaker. Nothing but a *miraculous gift* can supersede these advantages. The Apostles accordingly were forbidden *to use any premeditation*, being assured that "it should be *given* them, in that same hour, what they should say:" and when they found, in effect, this promise fulfilled to them, they had experience, within themselves, of a sensible miracle. This circumstance may furnish a person of sincerity with a useful test for distinguishing (in his own case) the emotions of a fervid imagination, from actual inspiration.

other advantages, such as have been just alluded to, belong to the latter. Which is to be preferred on each occasion, and by each orator, it does not belong to the present discussion to enquire ; but it is evidently of the highest importance, to *combine* as far as possible, in each case, the advantages of both.

A perfect familiarity with the rules laid down in the first part of this Treatise, would be likely, it is hoped, to give the extemporaneous orator that habit of *quickly* methodizing his thoughts on a given subject, which is essential (at least where no very long premeditation is allowed) to give to a *speech* something of the weight of argument, and clearness of arrangement, which characterize good Writing.* In order to attain the corresponding advantage, — to impart to the delivery of a written discourse, something of the vivacity and interesting effect of real, earnest *speaking*, the plan to be pursued, conformably with the principles I have been maintaining, is, for the reader to draw off his mind as much as possible from the thought that he *is* reading, as well as from all thought

It is evident that an *inspired* preacher can have nothing to gain from practice, or study of any kind : he therefore who finds himself *improve* by practice, either in Argument, Style, or Delivery, — or who observes that he speaks more fluently and better on subjects on which he has been *accustomed* to speak, — or better, with *premeditation*, than on a sudden, may indeed deceive his hearers by a pretence to inspiration, but can hardly deceive *himself*.

* Accordingly, it may be remarked, that, (contrary to what might at first sight be supposed,) though the preceding parts, as well as the present, are intended for general application, yet it is to the *extemporary speaker* that the rules laid down in the former part (supposing them correct) will be the most peculiarly useful; while the suggestions offered in this last, respecting Elocution, are more especially designed for the use of the *reader*.

respecting his own utterance : — to fix his mind as earnestly as possible on the *matter*, and to strive to adopt as his *own*, and as his *own at the moment* of utterance, every sentiment he delivers ; — and to *say* it to the audience, in the manner which the occasion and subject spontaneously suggest to him who has abstracted his mind both from all consideration of *himself*, and from the consideration that he is reading.

§ 2.

The advantage of this NATURAL MANNER, (i. e. the manner which one naturally falls into who is *really speaking*, in earnest, and with a mind *exclusively* intent on what he has to say,) may be estimated from this consideration ; that there are few who do not *speak* so as to give effect to what they are saying. Some, indeed, do this much better than others : — some have, in ordinary conversation, an indistinct or incorrect pronunciation, — an embarrassed and hesitating utterance, or a bad choice of words : but hardly any one fails to deliver (when speaking earnestly) what he does say, so as to convey the sense and the force of it, much more completely than even a good reader would, if those same words were written down and read.* The latter might, indeed, be more *approv-*

Most men speak well in common discourse

* There is, indeed, a wide difference between different men, in respect of the degrees of impressiveness with which, in earnest conversation, they deliver their sentiments ; but it may safely be laid down that he who delivers a written composition with the same degree of spirit and energy with which he would naturally speak on the same subject, has attained, not indeed, necessarily, *absolute* perfection, but the utmost excellence attainable by *him*. Any attempt to outdo his own Natural manner, will inevitably lead to something worse than failure.

ed ; but that is not the present question ; which is, concerning the *impression* made on the hearers' minds. It is not the polish of the blade, that is to be considered, or the grace with which it is brandished, but the keenness of the edge, and the weight of the stroke.

On the contrary, it can hardly be denied that the elocution of most readers, when delivering their own compositions, is such as to convey the notion, at the very best, not that the preacher is expressing his own real sentiments, but that he is making known to his audience what is written in the book before him : and, whether the composition is professedly the reader's own, or not, the usual mode of delivery, though grave and decent, is so remote from the energetic style of real Natural Speech, as to furnish, if one may so speak, a kind of running comment on all that is uttered, which says, "I do not mean, think, or feel, all this ; I only mean to recite it with propriety and decorum :" and what is usually called *fine* Reading, only superadds to this, (as has been above remarked,) a kind of admonition to the hearers, that *they* ought to believe, to feel, and to admire, what is read.

§ 3.

Natural manner not to be confounded with the familiar.

It is easy to anticipate an objection which many will urge against, what they will call, a *colloquial* style of delivery; viz. that it is indecorous, and unsuitable to the solemnity of a serious, and especially, of a religious discourse. The objection is founded on a mistake. Those who urge it, derive all their notions of a Natural Delivery from two, irrelevant, instances ; that of ordinary conversation, the usual subjects of which, and consequently its usual tone, are

comparatively light ; — and, that of the coarse and extravagant rant of vulgar fanatical preachers. But to conclude that the objections against either of these styles, would apply to the Natural Delivery of a man of sense and taste, speaking earnestly, on a serious subject, and on a solemn occasion, or that he would naturally adopt, and is here advised to adopt, such a style as those objected to, is no less absurd than if any one, being recommended to walk in a natural and unstudied manner, rather than in a dancing step, (to employ Dr. A. Smith's illustration,) or a formal march, should infer that the natural gait of a clown following the plough, or of a child in its gambols, were proposed as models to be imitated in walking across a room. Should any one on being told that both tragic-acting and comic-acting ought to be a *natural representation* of man, interpret this to mean that Tragedy ought to be performed *exactly like* Comedy, he would be thought very absurd, if he were supposed to be speaking seriously. It is evident, that what is *natural* in one case, or for one person, may be, in a different one, very unnatural. It would not be by any means natural, to an educated and sober-minded man, to speak like an illiterate enthusiast ; nor to discourse on the most important matters in the tone of familiar conversation respecting the trifling occurrences of the day. Any one who does but notice the style in which a man of ability, and of good choice of words, and utterance, delivers his sentiments in *private*, when he is, for instance, earnestly and seriously admonishing a friend, — defending the doctrines of religion, — or speaking on any other grave subject on which he is intent, may easily observe, how different his tone is from that of *light* and familiar

conversation, — how far from deficient in the decent seriousness which befits the case: even a stranger to the language might guess that he was not engaged in any frivolous topic; and when an opportunity occurs of observing how he delivers a written discourse, of his own composition, on perhaps the very same, or a similar subject, one may generally perceive how comparatively stiff, languid, and unimpressive is the effect.

Natural manner is accommodated to the place, subject, and occasion.

It may be said indeed, that a sermon should not be preached before a congregation assembled in a place of worship, in the same style as one would employ in conversing across a table, with equal seriousness, on the same subject. this is undoubtedly true: and it is evident that it *has been implied* in what has here been said; the Natural-manner having been described as accommodated, not only to the *subject*, but to the *place*, *occasion*, and all other circumstances; so that he who should preach exactly as if he were speaking in private, though with the utmost earnestness, on the same subject, would, so far, be *departing* from the genuine Natural-manner. But it may be safely asserted, that even *this* would be far the less fault of the two. He who appears unmindful, indeed, of the place and occasion, but deeply impressed with the *subject*, and utterly forgetful of himself, would produce a much stronger effect than one, who, going into the opposite extreme, is, indeed, mindful of the place and the occasion, but not fully occupied with the subject, (though he may strive to *appear* so;) being partly engaged in thoughts respecting his own voice. The latter would, indeed, be the less likely to incur censure; but the other would produce the deeper impression.

The object, however, to be aimed at, (and it is not unattainable,) is to avoid *both* faults; — to keep the mind impressed both with the matter spoken, and with all the circumstances also of each case, so that the voice may spontaneously accommodate itself to *all*; carefully avoiding all studied modulations, and, in short, all thoughts of *self*; which, in proportion as they intrude, will not fail to diminish the effect.

§ 4.

A familiar delivery one species of the natural.

It must be admitted, indeed, that the different kinds of Natural delivery of any one individual on different subjects and occasions, various as they are, do yet bear a much greater resemblance to each other, than any of them does to the Artificial-style usually employed in reading; a proof of which is, that a person familiarly acquainted with the speaker, will seldom fail to *recognise his voice*, amidst all the variations of it, when he is *speaking* naturally and earnestly; though it will often happen that, if he have never before heard him *read*, he will be at a loss, when he happens accidently to hear without seeing him, to know who it is that is reading; so widely does the artificial cadence and intonation differ in many instances from the natural. And a consequence of this is, that the Natural-manner, however perfect, — however exactly accommodated to the subject, place, and occasion, — will, even when these are the most solemn, in some degree *remind* the hearers of the tone of conversation. Amidst all the differences that will exist, this one point of resemblance, — that of the delivery being unforced and unstudied, — will be likely, in some degree, to strike them. Those who are good

judges will perceive at once, and the rest, after being a little accustomed to the Natural-manner, that there is not necessarily any thing irreverent or indecorous in it; but that, on the contrary, it conveys the idea of the speaker's being deeply impressed with that which is his proper business. But, for a time, many will be disposed to find fault with such a kind of elocution; and, in particular, to complain of its indicating a want of respect for the audience. Yet even while this disadvantage continues a preacher of this kind may be assured that the *doctrine* he delivers is much more forcibly impressed, even on those who censure his style of delivering it, than it could be in the other way.

A discourse delivered in this style has been known to elicit the remark, from one of the lower orders, who had never been accustomed to any thing of the kind, that "it was an excellent sermon, and it was great pity it had not been *preached*:" a censure which ought to have been very satisfactory to the preacher: had he employed a pompous spout, or modulated whine, it is probable such an auditor would have admired his *preaching*, but would have known and thought little or nothing about the *matter* of what was taught.

Which of the two objects ought to be preferred by a Christian Minister, on Christian principles, is a question, not indeed hard to decide, but foreign to the present discussion: it is important, however, to remark, that an Orator is bound, as such, not merely on moral, but if such an expression may be used, on *rhetorical* principles, to be mainly, and indeed exclusively, intent on *carrying his point*; not, on gaining approbation, or even avoiding censure, except with a view to that point. He

should, as it were, adopt as a motto, the reply of Themistocles to the Spartan commander, Eurybiades, who lifted his staff to chastise the earnestness with which his own opinion was controverted; "Strike, but hear me."

I would not, indeed, undertake to maintain (like Quinctilian) that no one can be an Orator who is not a virtuous man; but there certainly is a kind of moral excellence implied in that renunciation of all effort after display, — in that forgetfulness of self, — which is absolutely necessary, both in the manner of writing, and in the delivery, to give the full force to what is said.

§ 5.

Besides the inconvenience just mentioned, — the censure, which the proposed style of elocution will be liable to, from perhaps the majority of hearers, till they shall have become somewhat accustomed to it, — this circumstance also ought to be mentioned, among what many, perhaps, would reckon (or at least feel) as the disadvantages of it; that, after all, even when no disapprobation is incurred, no *praise* will be bestowed, (except, by observant critics,) on a truly natural delivery: on the contrary the more perfect it is, the more will it withdraw, from itself, to the arguments and sentiments delivered, the attention of all but those who are studiously directing their view to the mode of utterance, with a design to criticise or to learn. The credit, on the contrary, of having a very fine elocution is to be obtained at the expense of a very moderate share of pains; though at the expense also, inevitably, of much of the force of what is said.

Natural manner not praised.

§ 6

Bashfulness felt on first adopting the Natural manner.

One inconvenience, which will at first be experienced by a person who, after having been long accustomed to the Artificial delivery, begins to adopt the Natural, is, that he will be likely suddenly to feel an embarrassed, bashful, and, as it is frequently called, *nervous* sensation, to which he had before been comparatively a stranger. He will find himself in a new situation, — standing before his audience in a different character, — stripped, as it were, of the sheltering veil of a conventional and artificial delivery; — in short, delivering to them his thoughts, as one man *speaking to* other men; not, as before, merely *reading in public*. And he will feel that he attracts a much greater share of their attention, not only by the novelty of a manner to which most congregations are little accustomed, but also, (even supposing them to have been accustomed to extemporary discourses,) from their perceiving themselves to be personally *addressed*, and feeling that he is not merely reciting something *before* them, but saying it *to* them. The speaker and the hearers will thus be brought into a new and closer relation to each other: and the increased interest thus excited in the audience, will cause the Speaker to feel himself in a different situation, — in one which is a greater trial of his confidence, and which renders it more difficult than before to with draw his attention from himself. It is hardly necessary to observe that this very change of feelings experienced by the speaker, ought to convince him the more, if the causes of it (to which I have just alluded) be attentively considered, how much greater impression this manner is likely to produce. As he will be likely to feel much of

the bashfulness which a really extemporary speaker has to struggle against, so he may produce much of a similar effect.

After all, however, the effect will never be completely the same. A composition delivered from writing, and one actually extemporaneous, will always produce feelings, both in the hearer and the speaker, considerably different; even on the supposition of their being word for word the same, and delivered so exactly in the same tone, that by the ear alone no difference could be detected: still the audience will be differently affected, according to their knowledge that the words uttered, are, or are not, written down and before the speaker's eyes: and the consciousness of this will produce a corresponding effect on the mind of the speaker. For were this not so, any one who, on any subject, can speak (as many can) fluently and correctly in private conversation, would find no greater difficulty in saying the same things before a large congregation, than in reading to them a written discourse.

§ 7.

Enquiry respecting the bashfulness felt in addressing a large audience.

And here it may be worth while briefly to enquire into the causes of that remarkable phenomenon, as it may justly be accounted, that a person who is able with facility to express his sentiments in private to a friend, in such language and in such a manner, as would be perfectly suitable to a certain audience, yet finds it extremely difficult to address to that audience the very same words, in the same manner; and is, in many instances, either completely struck dumb, or greatly embarrassed, when

he attempts it.* It cannot be from any superior deference which he thinks it right to feel for their judgment; for it will often happen that the single friend, to whom he is able to speak fluently, shall be one whose good opinion he more values, and to whose wisdom he is more disposed to look up, than of all the others together The speaker may even feel that he himself has a decided and acknowledged superiority over every one of the audience; and that he should not be the least abashed in addressing any two or three of them, separately; yet still all of them, collectively, will often inspire him with a kind of dread.

Powerful excitement produced in a large audience.

Closely allied in its causes with the phenomenon I am considering, is that other curious fact, that the very same sentiments expressed in the same manner, will often have a far more powerful effect on a large audience, than they would have on any one or two of these very persons, separately. That is in a great degree true of all men, which was said of the Athenians, that they were like sheep, of which a flock is more easily driven than a single one.

Different language employed according to the number addressed.

Another remarkable circumstance, connected with the foregoing, is the difference in respect of the style which is suitable, respectively, in addressing a multitude, and two or three even of the same persons. A much *bolder*, as well as less accurate, kind of language is both allowable and advisable, in speaking to a considerable number; as

* Most persons are so *familiar* with the fact, as hardly to have ever considered that it requires explanation: but attentive consideration, shews it to be a very curious, as well as important one.

Aristotle has remarked,* in speaking of the *Graphic* and *Agonistic* styles, — the former, suited to the closet, the latter, to public speaking before a large assembly. And he ingeniously compares them to the different styles of painting; the greater the crowd, he says, the more distant is the view; so that in scene-painting, for instance, coarser and bolder touches are required, and the nice finish, which would delight a close spectator, would be lost. He does not, however, account for the phenomena in question.

§ 8.

The phenomena referred to reflex sympathy.

The solution of them will be found by attention to a very curious and complex play of sympathies which takes place in a large assembly; and, (within certain limits,) the more, in proportion to its numbers. First, it is to be observed that we are disposed to sympathise with any emotion which we believe to exist in the mind of any one present; and hence, if we are at the same time otherwise disposed to feel that emotion, such disposition is in consequence heightened. In the next place, we not only ourselves feel this tendency, but we are sensible that others do the same; and thus, we sympathize not only with the other emotions of the rest, but also, with their sympathy towards us. Any emotion accordingly which we feel, is still further heightened by the knowledge that there are others present who not only feel the same, but feel it the more strongly in consequence of their sympathy with ourselves. Lastly, we are sensible that

* *Rhetoric*, book iii.

those around us sympathize not only with ourselves, but with each other also: and as we enter into this heightened feeling of theirs likewise, the stimulus to our own minds is thereby still further increased.

The case of the *Ludicrous* affords the most obvious illustration of these principles, from the circumstance that the effects produced are so open and palpable. If any thing of this nature occurs, a man is disposed, by the character of the thing itself, to laugh: but much more, if any one else is known to be present whom he thinks likely to be diverted with it; even though that other should not know of the presence of the first; but much more still, if he does know it; because his companion is then aware that sympathy with his own emotion heightens that of the other: and most of all will the disposition to laugh be increased, if many are present; because each is then aware that they all sympathize with each other, as well as with himself. It is hardly necessary to mention the exact correspondence of the fact with the above explanation. So important, in this case, is the operation of the causes here noticed, that hardly any one ever laughs when he is quite alone: or if he does, he will find on consideration, that it is from a *conception* of the presence of some companion whom he thinks likely to have been amused, had he been present, and to whom he thinks of describing, or repeating, what had diverted himself. Indeed, in other cases, as well as the one just instanced, almost every one is aware of the *infectious* nature of any emotion excited in a large assembly. It may be compared to the increase of sound by a number of echoes, or of light, by a number of mirrors; or to the blaze of a heap of

firebrands, each of which would speedily have gone out if kindled separately, but which, when thrown together, help to kindle each other.

The application of what has been said to the case before us, is sufficiently obvious. The speaker who is addressing a large assembly, knows that each of them sympathizes both with his own anxiety to acquit himself well, and also with the same feeling in the minds of the rest. He knows also, that every slip he may be guilty of, that may tend to excite ridicule, pity, disgust, &c. makes the stronger impression on each of the hearers, from their mutual sympathy, and their consciousness of it. This augments his anxiety. Next, he knows that each hearer, putting himself, mentally, in the speaker's place,* sympathises with this augmented anxiety; which is by this thought increased still further. And if he becomes at all embarrassed, the knowledge that there are so many to sympathize, not only with that embarrassment, but also with each other's feelings on the perception of it, heightens the speaker's confusion to the utmost.

The same causes will account for a skilful orator's being able to rouse so much more easily, and more powerfully, the passions of a *multitude:* they inflame each other by mutual sympathy, and mutual consciousness of it. And hence it is that a bolder kind of language is suitable to such an audience: a passage which, in the closet, might just at the first glance tend to excite awe, compassion, indignation, or any

* Hence it is that *shy* persons are, as is matter of common remark, the more distressed by this infirmity when in company with those who are subject to the same.

other such emotion, but which would, on a moment's cool reflection, appear extravagant, may be very suitable for the *Agonistic* style; because before that moment's reflection could take place in each hearer's mind, he would be aware that every one around him sympathized in that first emotion; which would thus become so much heightened as to preclude, in a great degree, the ingress of any counteracting sentiment.

If one could suppose such a case as that of a speaker, (himself aware of the circumstance,) addressing a multitude, each of whom believed himself to be the *sole* hearer, it is probable that little or no embarrassment would be felt, and a much more sober, calm, and finished style of language would be adopted.

§ 9.

Sympathy with the extemporaneous speaker in surmounting his difficulty.

The impossibility of bringing the delivery of a written composition *completely* to a level with real extemporary speaking, (though, as has been said, it may approach indefinitely near to such an effect,) is explained on the same principle. Besides that the audience are more sure that the thoughts they hear expressed, are the genuine emanation of the speaker's mind at the moment, * their attention and interest are the more excited by their sympathy with one whom they perceive to be carried forward solely by his own unaided and unremitted efforts, without having any book to refer to: they view him as a swimmer supported by his own constant exertions; and in every such case, if the feat be well accomplished, the *surmounting of the difficulty* affords great gratification; especially to those who are conscious that they could not do the same. And one proof, that part of the pleasure conveyed does arise from this source, is, that as the spectators of an exhibition of supposed unusual skill in swimming, would instantly withdraw most of their interest and admiration, if they perceived that the performer was supported by corks, or the like; so would the feelings alter of the hearers of a supposed extemporaneous discourse, as soon as they should perceive, or even suspect, that the orator had it written down before him.

* It is not meant by this that an extemporary *speaker* necessarily *composes* (in respect of his matter) extempore, or that he professes to do so: but only, that if he *frames each sentence* at the moment, he must, at that moment, have the sentiment which is expressed in it, strongly present to his mind.

§ 10.

Remedy proposed.

The way in which the respective inconveniences of both kinds of discourses may best be avoided, is evident from what has been already said. Let both the extemporary Speaker, and the Reader of his own compositions, study to avoid, as far as possible, all thoughts of *self*, earnestly fixing the mind on the matter of what is delivered; and the one will feel the less of that embarrassment which arises from the thought of what opinion the hearers will form of him; while the other will appear to be speaking, because he actually *will be* speaking, the sentiments, not indeed which at that time first *arise* in his own mind, but, which are then really *present* to, and occupy, his mind.

CHAP. IV.

Practical deductions from the foregoing views.

§ 1.

Original compositions suitable to the natural delivery.

One of the consequences of the adoption of the mode of elocution here recommended, is, that he who endeavours to employ it will find a growing reluctance to the delivery, as his own, of any but his own compositions. Doctrines, indeed, and arguments he will freely borrow; but he will be led to compose his own discourses, from finding that he cannot deliver those of another to his own satisfaction, without laboriously studying them, as an actor does his part, so as to *make* them, in some measure, his own. And with this view, he will generally find it advisable to introduce many alterations in the expression, not with any thought of improving the style, *absolutely*, but only with a view to his *own delivery*. And indeed, even his own previous compositions, he will be led to alter, almost as much, in point of expression, in order to accommodate them to the Natural manner of delivery.* Much that would please in the closet, — much of the *Graphic* style described by Aristotle, will be laid aside for the *Agonistic*; — for a style somewhat more blunt and homely, — more simple and, apparently, unstudied in its structure, and, at the same time, more daringly energetic. And if again he is desirous of fitting

* In many instances accordingly, the perusal of a manuscript sermon would afford, from the observation of its style, a tolerably good ground of conjecture as to the author's customary elocution.

his discourses for the press, he will find it expedient to reverse this process, and alter the style afresh.

A mere *sermon-reader*, on the contrary, will avoid this inconvenience, and this labour; he will be able to preach another's discourses nearly as well as his own; and may send his own to the press, without the necessity of any great preparation: but he will purchase these advantages at the expense of more than half the force which might have been given to the sentiments uttered.* And he will have no right to complain that his discourses, though replete perhaps with good sense, learning, and eloquence, are received with languid apathy, or that many are seduced from their attendance on his teaching, by the vapid rant of an illiterate fanatic. Much of these evils must, indeed, be expected, after all, to remain: but he does not give himself a fair chance for diminishing them, unless he does justice to his own arguments, instructions, and exhortations, by *speaking* them, in the only effectual way, to the hearts of his hearers; that is, as uttered naturally *from* his own.

The principles here laid down may help to explain a remarkable fact which is usually attributed to other than the true causes. The powerful effects often produced by some fanatical preachers, not superior in pious and sincere zeal, and inferior in learning, in good sense, and in taste, to men who are listened to with comparative apa-

* I have seen some where an anecdote of some celebrated actor being asked by a divine, "How is it that people listen with so much emotion to what you say, which they know to be all fictitious, besides that it would be no concern of theirs, even if true; while they hear with comparative apathy from us, truths, the most sublime, and the most important to them?" The answer was, "Because we deliver fiction like truth, and you deliver truth like fiction."

thy, are frequently considered as a proof of superior *eloquence*; though an eloquence tarnished by barbarism, and extravagant mannerism. But may not such effects result, not from any superior powers in the preacher, but merely from the intrinsic beauty and sublimity, and the measureless importance of the *subject*? Why then, it may be replied, does not the other preacher, whose subject is the very same, produce the same effect? The answer is, because he is but *half-attended to*. The ordinary measured cadence of reading, is not only in itself dull, but is what men are *familiarly* accustomed to: Religion itself also, is a subject so *familiar*, in a certain sense, (familiar, that is, to the *ear*,) as to be *trite*, even to those who *know* and *think* little about it. Let but the attention be thoroughly roused, and intently fixed on such a stupendous subject, and that subject itself will produce the most overpowering emotion. And not only unaffected earnestness of manner, but, perhaps, even still more, any uncouth oddity, and even ridiculous extravagance, will, by the stimulus of *novelty*, have the effect of thus rousing the hearers from their ordinary lethargy. So that a preacher of little or no real eloquence, will sometimes, *on such a subject*, produce the effects of the greatest eloquence, by merely forcing the hearers (often, even by the excessively glaring *faults* of his style and delivery) to *attend*, to a subject which no one can *really* attend to unmoved.

It will not of course be supposed that my intention is to *recommend* the adoption of extravagant rant. The good effects which it undoubtedly does sometimes produce, incidentally, in some, is more than counterbalanced by the mischievous consequences to others.

§ 2.

Practice of recitation at schools injurious

One important practical maxim resulting from the views here taken, is the decided condemnation of all *recitation of speeches* by school-boys; a practice so much approved and recommended by many, with a view to preparing youths for public Speaking in after life. It is to be condemned, however, (supposing the foregoing principle correct,) not as useless merely, but absolutely pernicious, with a view to that object. The *justness*, indeed, of this opinion will, doubtless, be disputed; but its *consistency* with the plan I have been recommending, is almost too obvious to be insisted on. In any one who should think a Natural delivery desirable, it would be an obvious absurdity to think of attaining it by practising that which is the most completely artificial. If there is, as is evident, much difficulty to be surmounted, even by one who is delivering, on a serious occasion, his own composition, before he can completely succeed in abstracting his mind from all thoughts of his own voice, — of the judgment of the audience on his performance, &c. and in fixing it on the Matter, Occasion, and Place, — on every circumstance which *ought* to give the character to his elocution, — how much must this difficulty be enhanced, when neither the sentiments he is to utter, nor the character he is to assume, are his own, or even supposed to be so, or anywise connected with him: — when neither the place, the occasion, nor the audience, which are *actually present*, have any thing to do with the substance of what is said It is therefore almost inevitable, that he will stu

diously form to himself an Artificial manner; * which, especially if he succeed in it, will probably cling to him through life, even when he is delivering his own compositions on real occasions. The very best that can be expected, is, that he should become an accomplished *actor*, — possessing the *plastic* power of putting himself, in imagination, so completely into the situation of him whom he personates, and of adopting, for the moment, so perfectly, all the sentiments and views of that character, as to express himself exactly as such a person would have done, in the supposed situation. Few are likely to attain such perfection; but he who shall have succeeded in accomplishing this, will have taken a most circuitous route to his proposed object, if that object be, not to qualify himself for the Stage, but to be able impressively to deliver in public, on real and important occasions, his own sentiments. He will have been carefully learning to *assume*, what, when the real occasion occurs, need not be assumed, but only *expressed*. Nothing surely can be more preposterous than labouring to acquire the art of *pretending* to be what he is *not*, and, to feel, what he does not, in order that he may be enabled, on a real emergency, to *pretend* to be and to feel just what the occasion itself requires and suggests: in short, to *personate himself*.†

* Some have used the expression of "a *conscious* manner," to denote that which results (either in conversation, — in the ordinary actions of life, — or in public speaking) from the anxious attention which some persons feel to the opinion the company may form of them; — a *consciousness* of being watched and scrutinized in every word and gesture, together with an extreme anxiety for approbation, and dread of censure.

† The Barmecide, in the *Arabian Nights*, who amused himself by setting down his guest to an imaginary feast, and trying his skill in imitating, at an empty table, the actions of eating and drinking, did not propose this as an advisable mode of instructing him how to perform those actions in reality.

Let all studied recitation therefore, — every kind of speaking which from its nature must necessarily be artificial, — be carefully avoided, by one whose object is to attain the only truly impressive, — the Natural Delivery.

It should be observed, that the censure here pronounced on school-recitations, and all exercises of the like nature, relates, exclusively, to the effect produced on the style of *Elocution*. With any other objects that may be proposed, the present work has, obviously, no concern. Nor can it be doubted that a familiarity with the purest forms of the Latin and Greek languages, may be greatly promoted by committing to memory, and studying, not only to understand, but to recite with propriety, the best orations and plays in those languages. The familiar knowledge too, and temporary adoption, of the characters and sentiments, for instance, of Terence's plays, can hardly fail to produce a powerful effect on the moral character. If the *spectators* of a play which strongly interests them are in any degree disposed (as the Poet expresses it) to "live o'er each scene, and be what they behold," much more may this be expected in the *actor*, who studies to give the fullest effect to his performance, by fancying himself, as far as possible, the person he represents. If any one, therefore, is more anxious for his son's proficiency in the Latinity, and in the morality, of Terence, than for his excellence in public speaking, he is right in encouraging such exercises.*

* To those who do wish their sons to imbibe the morality of Terence, I have, of course, nothing more to say. But if there are any,

But let no one seek to attain a natural, simple, and forcible *Elocution*, by a practice which, the more he applies to it, will carry him still the farther from the object he aims at.

What has been said may perhaps be considered by some as applicable only in the case where the design is merely to qualify a man for extemporaneous *speaking*; not for delivering a *written* discourse with the effect of one that is actually extemporaneous. For it may be

as I must hope there are not a few, who would deprecate such a result, and who yet patronize the practice in question, I cannot but express my unfeigned wonder at their doing so. Can they doubt that *some* effect is likely to be produced on a young and unformed mind, forwarder in passions than in reason, by — not *reading* merely — not *learning by heart* merely — but studying as an actor, and striving to deliver with effect, the part of an accomplished debauchee? And this too, such a character as Terence's poetical justice never fails to crown with success and applause. The foulest obscenity, such as would create disgust in any delicate mind, would probably be less likely to corrupt the principles, than the more gentleman-like profligacy, which is not merely represented, but recommended in Terence; and which approaches but too nearly to what the youth may find exemplified among the higher classes in this country.

Will it be answered that because these same boys are taught to say their Catechism — are sent to Chapel — and are given to understand that they are not to take Pamphilus as a model, a sufficient safeguard is thus provided, against the effects of an assiduous effort to gain applause by a lively and spirited representation of such a character? I can only reply, in the words of Thucydides, *ΜΑΚΑΡΙΖΟΝΤΕΣ ΥΜΩΝ ΤΟ ΑΠΕΙΡΟΚΑΚΟΝ, ΟΥ ΖΗΛΟΥΜΕΝ ΤΟ ΑΦΡΟΝ.*

I am aware that I run a risk of giving offence by these remarks; but a sense of duty forbids their suppression. If the practice is capable of vindication, let it receive one: if not, let it be abolished.

Let the experiment be tried, of placing in the hands of the MOTHERS of the boys, when they come to witness the exhibition, a close *translation* of the play their sons are acting. I will be satisfied to abide by the decision of the right-minded and judicious among them.

urged, that he who attempts *this*, must be, to a certain extent, an Actor: he may indeed really think, and strongly feel at the moment, all that he is saying; but though, thus far, no disguise is needed, he cannot, without a distinct effort, deliver what he is, in fact, reading, with the air of one who is *not* reading, but framing each sentence as he delivers it: and to learn to do this, it may be said, practice is requisite; not such practice indeed as that of ordinary school-recitations, which has a directly contrary tendency; but such as *might* be adopted, on the principle above laid down. And it must be admitted, (indeed the remark has been frequently made in the foregoing pages,) that the task of him who delivers a written discourse, is very different from that of the truly extemporary speaker, supposing the object be to produce at all a similar effect. For, as I have formerly observed, what has been here called the *Natural* Delivery, is that which is *natural to the real Speaker* alone; and is by no means what will spontaneously suggest itself to one who has (even his own) written composition before him. To attain the delivery I have been recommending, he must make a strong and continual effort so to withdraw his mind, not only from studied modulation of voice, but from the knowledge that he is reading, — and so to absorb himself, as it were, not only in the general sentiments, but in each separate expression, as to make it thoroughly his own at the moment of utterance. And I am far from supposing that in doing this he will not improve by practice; indeed I have all along implied, that no one can expect at once to attain perfection in it. But whether any such system of recitation as would afford beneficial practice could

be adopted at schools, I am more doubtful. Supposing the established mode of spouting to be totally exploded, and every effort used to make a boy deliver a Speech of Cæsar, for instance, or Lear, in the natural manner, i. e. according to the *Master's* view of what is natural, the learner himself will be reciting in a manner, *to him*, wholly artificial; not merely because he is reading, or repeating from memory, what he is endeavouring to utter as if extempore; — nor again, merely because the composition is another's, and the circumstances fictitious; but because the composition, the situation, and the circumstances *could not* have been his own. A School-boy has *no* natural way *of his own* to express himself on the topics on which he is made to declaim; because as yet those topics form no part of the furniture of his mind. And thus the object proposed, viz. to qualify him for delivering well, on real occasions, his own, *or such as his own*, written compositions, will have been defeated; and we shall have anticipated, and corrupted, by a studied elocution, what would have been his own natural mode of expressing himself on such occasions.

However serviceable practice may be, there is none I think that will not do more harm than good, except the practice of reciting, either on real occasions, or on such as one can fully conceive and enter into, expressions either actually his own, or at least *such* as he would naturally have uttered on the occasion. Should the School-boy be limited to the recitation of compositions of his own, or of a fellow student, and that too, compositions not written as a task on a given subject, (on such

subjects at least as are usually set for exercises,*) but on some real occasion interesting to a youthful mind, (a narrative e. g. of some recent occurrence, or the like,) a system of practice might perhaps be adopted which would prove beneficial.

Such exercises as these, however, would make but a sorry *display*, in comparison of the customary declamations. The "pomp and circumstance" of annual public recitations has much that is attractive to Masters, Parents, and Scholars; and it is easily believed, by those who wish to believe it, that for a boy who is destined hereafter to speak in public, the practice of making public speeches, and of taking great pains to deliver them well, must be a very beneficial exercise.

§ 3.

Natural delivery more easily heard

The last circumstance to be noticed among the results of the mode of delivery recommended, is, that the speaker will find it much easier, in his Natural manner, to *make himself heard*: he will be heard, that is, much more distinctly, — at a greater distance, — and with far less exertion and fatigue to himself. This is the more necessary to be mentioned, because it is a common, if not a prevailing opinion, that the reverse of this is the fact. There are not a few who assign as a reason for their adoption of a certain unnatural tone and measured cadence, that it is necessary, in order to be heard by a large congregation. But though such an artificial voice and utterance will often appear to produce a *louder sound*, (which is

* See Introd. § 5.

the circumstance that probably deceives such persons,) yet a natural voice and delivery, provided it be clear, though it be less laboured, and may even seem low to those who are near at hand, will be distinctly heard at a much greater distance. The only decisive proof of this must be sought in experience; which will not fail to convince of the truth of it any one who will fairly make the trial.

The requisite degree of loudness will be best obtained, conformably with the principles here inculcated, not by thinking about the voice, but by *looking* at the most *distant* of the hearers, and addressing one's self especially to him. The voice rises *spontaneously*, when we are speaking to a person who is not very near.

It should be added, that a speaker's being well heard does not depend near so much on the *loudness* of the sounds, as on their *distinctness*; and especially on the clear pronunciation of the *consonants*.

That the organs of voice are much less strained and fatigued by the natural action which takes place in real speaking, than by any other, (besides that it is, what might be expected, *a priori*,) is evident from daily experience. An extemporary Speaker will usually be much less exhausted in two hours, than an elaborate reciter (though less distinctly heard) will be, in one. Even the ordinary tone of *reading* aloud is so much more fatiguing than that of conversation, that feeble patients are frequently unable to continue it for a quarter of an hour without great exhaustion; even though they may feel no inconvenience from *talking*, with few or no pauses and in no lower voice, for more than double that time.*

* "We can at will enlarge or diminish the area of the chest, and stop, accelerate, or retard the act of respiration. When we attend to our breathing, and regulate its rate, it quickly becomes fatiguing; but the same happens with any voluntary and habitual action, if we attempt to perform it analytically, by directing the attention to every step in its progress." *Mayo's Physiology*, p. 107.

§ 4.

Recapitulation of advantages and disadvantages.

He then who shall determine to aim at the Natural manner, though he will have to contend with considerable difficulties and discouragements, will not be without corresponding advantages, in the course he is pursuing. He will be at first, indeed, repressed to a greater degree than another by emotions of bashfulness; but it will be more speedily and more completely subdued: the very system pursued, since it forbids all thoughts of *self*, striking at the root of the evil. He will, indeed, on the outset, incur censure, not only critical but moral;—he will be blamed for using a *colloquial* delivery; and the censure will very likely be, as far as relates to his earliest efforts, not wholly undeserved; for his manner *will* probably at first too much resemble that of conversation, though of serious and earnest conversation: but by perseverance he may be sure of avoiding deserved, and of mitigating, and ultimately overcoming, undeserved, censure.

He will, indeed, never be praised for a "very fine delivery;" but his *matter* will not lose the approbation it may deserve; as he will be the more sure of being heard and attended to. He will not, indeed, meet with many who can be regarded as models of the Natural manner; and those he does meet with, he will be precluded, by the nature of the system, from minutely imitating; but

he will have the advantage of carrying within him an *Infallible Guide*, as long as he is careful to follow the suggestions of nature; abstaining from all thoughts respecting his own utterance, and fixing his mind intently on the business he is engaged in.

And though he must not expect to attain perfection at once, he may be assured that, while he steadily adheres to this plan, he is in the right road to it; instead of becoming, as on the other plan, more and more artificial, the longer he studies. And every advance he makes will produce a proportional effect: it will give him more and more of that hold on the attention, the understanding, and the feelings of the audience, which no studied modulation can ever attain. Others indeed may be more successful in escaping censure, and ensuring admiration; but he will far more surpass them, in respect of the proper object of the Orator which is, *to carry his point.*

§ 5.

Action.

Much need not be said on the subject of *Action*, which is at present so little approved, or, designedly, employed, in this country that it is hardly to be reckoned as any part of the Orator's art.

Action, however, seems to be natural to man, when speaking earnestly: but the state of the case at present seems to be, that the disgust excited, on the one hand, by awkward and ungraceful motions, and, on the other, by studied gesticulations, has led to the general disuse of Action altogether; and has induced men to form the habit (for it certainly *is* a *formed* habit) of keeping themselves quite still, or nearly so, when speaking.

This is supposed to be, and perhaps is, the more rational and dignified way of speaking; but so strong is the tendency to indicate vehement internal emotion by some kind of outward gesture, that those who do not encourage or allow themselves in any, frequently fall unconsciously into some awkward trick of swinging the body,* folding a paper, twisting a string, or the like. But when any one is reading, or even speaking, in the Artificial manner, there is little or nothing of this tendency; precisely, because the mind is *not* occupied by that strong internal emotion which occasions it. And the prevalence of this (the artificial) manner may reasonably be conjectured to have led to the disuse of all gesticulation, even in extemporary speakers; because if any one, whose delivery is artificial, does use action, it will of course be, like his voice, studied and artificial; and savouring still more of disgusting affectation, from the circumstance that it evidently might be entirely omitted.† And hence, the practice came to be generally disapproved, and exploded.

Why action is generally disused.

It need only be observed, that, in conformity with the principles maintained throughout this Book, no *care* should, in any case, be taken to use graceful or appro-

* Of one of the ancient Roman Orators it was satirically remarked, (on account of his having this habit,) that he must have learned to speak *in a boat*. Of some other Orators, whose favorite action is rising on tiptoe, it would perhaps have been said, that they had been accustomed to address their audience over a high wall.

† ——*Gratas inter mensas symphonia discors,*
Et crassum unguentum, et Sardo cum melle papaver
Offendunt; poterat duci quia cœna sine istis.
Horace, *Ars Poët.*

priate action; which, if not perfectly unstudied, will always be (as has been just remarked) intolerable. But if any one spontaneously falls into any gestures that are unbecoming, care should *then* be taken to break the habit; and that, not only in public speaking, but on all occasions. The case, indeed, is the same with utterance: if any one has, in common discourse, an indistinct, hesitating, dialectic, or otherwise faulty, delivery, *his* Natural manner certainly is not what he should adopt in public speaking; but he should endeavour, by care, to remedy the defect, not in public speaking only, but in ordinary conversation also. And so also, with respect to attitudes and gestures. It is in these points, principally, if not exclusively, that the remarks of an intelligent friend will be beneficial.

If, again, any one finds himself naturally and spontaneously led to use, in speaking, a moderate degree of action, which he finds from the observation of others not to be ungraceful or inappropriate, there is no reason that he should study to repress this tendency.

§ 6.

Action naturally precedes the words.

It would be inconsistent with the principle just laid down, to deliver any *precepts* for gesture: because the *observance* of even the best conceivable precepts, would by destroying the natural appearance, be fatal to their object: but there is a *remark*, which is worthy of attention, from the illustration it affords of the erroneousness, in detail, as well as in principle, of the ordinary systems of instruction in this point. Boys are generally taught to employ the prescribed action either *after*, or *during* the utterance of the words it is to enforce. The best and most appropriate action must, from this circumstance alone, necessarily appear a feeble affectation. It suggests the idea of a person speaking to those who do not fully understand the language, and striving by signs to explain the meaning of what he has been saying. The very same gesture, had it come at the proper, that is, the *natural* point of time, might perhaps have added greatly to the effect; viz. had it *preceded* somewhat the utterance of the words. *That* is always the natural order of action. An emotion,* struggling for utterance, produces a tendency to a bodily gesture, to express that emotion more *quickly* than *words* can be framed; the words follow, as soon as they *can* be spoken. And this being always the case with a real, earnest, unstudied speaker, this mode of placing the action foremost, gives (if it be otherwise appropriate) the appearance of earnest emotion actually present in the mind. And the reverse of this natural order would alone be sufficient to convert the action of Demosthenes himself into unsuccessful and ridiculous mimicry.

---

* *Format enim Natura prius nos intus ad omnem*
Fortunarum habitum; juvat, aut impellit ad iram
Aut ad humum mœrore gravi deducit, et angit:
Post effert animi motus interprete linguâ.

Horace, *Ars Poët.*

APPENDIX.

Page 29, [A.]

" . . . . . there is a distinction to be made between the *unnatural* and the merely *improbable:* a fiction is unnatural when there is some assignable reason against the events taking place as described,—when men are represented as acting contrary to the character assigned them, or to human nature in general; as when a young lady of seventeen, brought up in ease, luxury, and retirement, with no companions but the narrow-minded and illiterate, displays (as a heroine usually does) under the most trying circumstances, such wisdom, fortitude, and knowledge of the world, as the best instructors and the best examples can rarely produce without the aid of more mature age and longer experience. —On the other hand, a fiction is still *improbable*, though *not unnatural*, when there is no reason to be assigned why things should not take place as represented, except that the *overbalance of chances is* against it; the hero meets in his utmost distress, most opportunely, with the very person to whom he had formerly done a signal service, and who happens to communicate to him a piece of intelligence which sets all to rights. Why should he not meet him as well as any one else? all that can be said is, that there is no reason why he should. The infant who is saved from a wreck, and who afterwards becomes such a constellation of virtues and accomplishments, turns out to be no other than the nephew of the very gentleman, on whose estate the waves had cast

him, and whose lovely daughter he had so long sighed for in vain: there is no reason to be given, except from the calculation of chances, why he should not have been thrown on one part of the coast as well as another. Nay, it would be nothing unnatural, though the most determined novel-reader would be shocked at its improbability, if all the hero's enemies, while they were conspiring his ruin, were to be struck dead together by a lucky flash of lightning: yet many denouements which *are* decidedly unnatural, are better tolerated than this would be. We shall, perhaps, best explain our meaning by examples, taken from a novel of great merit in many respects. When Lord Glenthorn, in whom a most unfavourable education has acted on a most unfavourable disposition, after a life of torpor, broken only by short sallies of forced exertion, on a sudden reverse of fortune, displays at once the most persevering diligence in the most repulsive studies, and in middle life, without any previous habits of exertion, any hope of early business, or the example of friends, or the stimulus of actual want, to urge him, outstrips every competitor, though every competitor has every advantage against him; this is unnatural.—When Lord Glenthorn, the instant he is stripped of his estates, meets, falls in love with, and is conditionally accepted by, the very lady who is remotely entitled to those estates; when, the instant he has fulfilled the conditions of their marriage, the family of the person possessed of the estates becomes extinct, and by the concurrence of circumstances, against every one of which the chances were enormous, the hero is re-instated in all his old domains; this is merely improbable. The distinction which we have been pointing out may be plainly perceived in the events of real life; when any thing takes place of such a nature as we should call, in a fiction, merely improbable, because there are many chances against it, we call it a lucky or unlucky

accident, a singular coincidence, something very extraordinary, odd, curious, &c.; whereas any thing which, in a fiction, would be called unnatural, when it actually occurs, (and such things do occur,) is still called unnatural, inexplicable, unaccountable, inconceivable, &c. epithets which are not applied to events that have merely the balance of chances against them." *Quarterly Review*, *No.* xlviii. p 354, 355.

Page 51, [B.]

"Analogy does not mean the similarity of two *things*, but the similarity, or sameness, of two *relations*. There must be more than two *things* to give rise to two *relations*: there must be at least three; and in most cases there are four. Thus A may be *like* B, but there is no *analogy* between A and B: it is an abuse of the word to speak so, and it leads to much confusion of thought. If A has the same relation to B which C has to D, then there is an analogy. If the first relation be well known, it may serve to explain the second, which is less known: and the transfer of name from one of the terms in the relation best known to its corresponding term in the other, causes no confusion, but on the contrary tends to remind us of the similarity that exists in these relations; and so assists the mind instead of misleading it.

"In this manner things most *unlike* and discordant in their nature may be strictly *analogous* to one another. Thus a certain *proposition* may be called the *basis* of a system. The proposition is to the system what the basis is to a building. It serves a similar office and purpose; and this last relation being well known is of use to illustrate the other which was less known. E. g. The system *rests* upon it: it is *useless to proceed* with the argument till this is well established: if this were *removed*, the system must fall. The only cautions requisite in the use of this kind of analogy are,

FIRST, not to proceed to a comparison of the corresponding terms as they are intrinsically *in themselves* or in their own nature, but merely as they are *in relation* to the other terms respectively; and, SECONDLY, not to presume that because the relation is the same or similar in one or two points, therefore it is the same or similar in all.

"The FIRST of these errors cannot be committed in the instance before us, because the two things are of such different natures that they have no one point of resemblance. But when the first and the third term are not only corresponding in relation, but chance also to be of a kindred nature, or when, from the circumstance of one being visible and the other invisible, their discrepancies do not strike us, it often happens that a comparison is pursued between the *things themselves*, and this is one cause of the promiscuous use of the terms *similitude* and *analogy*. As for example, when Locke, having once established the comparison, proceeds to talk of *Ideas* as if they were really *images* in the mind, or *traces* in the brain.

"It is from observing this tendency in men to regard the metaphorical or analogous name as bringing along with it something of the nature of the thing it originally signified, that Mr. Stewart is led to make the remark not less original than just, that it is well for the understanding, though it may be a loss to the fancy, when a metaphorical word has lost its pedigree *—that is, when it no longer excites the primary idea denoted by it, and is reduced by custom to a plain and direct appellation in its secondary sense. He suggests also†

* Philosophical Essays, Ess. v. c. 3.

† Ibid. In the analysis here given of *analogy*, it will be perceived by those who are conversant with Mr. Stewart's writings, that I have ventured to depart widely from his use of the word. Indeed M. Prevot's etymology, as given in a passage quoted with approbation by Mr. Stewart, vol. ii. c. iv. sect. 4. appears to me quite erroneous,

with equal ingenuity, in cases where words have not yet been worn down to this use, the expedient of *varying* our metaphor when speaking of the same subject, as a preservative against this dangerous and encroaching error. Of the utility of this practice I have no doubt: and I think it may be regarded as an advantage of the same kind, that the parables of the New Testament are drawn from such a great diversity of objects, as to check the propensity in man, especially in matters of religion, to attach some mystical character to the images so employed, and to look upon them as emblems possessing an intrinsic virtue, or at least a secret affinity with those spiritual truths, to the illustration of which they are made subservient.

"When the points in which this similarity of relation holds are of secondary importance—when instead of being essential and characteristic, they are slight and superficial—the analogy is often called a metaphor, and often a similitude, as being addressed rather to the fancy than to the judgment, and intended rather to adorn and illustrate, than to explain. But it would perhaps be better to avoid the name *similitude* in these cases, and to regard them as being, what they really are, *analogies*, although subsisting in points of inferior moment.

"Thus when the swallow is called the herald of summer, or a ship is said to plough the waves, it is easy to resolve the phrase into the form of analogy or proportion: the swallow is to the summer what the herald is to his prince; he announces his approach. So the action of a ship is to the sea, what the action of a plough is to the land. But because in these cases the relation is *fanciful* rather than *real*, that is, it consists not in essential points but in mere

' Le mot Analogie, *dans l'origine*, n'exprime que la ressemblance. The reverse of which I take to be the fact. But this is not the place for entering farther into the discussion.

circumstances of inferior importance, we leave such things to the province of taste or amusement, and no considerate man ever attempts to reason from them.

" ' I am not of the mind of those speculators,' said Mr. Burke, ' who seem assured that all states have the same period of infancy, manhood, and decrepitude, that are found in individuals. Parallels of this sort rather furnish similitudes to illustrate or to adorn, than supply analogies from whence to reason. The objects which are attempted to be forced into an analogy are not found in the same classes of existence. Individuals are physical beings — commonwealths are not physical but moral essences.' *

" A remarkable example of this kind is that argument of Toplady against free-will, who, after quoting the text, *Ye also as lively stones are built up a spiritual house*,† triumphantly exclaims, ' This is giving free-will a stab under the fifth rib: for can stones hew themselves, and build themselves into a regular house?' ‡

" Even when we attribute to inanimate things the qualities of animals, the same analysis may be adopted as before. Thus the *rage* of the *sea* denotes a similarity of effect to the effect of rage in animals. This is even more the work of fancy than the example before given: for in reducing it to the form of a proportion, *one term* is wholly supplied by the imagination. We do not really believe there is a principle in the sea producing these effects, answering to rage in animals, but the imagination suggests such a principle, and transfers the name of rage to it.

" In those cases where the analogy is traced between things *perfectly heterogeneous* there is little danger of confounding the idea with that of similitude. But when the

* Letters on a Regicide Peace, p. 4.

† 1 Pet. ii. 5.

‡ Christian and Philosophical Necessity Asserted, p. 56

subjects we are comparing are of a *kindred nature*, so that the things spoken of not only stand in the same relation, but also bear a close resemblance to each other, then it is we are most apt to confound them together, and to substitute resemblance for analogy. Thus because the heart or the tooth of an animal not only serves the same office to the animal that the heart or the tooth of a man does to him, but is also an object very nearly resembling it in structure and outward appearance, we are apt to imagine that the same name is given to it solely on this last account. But if we pursue the enquiry throughout the animal creation, we shall find that the form of the corresponding parts is infinitely varied, although the analogy remains the same; till at length we arrive at such diversities, that it is only persons conversant with comparative anatomy who can readily detect the analogy. And long before the difference has reached this length, in popular discourse the analogical name is dropped, and the scientific use of it in such cases sounds pedantic to unlearned ears. Thus the beak of a bird answers to the tooth of man, and the shell of a lobster to the bones of other animals. If the use and office remain the same no diversity of form impairs the analogy: but we ought from such examples to learn, even when similitude of form *does* exist, not to regard it as the true ground of the comparison we make, and of our affixing the same name.

" Thus too when we speak of *qualities* of things which are not cognizable by our senses except in their effects, we bestow the same name on account of a real or supposed analogy, not on account of any similarity in the qualities themselves, which may or may not exist, *according as the things we speak of are more or less of a kindred nature.* Sagacity, courage, fidelity, love, jealousy, revenge, are all predicated of brute animals not less than of man, although they are not things or existences in themselves, but certain

attributes or affections in them, exhibiting symptoms and producing effects corresponding with the symptoms and effects attendant upon those qualities in ourselves. In these instances, *still more* than in the former, we are prone to confound analogy with resemblance—because as these things have no form or existence of their own—as the whole essence of them consists in their relation to something else—if the *relations* be alike, the *things* are necessarily alike, and we naturally slide into that form of speaking which makes no distinction between analogy and resemblance: but even then we regard the *qualities* as identical, only in proportion as the *nature* of the respective subjects to which they belong may be regarded as the same.

"The SECOND error above noticed as carefully to be avoided in the use of analogy is, when we do not indeed treat the corresponding terms as *resembling one another* in their own nature, but when we presume that a similarity of relation subsists in *other points* besides those which are the foundation of analogy.

"When the analogy consists in slight or superficial circumstances, still more when it is fanciful only, no attempt whatever should be made to reason from it; as was exemplified in the passage produced from Burke's writings: but even when the analogy is solid and well-founded we are liable to fall into error, if we suppose it to extend farther than it really does. Errors of this nature are often committed by men of lively fancies, or of ardent minds, and they are the more seducing because they set out not only with a shew of reason, but with reason and truth actually on their side.

"Thus because a just analogy has been discerned between the metropolis of a country, and the heart in the animal body, it has been sometimes contended that its increased size is a disease—that it may impede some of its

most important functions—or even be the means of its dissolution.

"Another frequent example of this *second* error is found in the use of the same titles of office or dignity in different nations or in distant times. Although the relation denoted by them be the same in one or in several important particulars, yet it scarcely ever holds throughout; and the most false notions are in consequence entertained by people of the nature of these corresponding offices in every country but their own. We have known what mischief has been produced by the adoption of the phrase, 'servant of the people,' although it cannot be denied that in some points the duty of the magistrate is the same as the duty of a servant—that his time, for instance, his thoughts, his abilities, should be devoted to the benefit of the people—and again, on the other hand, because the duty of a subject towards his sovereign coincides in many respects with the duty of a child towards his parent, some speculative writers have hastily concluded that the institution of monarchy is equally founded in nature, and possesses the same inherent authority with the parental." *Copleston's Four Discourses on the Doctrines of Necessity and Predestination*, note to Disc. III. p. 122—130.

Page 83, [C.]

"Theirs" (the New Testament writers) "is a history of miracles; the historical picture of the scene in which the Spirit of God was poured on all flesh, and signs and wonders, visions and dreams, were part of the essentials of their narratives. How is all this related? With the same absence of high colouring and extravagant description with which other writers notice the ordinary occurrences of the

world: partly no doubt for the like reason, that they were really familiar with miracles; partly too because to them these miracles had long been contemplated only as subservient measures to the great object and business of their ministry—the salvation of men's souls. On the subject of miracles, the means to this great end, they speak in calm, unimpassioned language; on man's sins, change of heart; on hope, faith, and charity; on the objects in short to be effected, they exhaust all their feelings and eloquence. Their history, from the narrative of our Lord's persecutions, to those of Paul, the abomination of the Jews, embraces scenes and personages which claim from the ordinary reader a continual effusion of sorrow, or wonder, or indignation. In writers who were friends of the parties and adherents of the cause for which they did and suffered so great things, the absence of it is on ordinary grounds inconceivable. Look at the account even of the crucifixion. Not one burst of indignation or sympathy mixes with the details of the narrative. Stephen the first martyr is stoned, and the account comprised in these few words, "they stoned Stephen calling upon God, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." The varied and immense labours and sufferings of the apostles are slightly hinted at, or else related in this dry and frigid way. "And when they had called the apostles, and beaten them, they commanded that they should not speak in the name of Jesus, and let them go."* "And there came thither certain Jews, from Antioch and Iconium, who persuaded the people, and having stoned Paul, drew him out of the city, supposing he had been dead. Howbeit, as the disciples stood round about him, he rose up, and came into the city; and the next day he departed with Barnabas to Derbe."† Had these authors no feeling? Had their mode of life bereaved them of the common sympathies and sen

* Acts v. 40, 41. † Acts xiv. 19, 20.

sibilities of human nature? Read such passages as St. Paul's parting address to the elders of Miletus; the same apostle's recommendation of the offending member of the Corinthian Church to pardon; and, more than all, the occasional bursts of conflicting feeling, in which anxious apprehension for the faith and good behaviour of his converts is mixed with the pleasing recollection of their conversion, and the minister and the man are alike strongly displayed; and it will be plain that Christianity exercised no benumbing influence on the heart. No: their whole soul was occupied with one object, which predominated over all the means subservient to it, however great those means might be. *In the storm, the pilot's eye is fixed on the headland which must be weathered; in the crisis of victory or defeat, the general sees only the position to be carried; and the dead and the instruments of death fall around him unheeded.* On the salvation of men, on this one point, the witnesses of Christ and the ministers of his Spirit, expended all their energy of feeling and expression. All that occurred—mischance, persecution, and miracle—were glanced at by the eye of faith only in subserviency to this mark of the prize of their high calling, as working together for good, and all exempt from the associations which would attach to such events and scenes, when contemplated by themselves, and with the short-sightedness of uninspired men. Miracles were not to them objects of wonder, nor mischances a subject of sorrow and lamentation. They did all, they suffered all, to the glory of God." *London Review*, No. II. p. 345.

Page 134, [D.]

"First, as to *proximity of time*, every one knows, that any melancholy incident is the more affecting that it is recent. Hence it is become common with story-tellers, that

they may make a deeper impression on the hearers, to introduce remarks like these: that the tale which they relate is not old, that it happened but lately, or in their own time, or that they are yet living who had a part in it, or were witnesses of it. Proximity of time regards not only the past, but the future. An event that will probably soon happen, hath greater influence upon us than what will probably happen a long time hence. I have hitherto proceeded on the hypothesis, that the orator rouses the passions of his hearers, by exhibiting some past transaction; but we must acknowledge that passion may be as strongly excited by his reasonings concerning an event yet to come. In the judiciary orations there is greater scope for the former, in the deliberative, for the latter; though in each kind there may occasionally be scope for both. All the seven circumstances enumerated are applicable, and have equal weight, whether they relate to the future or to the past. The only exception that I know of is, that probability and plausibility are scarcely distinguishable, when used in reference to events in futurity. As in these there is no access for testimony, what constitutes the principal distinction is quite excluded. In comparing the influence of the past upon our minds with that of the future, it appears in general, that if the evidence, the importance, and the distance of the objects, be equal, the latter will be greater than the former. The reason, I imagine, is, we are conscious, that as every moment, the future which seems placed before us, is approaching; and the past, which lies, as it were, behind, is retiring; our nearness or relation to the one constantly increaseth as the other decreaseth. There is something like attraction in the first case, and repulsion in the second. This tends to interest us more in the future than in the past, and consequently to the present view aggrandizes the one, and diminishes the other.

"What, nevertheless, gives the past a very considerable advantage, is its being generally susceptible of much stronger evidence than the future. The lights of the mind are, if I may so express myself, in an opposite situation to the lights of the body. These discover clearly the prospect lying before us, but not the ground we have already passed. By the memory, on the contrary, that great luminary of the mind, things past are exhibited in retrospect; we have no correspondent faculty to irradiate the future: and even in matters which fall not within the reach of our memory, past events are often clearly discoverable by testimony, and by effects at present existing; whereas we have nothing equivalent to found our arguments upon in reasoning about things to come. It is for this reason that the future is considered as the province of conjecture and uncertainty.

"Local *Connexion*, the fifth in the above enumeration, hath a more powerful effect than proximity of time. Duration and space are two things (call them entities, or attributes, or what you please) in some respects the most like, and in some respects the most unlike, to one another. They resemble in continuity, divisibility, infinity, in their being deemed essential to the existence of other things, and in the doubts that have been raised as to their having a real or independent existence of their own. They differ in that the latter is permanent, whereas the very essence of the former consisteth in transitoriness: the parts of the one are all successive, of the other all co-existent. The greater portions of time are all distinguished by the memorable things which have been transacted in them, the smaller portions by the revolutions of the heavenly bodies: the portions of place, great and small, (for we do not here consider the regions of the fixed stars and planets,) are distinguished by the various tracts of land and water, into which the earth is divided and subdivided; the one dis-

tinction intelligible, the other sensible; the one chiefly known to the inquisitive, the other in a great measure obvious to all.

"Hence perhaps it arises, that the latter is considered as a firmer ground of relation than the former. Who is not more curious to know the notable transactions which have happened in his own country from the earliest antiquity, than to be acquainted with those which have happened in the remotest regions of the globe during the century wherein he lives? It must be owned, however, that the former circumstance is more frequently aided by that of personal relation than the latter. Connexion of place not only includes vicinage, but every other local relation, such as being in a province under the same government with us, in a state that is in alliance with us, in a country well known to us, and the like. Of the influence of this connexion in operating on our passions we have daily proofs. With how much indifference, at least with how slight and transient emotion, do we read in newspapers the accounts of the most deplorable accidents in countries distant and unknown? How much, on the contrary, are we alarmed and agitated on being informed that any such accident hath happened in our own neighbourhood, and that, even though we be totally unacquainted with the persons concerned?

"Still greater is the power of *relation* to the persons concerned, which was the sixth circumstance mentioned, as this tie is more direct than that which attacheth us to the scene of action. It is the persons, not the place, that are the immediate objects of the passions love or hatred, pity or anger, envy or contempt. Relation to the actors commonly produces an effect contrary to that produced by relation to the sufferers, the first in extenuation, the second in aggravation, of the crime alleged. The first makes

for the apologist, the second for the accuser. This, I say, is commonly the case, not always. The remote relation to the actors, when the offence is heinous, especially if the sufferers be more nearly related, will sometimes rather aggravate than extenuate the guilt in our estimation. But it is impossible with any precision to reduce these effects to rules; so much depending on the different tempers and sentiments of different audiences. Personal relations are of various kinds. Some have generally greater influence than others; some again have greater influence with one person, others with another. They are consanguinity, affinity, friendship, acquaintance, being fellow-citizens, countrymen, of the same surname, language, religion, occupation, and innumerable others.

"But of all the connexive circumstances, the most powerful is *interest*, which is the last. Of all relations, personal relation, by bringing the object very near, most enlivens that sympathy which attaches us to the concerns of others; interest in the effects brings the object, if I may say so, into contact with us, and makes the mind cling to it, as a concern of its own. Sympathy is but a reflected feeling, and therefore, in ordinary cases, must be weaker than the original. Though the mirror be ever so true, a lover will not be obliged to it for presenting him with the figure of his mistress, when he hath an opportunity of gazing on her person. Nor will the orator place his chief confidence in the assistance of the social and sympathetic affections, when he hath it in his power to arm the selfish.

"Men universally, from a just conception of the difference, have, when self is concerned, given a different name to what seems originally the same passion in a higher degree. Injury, to whomsoever offered, is to every man that observes it, and whose sense of right is not debauched by vicious practice, the natural object of *indignation*. In-

dignation always implies *resentment*, or a desire of retaliating on the injurious person, so far at least as to make him repent the wrong he hath committed. This indignation in the person injured, is, from our knowledge of mankind, supposed to be, not indeed universally, but generally, so much stronger, that it ought to be distinguished by another appellation, and is accordingly denominated *revenge*. In like manner, beneficence, on whomsoever exercised, is the natural object of our *love;* love always implies *benevolence*, or a desire of promoting the happiness of the beneficent person; but this passion in the person benefited is conceived to be so much greater, and to infer so strong an obligation to a return of good offices to his benefactor, that it merits to be distinguished by the title *gratitude*. Now by this circumstance of *interest* in the effects, the speaker, from engaging *pity* in his favour, can proceed to operate on a more powerful principle, *self-preservation*. The *benevolence* of his hearers he can work up into *gratitude*, their *indignation* into *revenge*.

"The two last-mentioned circumstances, personal relation and interest, are not without influence, as was hinted in the enumeration, though they regard the speaker only, and not the hearers. The reason is, a person present with us, whom we see and hear, and who by words, and looks, and gestures, gives the liveliest signs of his feelings, has the surest and most immediate claim upon our sympathy. We become infected with his passions. We are hurried along by them, and not allowed leisure to distinguish between his relation and our relation, his interest and our interest." *Campbell's Rhetoric*, p. 184—190, (b i. ch. 7. § 5. parts 4, 5, 6, 7.

Page 135 [E.]

A good illustration of what has been said is supplied by the following extract from Mr. Milman's Bampton Lectures, (Lecture VI. p. 269.) "Conceive then the apostles of Jesus Christ, the tentmaker or the fisherman, entering, as strangers, into one of the splendid cities of Syria, Asia Minor, or Greece. Conceive them, I mean, as unendowed with miraculous powers, having adopted their itinerant system of teaching from human motives, and for human purposes alone. As they pass along to the remote and obscure quarter, where they expect to meet with precarious hospitality among their countrymen, they survey the strength of the established religion, which it is their avowed purpose to overthrow. Every where they behold temples, on which the utmost extravagance of expenditure has been lavished by succeeding generations; idols of the most exquisite workmanship, to which, even if the religious feeling of adoration is enfeebled, the people are strongly attached by national or local vanity. They meet processions, in which the idle find perpetual occupation, the young excitement, the voluptuous a continual stimulant to their passions. They behold a priesthood, numerous, sometimes wealthy; nor are these alone wedded by interest to the established faith; many of the trades, like those of the makers of silver shrines in Ephesus, are pledged to the support of that to which they owe their maintenance. They pass a magnificent theatre, on the splendour and success of which the popularity of the existing authorities mainly depends; and in which the serious exhibitions are essentially religious, the lighter, as intimately connected with the indulgence of the baser passions. They behold another public building, where even worse feelings, the cruel and the sanguinary, are pampered by the animat-

ing contests of wild beasts and of gladiators, in which they themselves may shortly play a dreadful part,

Butcher'd to make a Roman holiday!

Show and spectacle are the characteristic enjoyments of the whole people, and every show and spectacle is either sacred to the religious feelings, or incentive to the lusts of the flesh; those feelings which must be entirely eradicated, those lusts which must be brought into total subjection to the law of Christ. They encounter likewise itinerant jugglers, diviners, magicians, who impose upon the credulous, and excite the contempt of the enlightened; in the first case, dangerous rivals to those who should attempt to propagate a new faith by imposture and deception; in the latter, naturally tending to prejudice the mind against all miraculous pretensions whatever: here, like Elymas, endeavouring to outdo the signs and wonders of the apostles; there, throwing suspicion on all asserted supernatural agency, by the frequency and clumsiness of their delusions. They meet philosophers, frequently itinerant like themselves; or teachers of new religions, priests of Isis and Serapis, who have brought into equal discredit what might otherwise have appeared a proof of philanthropy, the performing laborious journeys at the sacrifice of personal ease and comfort for the moral and religious improvement of mankind; or at least have so accustomed the public mind to similar pretensions, as to take away every attraction from their boldness or novelty. There are also the teachers of the different mysteries, which would engross all the anxiety of the inquisitive, perhaps excite, even if they did not satisfy, the hopes of the more pure and lofty minded. Such must have been among the obstacles which would force themselves on the calmer moments of the most ardent; such the overpowering difficulties, of which it would be impossible to overlook the importance, or elude the force; which required no sober calculation to estimate, no laborious enquiry to discover; which met and confronted them wherever they went, and which, either in desperate presumption, or deliberate reliance on their own preternatural powers, they must have contemned and defied.

The commencement of their labours was usually disheartening, and ill calculated to keep alive the flame of ungrounded enthusiasm. They begin their operations in the narrow and secluded synagogue of their own countrymen. The novelty of their doctrine, and curiosity, secure them at first a patient attention; but as the more offensive tenets are developed, the most fierce and violent passions are awakened. Scorn and hatred are seen working in the clouded brows and agitated countenances of the leaders: if here and there one is *pricked to the heart*, it requires considerable moral courage to acknowledge his conviction; and the new teachers are either cast forth from the indignant assembly of their own people, liable to all the punishments which they are permitted to inflict, scourged and beaten; or, if they succeed in forming a party, they give rise to a furious schism; and thus appear before the heathen with the dangerous notoriety of having caused a violent tumult, and broken the public peace by their turbulent and contentious harangues: at all events, disclaimed by that very people on whose traditions they profess to build their doctrines, and to whose Scriptures they appeal in justification of their pretensions. They endure, they persevere, they continue to sustain the contest against Judaism and paganism. It is still their deliberate, ostensible, and avowed object, to overthrow all this vast system of idolatry: to tear up by the roots all ancient prejudices; to silence shrines, sanctified by the veneration of ages as

oracular; to consign all those gorgeous temples to decay, and all those images to contempt; to wean the people from every barbarous and dissolute amusement." * * * * * * * *

"But in one respect it is impossible now to conceive the extent, to which the apostles of the crucified Jesus shocked all the feelings of mankind. The public establishment of Christianity, the adoration of ages, the reverence of nations, has thrown around the cross of Christ an indelible and inalienable sanctity. No effort of the imagination can dissipate the illusion of dignity which has gathered round it; it has been so long dissevered from all its coarse and humiliating associations, that it cannot be cast back and desecrated into its state of opprobrium and contempt. To the most daring unbeliever among ourselves, it is the symbol, the absurd, and irrational, he may conceive, but still the ancient and venerable symbol of a powerful and influential religion: what was it to the Jew and to the heathen? the basest, the most degrading punishment of the lowest criminal! the proverbial terror of the wretched slave! it was to them, what the most despicable and revolting instrument of public execution is to us. Yet to the cross of Christ, men turned from deities in which were embodied every attribute of strength, power, and dignity; in an incredibly short space of time, multitudes gave up the splendour, the pride, and the power of paganism, to adore a Being, who was thus humiliated beneath the meanest of mankind, who had become, according to the literal interpretation of the prophecy, *a very scorn of men, and an outcast of the people.*" *Ibid.* p. 279.

Page 140, [F.]

"Such is *our* yoke and *our* burden! Let him, who has thought it too hard and too heavy to bear, be prepared to

state it boldly, when he shall appear side by side with the poor and mistaken Indian before the throne of God at the day of judgment. The poor heathen may come forward with his wounded limbs and weltering body, saying, 'I thought thee an austere master, delighting in the miseries of thy creatures, and I have accordingly brought thee the torn remnants of a body which I have tortured in thy service.' And the Christian will come forward, and say, 'I knew that thou didst die to save me from such sufferings and torments, and that thou only commandedst me to keep my body in temperance, soberness, and chastity, and I thought it too hard for me; and I have accordingly brought thee the refuse and sweepings of a body that has been corrupted and brutalized in the service of profligacy and drunkenness,—even the body which thou didst declare should be the temple of thy Holy Spirit.' The poor Indian will perhaps, shew his hands, reeking with the blood of his children, saying, 'I thought this was the sacrifice with which God was well pleased:' and you, *the Christian*, will come forward with blood upon thy hands also, 'I knew that thou gavest thy son for my sacrifice, and commandedst me to lead my offspring in the way of everlasting life; but the command was too hard for me, to teach them thy statutes and to set them my humble example: I have let them go the broad way to destruction, and their blood is upon my hand — and my heart — and my head.' The Indian will come forward, and say, 'Behold, I am come from the wood, the desert, and the wilderness, where I fled from the cheerful society of my fellow-mortals, because I thought it was pleasing in thy sight.' And the Christian will come forward, and say, 'Behold, I come from my comfortable home and the communion of my brethren, which thou hast graciously permitted me to enjoy; but I thought it too hard to give them a share of those blessings which thou hast

bestowed upon me; I thought it too hard to give them a portion of my time, my trouble, my fortune, or my interest; I thought it too hard to keep my tongue from cursing and reviling, my heart from hatred, and my hand from violence and revenge.' What will be the answer of the Judge to the poor Indian, none can presume to say. That he was sadly mistaken in the means of salvation, and that what he had done could never purchase him everlasting life, is beyond a doubt; but yet the Judge may say, 'Come unto me, thou heavy-laden, and I will give thee the rest which thou couldst not purchase for thyself.' But, to the Christian, 'Thou, who hadst my easy yoke, and my light burden; thou, for whom all was already purchased,' —— Thank God! it is not yet pronounced: — begone! and fly for thy life!" *Wolfe's Sermons*, (*Remains*,) Sermon X p. 371 — 373.

"Suppose it were suddenly revealed to any one among you, that he, and he alone of all that walk upon the face of this earth, was destined to receive the benefit of his Redeemer's atonement, and that all the rest of mankind was lost — and lost *to all eternity;* it is hard to say what would be the first sensation excited in that man's mind by the intelligence. It is indeed probable it would be joy—to think that all his fears respecting his eternal destiny were now no more; that all the forebodings of the mind and misgivings of the heart—all the solemn stir which we feel rising within us whenever we look forward to a dark futurity, — to feel that all these had now subsided for ever, — to know that he shall stand in the everlasting sunshine of the love of God! It is perhaps impossible that all this should not call forth an immediate feeling of delight: but if you wish the sensation to continue, you must go to the wilderness; you must beware how you come within sight of a human being, or within sound of a

human voice; you must recollect that you are now *alone* upon the earth; or, if you want society, you had better look for it among the beasts of the field than among the ruined species to which you belong; unless indeed the Almighty, in pity to your desolation, should send his angels before the appointed time, that you might learn to forget in their society the outcast objects of your former sympathies. But to go abroad into human society, — to walk amongst Beings who are now no longer your fellow-creatures, — to feel the charity of your common nature rising in your heart, and to have to crush it within you like a sin, — to reach forth your hand to perform one of the common kindnesses of humanity, and to find it withered by the recollection, that however you may mitigate a present pang, the everlasting pang is irreversible; to turn away in despair from these children whom you have now come to bless and to save (we hope and trust both here and for ever)! — perhaps it would be too much for you; at all events, it would be hard to state a degree of exertion within the utmost range of human energy, or a degree of pain within the farthest limit of human endurance, to which you would not submit, that you might have one companion on your lonely way from this world to the mansions of happiness. But suppose, at that moment, that the angel who brought the first intelligence returns to tell you that there are Beings upon this earth who may yet be saved, — that he was before mistaken, no matter how,—perhaps he was your guardian angel, and darted from the throne of grace with the intelligence of your salvation without waiting to hear the fate of the rest of mankind, — no matter how, — but he comes to tell you that there are Beings upon the earth who are within the reach of your Redeemer's love, and of your own,—that some of them are now before you, and their everlasting destiny is placed in your hands; then,

what would first occur to your mind?—privations, — dangers,— difficulties? No: but you would say, Lord, what shall I do? shall I traverse earth and sea, through misery and torment, that of those whom thou hast given me I may not lose one?" *Ibid.* Sermon XI. p. 391 — 393.

Page 182, [G.]

In Dr. Campbell's ingenious dissertation (*Rhetoric*, book ii. c. vii.) "on the causes that nonsense often escapes being detected, both by the writer and the reader," he remarks, (sec. 2.) that "there are particularly three sorts of writing wherein we are liable to be imposed upon by words without meaning."

"The first is, where there is an exuberance of metaphor. Nothing is more certain than that this trope, when temperately and appositely used, serves to add light to the expression, and energy to the sentiment. On the contrary, when vaguely and intemperately used, nothing can serve more effectually to cloud the sense, where there is sense, and by consequence to conceal the defect, where there is no sense to shew. And this is the case, not only where there is in the same sentence a mixture of discordant metaphors, but also where the metaphoric style is too long continued, and too far pursued. [*Ut modicus autem atque opportunus translationis usus illustrat orationem: ita frequens, et obscurat et tædio complet; continuus vero in allegoriam et ænigmata exit.* Quint. lib. viii. c. vi.] The reason is obvious. In common speech the words are the immediate signs of the thought. But it is not so here; for when a person, instead of adopting metaphors that come naturally and opportunely in his way, rummages the whole world in quest of them, and piles them one upon another, when he cannot so properly be said to use metaphor, as to talk in metaphor, or rather when from metaphor he runs into allegory, and thence into enigma, his words are not the immediate signs of his thoughts; they are at best but the signs of the signs of his thought. His writing may then be called, what Spenser not unjustly styled his Fairy Queen, *a perpetual allegory or dark conceit.* Most readers will account it much to bestow a transient glance on the literal sense, which lies nearest; but will never think of that meaning more remote, which the figures themselves are intended to signify. It is no wonder then that this sense, for the discovery of which it is necessary to see through a double veil, should, where it is, more readily escape our observation, and that where it is wanting we should not so quickly miss it." * * * * * * * * * * *

"There is, in respect of the two meanings considerable variety to be found in the tropical Style. In just allegory and similitude there is always a propriety, or, if you choose to call it, congruity, in the literal sense, as well as a distinct meaning or sentiment suggested, which is called the figurative sense. Examples of this are unnecessary. Again, where the figurative sense is unexceptionable, there is sometimes an incongruity in the expression of the literal sense. This is always the case in mixed metaphor, a thing not unfrequent even in good writers. Thus, when Addison remarks that 'there is not a single view of human nature, which is not sufficient to *extinguish* the *seeds* of pride,' he expresses a true sentiment somewhat incongruously; for the terms *extinguish* and *seeds* here metaphorically used, do not suit each other. In like manner, there is something incongruous in the mixture of tropes employed in the following passage from Lord Bolingbroke: 'Nothing less than the *hearts* of his people will content a patriot Prince, nor will he think his *throne* established, till it is established *there*.' Yet the thought is excellent. But

in neither of these examples does the incongruity of the expression hurt the perspicuity of the sentence. Sometimes, indeed, the literal meaning involves a direct absurdity. When this is the case, as in the quotation from, *The Principles of Painting* given in the preceding chapter, it is natural for the reader to suppose that there must be something under it; for it is not easy to say how absurdly even just sentiments will sometimes be expressed. But when no such hidden sense can be discovered, what, in the first view conveyed to our minds a glaring *absurdity*, is rightly on reflection denominated *nonsense*. We are satisfied that De Piles neither thought, nor wanted his readers to think, that Rubens was really the original performer, and God the copier. This then was not his meaning. But what he actually thought and wanted them to think, it is impossible to elicit from his words. His words then may justly be styled *bold*, in respect of their literal import, but *unmeaning* in respect of the author's intention.

"It may be proper here to observe, that some are apt to confound the terms *absurdity* and *nonsense* as synonymous; which they manifestly are not. An absurdity, in the strict acceptation, is a proposition either intuitively or demonstratively false. Of this kind are these: 'Three and two make seven.' 'All the angles of a triangle are greater than two right angles.' That the former is false we know by intuition; that the latter is so, we are able to demonstrate. But the term is further extended to denote a notorious falsehood. If one should affirm, that 'at the vernal equinox the sun rises in the north and sets in the south,' we should not hesitate to say, that he advances an absurdity; but still what he affirms has a meaning; insomuch, that on hearing the sentence we pronounce its falsity. Now *nonsense* is that whereof we cannot say

either that it is true, or that it is false. Thus, when the Teutonic Theosopher enounces, that 'all the voices of the celestial joyfulness, qualify, commix, and harmonize in the fire which was from eternity in the good quality,' I should think it equally impertinent to aver the falsity as the truth of this enunciation. For, though the words grammatically form a sentence, they exhibit to the understanding no judgment, and consequently admit neither assent nor dissent. In the former instances I say the meaning, or what they affirm, is absurd; in the last instance I say there is no meaning, and therefore properly nothing is affirmed. In popular language, I own, the terms absurdity and nonsense are not so accurately distinguished. Absurd positions are sometimes called nonsensical. It is not common, on the other hand, to say of downright nonsense, that it comprises an absurdity.

"Further, in the literal sense there may be nothing unsuitable, and yet the reader may be at a loss to find a figurative meaning, to which his expressions can with justice be applied. Writers immoderately attached to the florid, or highly figured diction, are often misled by a desire of flourishing on the several attributes of a metaphor, which they have pompously ushered into the discourse, without taking the trouble to examine whether there be any qualities in the subject, to which these attributes can with justice and perspicuity be applied. This immoderate use of metaphor," Dr. Campbell observes, "is the principal source of all the nonsense of Orators and Poets

"The second species of writing wherein we are liable to be imposed on by words without meaning, is that wherein the terms most frequently occurring, denote things which are of a complicated nature, and to which the mind is not sufficiently familiarized. Many of those notions which are called by Philosophers mixed modes, come under

this denomination. Of these the instances are numerous in every tongue; such as *government, church, state, constitution, polity, power, commerce, legislature, jurisdiction, proportion, symmetry, elegance.* It will considerably increase the danger of our being deceived by an unmeaning use of such terms, if they are besides (as very often they are) of so indeterminate, and consequently equivocal, significations, that a writer, unobserved either by himself or by his reader, may slide from one sense of the term to another, till by degrees he fall into such applications of it as will make no sense at all. It deserves our notice also, that we are in much greater danger of terminating in this, if the different meanings of the same word have some affinity to one another, than if they have none. In the latter case, when there is no affinity, the transition from one meaning to another is taking a very wide step, and what few writers are in any danger of; it is, besides, what will not so readily escape the observation of the reader. So much for the second cause of deception, which is the chief source of all the nonsense of writers on politics and criticism.

"The third and last, and, I may add, the principal species of composition, wherein we are exposed to this illusion by the abuse of words is that in which the terms employed are very abstract, and consequently of very extensive signification. It is an observation that plainly ariseth from the nature and structure of language, and may be deduced as a corollary from what hath been said of the use of artificial signs, that the more general any name is, as it comprehends the more individuals under it, and consequently requires the more extensive knowledge in the mind that would rightly apprehend it, the more it must have of indistinctness and obscurity. Thus the word *lion* is more distinctly apprehended by the mind than the word *beast*, beast than

animal, animal than *being*. But there is, in what are called abstract subjects, a still greater fund of obscurity, than that arising from the frequent mention of the most general terms. Names must be assigned to those qualities as considered abstractedly, which never subsist independently, or by themselves, but which constitute the generic characters and the specific differences of things. And this leads to a manner which is in many instances remote from the common use of speech, and therefore must be of more difficult conception." (Book ii. sec. 2. p. 102, 103.)

It is truly to be regretted that an author who has written so justly on this subject, should within a few pages so strikingly exemplify the errors he has been treating of, by indulging in a declamation against Logic, which could not even to himself have conveyed *any distinct meaning*. When he says that a man who had learned Logic was "qualified, without any other kind of knowledge, to defend any position whatever, however contradictory to common sense;" and that "that art observed the most absolute indifference to truth and error," he cannot mean that a false conclusion could be logically proved from true premises; since, ignorant as he was of the subject, he was aware, and has in another place distinctly acknowledged, that this is not the case; nor could he mean merely that a false conclusion could be proved from a false premiss, since that would evidently be a nugatory and ridiculous objection. He seems to have had, in truth, *no meaning at all;* though, like the authors he had been so ably criticising, he was perfectly unaware of the emptiness of what he was saying.

Page 217, [H.]

"Moses stretched forth his hand, and the waters were divided, and became a wall unto the children of Israel, on the right hand and on the left. Moses smote the rock with

his rod, and the waters flowed withal, and the children of Israel were refreshed in the wilderness, and were saved from death. But what was there in the arm of Moses, that the sea should obey it and stand still? Or what in the rod of Moses, that it should turn the flinty rock into a living fountain? Let me freely, though reverently, speak to you of the patriarch Moses. He was indeed great, because he was indeed good, in his generation. But except in the matter of his goodness—except in his superior faith and trust in his Maker — except in his more ready obedience to the holy desires which the Spirit of the Lord inspired into his soul, he was no more than the rest of the Israelites, and the rest of men. Like them, like us, like every human being that is born of woman, he was compassed with infirmities, and tried with afflictions, and subject to terror, and surrounded with sorrow. Of himself he was able to do nothing, but all the mighty acts which he did, he did because 'it was God which worked in him both to will and to do of his good pleasure,' and because Moses did not resist the will of God, or neglect or abuse the power with which he was endued. If to the Jew, God was very liberal, we have the promise of his beloved Son, that to Christians, in all spiritual and necessary things, he will be still more so. Over the world without us he will perhaps give us no power—because we are not called upon to save a people. But we *are* called upon to save ourselves, and he *will* give us a power over the rebellious world that is within us. Stretch forth but your hands in faith and sincerity to God, and surely he will separate between you and your lusts. He will divide the tumultuous sea of your passions, and open for you a way to escape from your enemies into the land of eternity. He will cause the waves thereof to stand still and harmless on your right hand and on your left, and make you to walk in safety and unhurt through the overflowings of

ungodliness, which, without his controlling arm, would have drowned your souls in perdition and destruction. Be ye never so faint and weary in the wilderness of sin, yet if in humility you smite upon your breast, and say, God, be merciful to me a sinner! he will melt the stony heart within you, and turning it into a fountain of piety and love — of love to man and love to your Maker — refresh you with the living waters of the comfort of the Spirit, and strengthen you by its power for your pilgrimage through life." *Benson's First Course of Hulsean Lectures for* 1820. Lect. XIV. p. 344 — 346.

Page 265, [I.]

" For the benefit of those who are desirous of getting over their bad habits, and discharging that important part of the Sacred office, the Reading the Liturgy with due decorum, I shall first enter into a minute examination of some parts of the Service, and afterwards deliver the rest, accompanied by such marks as will enable the Reader, in a short time, and with moderate pains, to make himself master of the whole.

" But first it will be necessary to explain the marks which you will hereafter see throughout the rest of this course. They are of two kinds; one, to point out the emphatic words, for which I shall use the Grave accent of the Greek, [`].

" The other, to point out the different pauses or stops, for which I shall use the following marks:

" For the shortest pause, marking an incomplete line thus ′.

" For the second, double the time of the former, two ″.

" And for the third or full stop, three ‴

" When I would mark a pause longer than any belonging to the usual stops, it shall be by two horizontal lines, as thus ═.

" When I would point out a Syllable that is to be dwelt on some time, I shall use this –, or a short horizontal over the Syllable.

" When a Syllable should be rapidly uttered, thus ˘, or a curve turned upwards; the usual marks of long and short in Prosody.

" The Exhortation I have often heard delivered in the following manner:

" ' Dearly beloved brethren, the Scripture moveth us in sundry places to acknowledge and confess our manifold sins and wickedness. And that we should not dissemble nor cloke them before the face of Almighty God our Heavenly Father, but confess them with an humble lowly penitent and obedient heart, to the end that we may obtain, forgiveness of the same, by his infinite goodness and mercy. And although we ought at àll times humbly to acknówledge our sins before God, yet ought we most chiefly sò to do, when we assemble and meet together. To render thánks for the great benefits we have received at his hands, to set forth his most worthy praise, to hear his most holy word, and to ask those things that are requisite and necessary, as well for the body as the soul. Wherefore I pray and beseech you, as many as are here present, to accompany me with a pure heart and humble voice to the throne of the heavenly grace, saying after me.'

" In the latter part of the first period, ' but confess them with an humble lowly penitent and obedient heart, to the end that we may obtain, forgiveness of the same, by his infinite goodness and mercy,' there are several faults committed. In the first place, the four epithets preceding the word ' heart,' are huddled together, and pronounced in a monotone, disagreeable to the ear, and enervating to the sense; whereas each word rising in force above the other, ought to be marked by a proportional rising of the notes in

the voice; and, in the last, there should be such a note used as would declare it at the same time to be the last— ' with an humble' lowly' penitent and obèdient heart,' &c. At first view it may appear, that the words ' humble ' and ' lowly,' are synonymous; but the word ' lowly,' certainly implies a greater degree of humiliation than the word ' humble.' The word ' penitent ' that follows, is of stronger import than either; and the word ' obedient,' signifying a perfect resignation to the will of God, in consequence of our humiliation and repentance, furnishes the climax. But if the climax in the words be not accompanied by a suitable climax in the notes of the voice, it cannot be made manifest. In the following part of the sentence, ' to the ènd that we may obtaìn' forgïveness of the sàme'' there are usually three emphases laid on the words, *end*, *obtain*, *same*, where there should not be any, and the only emphatic word, *forgiveness*, is slightly passed over; whereas it should be read —' to the end that we may obtain forgivèness of the same,' keeping the words, *obtain*, and *forgiveness*, closely together, and not disuniting them, both to the prejudice of the Sense and Cadence, &c. &c.

" I shall now read the whole, in the manner I have recommended; and if you will give attention to the marks, you will be reminded of the manner, when you come to practise in your private reading. ' Dearly belòved brethren! = The Scripture moveth us' in sundry places' to acknowledge and confess our manifold sins and wickedness" and that we should not dissèmble nor clòke them' before the face of Almighty God' our Heàvenly Father" but confèss them' with an humble' lowly' penitent' and obèdient heart' to the end that we may obtain forgïveness of the same' by hïs ìnfinite goodness and mercy"' And although we ought at àll times' humbly to acknowledge our sins before Gòd" yet ought we most chiefly so to do' when we assem-

ble and meet together′ to render thanks′ for the great benefits we have received at his hands″ to set forth′ his most worthy pràise″ to hèar′ his most hòly wòrd and to ask those things′ which are requisite and necessary′ as well for the bòdy′ as the sòul‴ Wherefore I pray and beseèch yŏu′ as màny as are here present′ to accompany me′ with a pùre heart′ and hùmble voice′ to the throne of the heavenly grace′ saying,' &c." *Sheridan, Art of Reading Prose.*

The generality of the remarks respecting the way in which each passage of the Liturgy should be read, are correct; though the mode recommended for attaining the proposed end is totally different from what is suggested in the present treatise. In some points, however, the author is mistaken as to the emphatic words: e. g. in the Lord's Prayer, he directs the following passage to be read thus; "thy will′ bè done′ on earth′ as it ìs′ in Heaven," with the emphasis on the words "be" and "is;" these, however, are not the emphatic words, and do not even *exist in the original Greek*, but are supplied by the translator; the latter of them might, indeed, be omitted altogether without any detriment to the sense; "thy will be done, as in Heaven, so also on earth," which is a more literal translation, is perfectly intelligible. A passage in the second Commandment again, he directs to be read, according indeed to the usual mode, both of reading and pointing it, — "visit the sins of the fathers′ upon the children′ unto the third and fourth generation of them that hàte me;" which mode of reading destroys the sense, by making a pause at "children," and none at "generation;" for this implies that the third and fourth generations, who suffer these judgments, are *themselves* such as hate the Lord, instead of being merely, as is meant to be expressed, the *children* of such; "*of* them that hate me," is a genitive governed not by "generation," but by "children:" it should be read

according to Sheridan's marks) "visit the sins of the fathers′ upon the children unto the third and fourth generation′ of them that hate me:" i. e. "visit the sins of the fathers who hate me, upon the third and fourth generations of their descendants." The same sanction is given to an equally common fault in reading the fifth Commandment; "that thy days′ may be long in the land′ which the Lord thy God giveth thee:" the pause should evidently be at "*long*," not at "*land*." No one would say in ordinary conversation, "I hope you will find enjoyment in the garden′ —— which you have planted." He has also strangely omitted an emphasis on the word "covet," in the tenth Commandment. He has, however, in the negative or prohibitory commands avoided the common fault of accenting the word "*not*." And here it may be worth while to remark, that in some cases the Copula ought to be made the emphatic word; (i. e. the "*is*," if the proposition be affirmative, the "*not*," if negative;) viz. where the proposition may be considered as in opposition to its *contradictory*. If, e. g. it had been a question, *whether* we ought to steal or not, the commandment, in answer to that, would have been rightly pronounced, "thou shalt *not* steal:" but the question being, *what* things we are forbidden to do, the answer is, that "to steal" is one of them, "thou shalt not *steal*." In such a case as this, the proposition is considered as opposed, not to its *contradictory*, but to one with a *different Predicate:* the question being, not, *which Copula* (negative or affirmative) shall be employed, but *what* shall be affirmed or denied of the subject: e. g. "it is lawful to *beg;* but not to *steal:*" in such a case, the *Predicate*, not the *Copula*, will be the emphatic word.

One fault worth noticing on account of its commonness is the placing of the emphasis on "*neighbour*" in the ninth and tenth Commandments; as if there might be some per-

sons precluded from the benefit of the prohibitions. One would think the man to whom our Lord addressed the parable of the good Samaritan, had been used to this mode of delivery, by his asking "and who is my *neighbour?*"

The usual pronunciation of one part of the "Apostles' Creed" is probably founded on some misapprehension of the sense of it:* "The holy Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints," is commonly read as if these were two distinct articles; instead of the latter clause being merely an explanation of the former: "The holy Catholic Church, [viz.] the Communion of Saints."

* See Sir Peter (afterwards Lord) King's History of the Apostles' Creed; a work much more valuable (in proportion to its size) than most that are studied by theologians.

INDEX

TO SOME OF THE PRINCIPAL WORDS.

Action, part iv. ch. iv. § 6.
Analogy, p. i. ch. ii. § 6.
Antithesis, p. iii. ch. ii. § 14.
A priori, (argument,) p. i. ch. ii. § 2.
Approach, (argument by,) p. i. ch. ii. § 5.
Argument, (distinguished from proposition,) p. i. ch. i. § 3.
Arrangement, (of arguments,) p. i. ch. iii. § 4.
——— of words, p. iii. ch. i. § 3. and ch. ii. § 11.

Bashfulness, (in public speaking,) p. iv. ch. iv. § 2.
Burden of proof, p. i. ch. iii. § 2.

Cause, (argument from,) p. i. ch. ii. § 2.
Chances, (calculation of,) p. i. ch. ii. § 4.
Character, (of Speaker,) p. ii. ch. i. § 3. and ch. iii. § 1.
Climax, p. ii. ch. ii. § 4.
Comparison, (use of, in exciting any feeling,) p. ii ch. ii. § 4.
——— or Simile, p. iii. ch. ii. § 3.
Composition, (fallacy of,) p. i. ch. ii. § 4.
Conciseness, p. iii. ch. ii. § 7.
Conclusion, (when to come first), p. i. ch. iii. § 5.
Conscious, (manner,) p. iv. ch. iv. § 2. note.
Conviction, (distinguished from Persuasion,) p. ii. ch. i. § i.
Crowded (style,) p. iii. ch. ii. § 9.

Direct (Argument,) p. i. ch. ii. § 1. and ch. iii. § 6.
Dividing (a question,) p. i. ch. iii. § 4.

Effect, (Argument from,) p i. ch. ii. § 3.

Elegance (of Style,) p. iii. ch. iii. § 1, 2.
Emphasis, p. iv. ch. ii. § 2.
Energy (of Style,) p. iii. ch. ii. § 1, &c.
Epithets, p. iii. ch. ii. § 4.
Example, p. i. ch. ii. § 6.
Exercises, Introd. § 5.
Experience, (Argument from,) p. i. ch. ii. § 6.
———Authority derived from, p. ii. ch. iii. § 5.

Feelings, (apt to fall short of what the occasion calls for,) p. ii. ch. i. § 2.

General terms, p. iii. ch. ii. § 1.
Good-will, (essential to the Speaker's character,) p. ii. ch. iii. § 3.

Illustration, p. i. ch. ii. § 7. and ch. iii. § 2.
Imagination, p. ii. ch. i. § 2.
Indirect (Argument), p. i. ch. ii. § 1. and ch. iii. § 7.
Induction, p. i. ch. ii. § 6.
Instruction (distinguished from Conviction strictly so called,) p. i. ch. i. § 1.
Integrity (of the speaker's character,) p. ii chap. iii § 3

Interrogation, p. iii. ch. ii § 15.
Ironical form, p. i. ch. iii. § 7.

Loose sentences, p. iii. ch ii. § 12.

Metaphor, p. iii. ch. ii. § 3
Metonymy, p. iii. ch. ii. § 3.

Natural delivery, p. iv. ch ii. iii. &c.
Number of words, (energy dependent on,) p. iii. ch. ii. § 7.

Objections, p. i. ch. iii. § 7
Oratory, (spurious,) p. iii ch. i. § 4, 5, 6.

Paradox, p. i. ch. iii. § 2.
Parity of reasoning, p. i. ch ii. § 6.
Party-Spirit, p. ii. ch. iii. § 3
Passions, p. ii. ch. i. § 3.
Periods, p. iii. ch. ii. § 12.
Perspicuity, p. iii. ch. i. § 2, &c.
Personification, p. iii. ch. ii. § 3.
Persuasion, (analysis of,) p. ii. ch. i. § 1.
Plain, (ambiguity of the word,) p. iii. ch. i. § 3.
Plausible, p. i. ch. ii. § 2

Poetry, (characteristic of,) p. iii. ch. iii. § 3.
Practice (in composition,) Introd. § 5.
Presumptions, p. i. ch. iii. § 2.
Prolixity, p iii. ch. i. § 2. and ch. ii. § 7.
Proper terms, p. iii. ch. ii. § 1.
Propositions, (to find,) part i. ch. i. § 3.

Reading, p. iv. ch. i. § 3. and ch. iii. § 1.
Recapitulation, p. i. ch. iii. § 8.
Recitation, p. iv. ch. iv. § 2.
Refutation, p. i. ch. iii. § 7.
Repetition, (conducive to perspicuity,) p. iii. ch. i. § 2.
Rhetoric, (why in greater repute among the Ancients,) Introd. § 3, 4.
Rhetorician (art of, practised by a wise man on himself,) p. ii. ch. i. § 2.

Sequence, (physical and logical,) p. i. ch. ii. § 3.
Sign, p. i. ch. ii. § 3.
Simile, p. iii. ch. ii. § 3.
Sound, (imitative,) p. iii. ch. ii. § 5.
Speaking, (distinguished from Reading,) p. iv. ch. i. § 3. and ch. iii. § 1.
Substantives, (excessive use of,) p. iii. ch. ii. § 8.
Suggestive (Style,) p. iii ch. ii. § 9.
Subjects (for learners,) Introd. § 5.
Sympathy, (reflex,) p. iv. ch. iii. § 8.

Tautology, p. iii. ch. ii. § 8.
Technical terms, p. iii. ch. ii. § 6.
Testimony, p. i. ch. ii. § 4.
Theological Style, p. iii. ch. ii. § 6.
Tone, p. iv. ch. i. § 3. note, and ch. ii. § 2.
Tropes, p. iii. ch. ii. § 2.

Verbosity, p. iii. ch. ii. § 8.

Waiving (a question,) p. i ch. iii. § 4.