Preaching, Sermon and Cultural Change in the Long Eighteenth Century

Edited by
Joris van Eijnatten

BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2009

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

On the cover: Preaching at the Herrnhutter community of Zeist in the Dutch Republic. Engraving by Abraham Jacobsz Hulk, 1782. Museum Catharijneconvent, Utrecht, the Netherlands (BMH g2797c). The print was originally included in William Hurd, *Oude en tegenwoordige staat en geschiedenis van alle godsdiensten van den schepping af tot op den tegenwoordige tijd* (7 vols.; Amsterdam 1781-1791).

A Herrnhutter (Moravian) community was established in Zeist in the Dutch Republic around the middle of the eighteenth century. Committed to upholding the universal priesthood of all believers, the Herrnhutters had no use for a pulpit. The preacher spoke from behind a simple table in a sober, white-washed church, where women sat on one side and the men on the other.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Preaching, sermon, and cultural change in the long eighteenth century / edited by Joris van Eijnatten.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-90-04-17155-8 (hardback : alk. paper) 1. Preaching--History--18th century. I. Eijnatten, Joris van.

BV4207.P73 2008
251.009'033--dc22

2008036975

ISBN 978 90 04 17155 8

Copyright 2009 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Hotei Publishing,
IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface.....	vii
List of Contributors	xv

I: Survey

Varieties of Sermon: A Survey of Preaching in the Long Eighteenth Century.....	3
<i>O.C. Edwards, Jr.</i>	

II: Foundation

The Theology of the Sermon in the Eighteenth Century.....	57
<i>Alexander Bitzel</i>	
The Art of Preaching	95
<i>Françoise Deconinck-Brossard</i>	

III: Transformation

The Classical Sermon	133
<i>Thomas Worcester</i>	
Pietism and Revival	173
<i>Jonathan Strom</i>	
The Enlightenment Sermon: Towards Practical Religion and a Sacred National Community	219
<i>Pasi Ihalainen</i>	

IV: Communication

On Sermons and Daily Life.....	263
<i>Sabine Holtz</i>	
From Embodying the Rules to Embodying Belief: On Eighteenth-Century Pulpit Delivery in England, Germany and the Netherlands.....	313
<i>Herman Roodenburg</i>	
Getting the Message: Towards a Cultural History of the Sermon.....	343
<i>Joris van Eijnatten</i>	
Index.....	389

FROM EMBODYING THE RULES TO EMBODYING BELIEF:
ON EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY PULPIT DELIVERY IN
ENGLAND, GERMANY AND THE NETHERLANDS

Herman Roodenburg

1. *Introduction*

Having no films, but only such visual sources as pictures and prints to go on, we shall never know how a sermon was delivered in the eighteenth century – how a priest, a minister or a rabbi modulated his voice, how he used his eyes, hands, arms or, for that matter, the whole body when addressing the faithful. The scant data we have derives from written records: various church documents, the occasional eyewitness account, and – the main source for this chapter – manuals on pulpit oratory.

For the Dutch Republic, some examples can be found in the Reformed Church's records. They occasionally inform us on the exams of licentiates, which included an assessment of their bodily eloquence. Church councils looking for a new minister also evaluated a candidate's delivery. Those with a strong, resonant voice and a wide range of expressive gestures had a far better chance of being appointed than colleagues with a husky or halting voice. A weak constitution was not recommended, either, for normally a good sermon required a fair amount of physical exertion. In the harsh winter of 1650, the Amsterdam church council actually proposed building a fire in the consistory so that the ministers 'descending exhausted and sweating' from the pulpit would not catch cold. In a similar vein, in 1780, an Amsterdam wigmaker advertised wigs that would stay put even during the ministers' most furious gesticulations.¹

Only rarely do we come across an eyewitness account: for example, notes taken down by a churchgoer who paid more attention to the preacher's

¹ Herman Roodenburg, *Onder censuur. De kerkelijke tucht in de gereformeerde gemeente van Amsterdam, 1578–1700* (Hilversum, 1990), p. 79; R.B. Evenhuis, *Ook dat was Amsterdam*, 5 vols. (Amsterdam, 1965–1978) IV, 37. Cf. the lawyer and man of letters Justus van Effen (1684–1735) who disapprovingly quotes a village minister boasting that he never preaches for more than an hour and comes down from the pulpit 'hardly more heated and worn out' than upon going up. See *Hollandsche Spectator* 3 (1734), p. 256.

sermo corporis than the *sermo* delivered.² In the spring of 1634, the physicist Isaac Beeckman (1588–1637) recorded the many gestures of Hugh Peters (1598–1660), a minister at the English Church in Rotterdam who certainly had the gift of oratory. Beeckman, one of the Republic's few Ramists and a long-time friend of René Descartes, had a special interest in the nature of emotions and how they are displayed through the orator's voice, countenance and gestures. In his notes, he described the minister's fervent gesticulation in detail and approvingly wrote: 'He depicts the matter well with his gestures'.³

Peters was a devout Puritan who before emerging in the 1640s as a major leader among Oliver Cromwell's Independents, would leave Rotterdam for the New World, moving to Salem in New England. Peters' style of preaching may be said to have followed William Perkins (1558–1602) and his *Prophetica, sive De sacra et unica ratione concionandi* (1592). According to Perkins, the 'father' of Elizabethan Puritanism, preachers should always be 'fervent and vehement' in their delivery.⁴ A similar kind of oratory was defended by other contemporary authors, among them the Jesuit Nicolas Caussin (1583–1651). In his *De eloquentia sacra et humana* (1617), Caussin even allowed for grinding one's teeth (when in anger), turning up one's nose (when scornful) or stamping one's feet (when embittered).⁵ If we may believe a third manual on oratory, the *Traité de l'action de l'orateur* (1657) by the Geneva-born clergyman Michel le Faucheur (1585–1657), such vehement preaching came to be perceived as improper by the middle of the seventeenth century.⁶ What, actually, do these manuals tell us?

When studying pulpit oratory, one may well take notice of Diana Taylor's distinction between the 'archive' and the 'repertoire'. Archival memory, according to Taylor, exists in the form of documents, maps, literary

² For an interesting analysis of such accounts, collected from a variety of European countries, see the contribution by Van Eijnatten to this volume; also Urs Herzog, *Geistige Wohlfahrt. Die katholische Barockpredigt* (Munich, 1991), pp. 302–311.

³ Isaac Beeckman, *Journal tenu par Isaac Beeckman de 1604 à 1634*, C. de Waard ed. (3 vols.; The Hague, 1939–1945) III, p. 342; also quoted in A. Th. Van Deursen, *Bavianen en slijkgeuzen. Kerk en kerkvolk ten tijde van Maurits en Oldenbarnevelt* (Assen, 1974), p. 44.

⁴ Quoted in James Thomas Ford, "Preaching in the Reformed Tradition", in Larissa Taylor ed. *Preachers and People in the Reformations and Early Modern Period* (Leiden, 2001), p. 76. Perkins' treatise was translated into Dutch in 1606 as William Perkins, *Prophetica, dat is een heerliick tractaet van de heylighe ende eenighe maniere van predicken*, trans. Vincent Meusevoet (Amsterdam, 1606).

⁵ Nicolas Caussin, *De eloquentia sacra et humana* (Paris, 1643).

⁶ Michel le Faucheur, *Traité de l'action de l'orateur* (Paris, 1657).

texts, letters, archaeological remains, bones, videos, films and compact discs. Conversely, the repertoire exists as embodied memory in the form of performances, gestures, orality, dancing and singing. The archive/repertoire divide exceeds that of written-versus-spoken language, for the archive encompasses more than merely written texts (think of paintings and drawings of church services that still exist today), just as the repertoire contains performances both verbal and nonverbal. What makes them different is their means of transmitting knowledge: the archive through supposedly enduring materials; the repertoire through the embodied action of the people actually involved. The relationship between the two modes of transmission, Taylor concludes, is not sequential. The repertoire does not disappear as the archive gains ascendancy; on the contrary, they usually work in tandem.⁷

Distinctions such as these are vital to qualifying the role of written culture.⁸ We should be aware, for instance, that manuals on preaching – the best source we have to document the phenomenon – were, at best, a prompt to performance. The manuals were nothing more than a mnemonic device: actual delivery was essentially a matter of observation, imitation and exercise. Once internalised – or rather, literally incorporated – delivery also became a matter of bodily memory. It had a performative force that, as every priest or minister came to realise, no published sermon could equal. As lamented by the English pastor John King (1559?–1621) in a preface to his own sermons: '[I] have changed my tongue into a pen, and whereas I spake before with the gesture and countenance of a living man, have now buried my self in a dead letter of less effectual persuasion'.⁹

It is inevitable, then, that this chapter – like all investigations into delivery, sacred or not – will, at best, just brush the subject; the repertoire itself is lost for good. As historians, we may try to reconstruct the contemporary delivery (labelled interchangeably in the Latin parlance of the time as *actio* or *pronuntiatio*). But we are in no better position than, for example, the Amsterdam professor of rhetoric Petrus Francius (1645–1704), who believed he could recognise the ancients' bodily eloquence manifested in

⁷ Diana Taylor, *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas* (Durham 2003), pp. 18–22.

⁸ For a similar distinction (between inscribing and incorporating practices), see Paul Connerton, *How Societies Remember* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 72–78. Though critical of Bourdieu's notion of 'habitus', Connerton also profits from his work.

⁹ Quoted in Bryan Crockett, "The Act of Preaching and the Art of Prophesying", in *Sewanee Review* 105 (1997) I, p. 48.

the gestures of a famous actor at the Amsterdam *schouwburg*.¹⁰ What has survived is the 'archive', a handful of non-animated images and a fair share of texts – of which the manuals on pulpit oratory are the most significant. These manuals may shed light on what their authors were thinking at the time and how their views evolved. Sometimes they even offer us a glimpse of the repertoire by holding up an individual preacher's delivery as an example that is worthy or unworthy of imitation. Until recently though, scholars have largely neglected this archive. Traditionally, historians of rhetoric, like those of homiletics, have been more interested in reading texts than reading gestures of the body.

Considering the nature of the sources at hand and the inchoate state of the present research, the aim of this chapter is a modest one. I will focus on what seems specific to pulpit oratory in the eighteenth century, its break into sentiment and sensibility: an inclination to cherish the fifth department of ancient oratory, that of *actio* or *pronuntiatio*, while dismissing all but the most general rules on the subject. As argued by manuals that emerged in the latter half of the eighteenth century and the first decades of the nineteenth, a good preacher should not think too much about the rules. As long as his delivery answered to the prevailing codes of politeness, a preacher's 'fire' as embodied in his voice, countenance and gestures, took precedence over the rules. What was at stake was all a matter of the preacher's sensibility, his capacity for emotion and emotional expression, and the religion being veritably communicated through his body.¹¹ Emerging around the middle of the eighteenth century, particularly in England, these views superseded older and more rule-based notions of sacred oratory. Authors on oratory in general shared these views, as did authors on stagecraft in France, England, the Netherlands and Germany. Thus, a newfound appreciation for unpolished delivery evolved. Eloquence could come to be appreciated among itinerant preachers, Methodists and other Pietists all over Europe. Though often going against the contemporary codes of politeness and propriety, a plain eloquence as such worked to move the hearts of the faithful, and in doing so, instil them with virtue and religion.

More precisely, in what follows I will describe how French thinking on delivery, especially in the work of Le Faucheur, was received during the

¹⁰ Ben Albach, *Langs kermissen en hoven. Ontstaan en kroniek van een Nederlands toneelgezelschap in de 17de eeuw* (Zutphen, 1977), pp. 81, 147–148; C.L. Heesakkers, "Petrus Franciscus en het toneel. Latijnse testimonia", in A.C.G. Fleurkens, W. Abrahamse, M. Meijer Drees eds., *Kort tijd-verdrijf. Opstellen over Nederlands toneel (vanaf ca. 1550) aangeboden aan Mieke B. Smits-Veldt* (Amsterdam, 1996), pp. 243–250.

¹¹ For the eighteenth-century meanings of 'sensibility' and 'sentiment', see Joseph Roach, *The Player's Passion: Studies in the Science of Acting* (Newark, 1985), pp. 98–100.

eighteenth century in England, Germany and the Netherlands. Le Faucheur was the first author to successfully merge the orator's delivery with notions of civility. He left room for the passions, yet embedded them in a long list of rules governing the body, such as voice pitch, use of eyes and the raising of one's arms and hands. Le Faucheur's ideas would inspire the British 'elocutionary movement', in which *actio* or *pronuntiatio* came to be seen as simply surpassing ancient rhetoric's other four departments: *inventio*, *dispositio*, *elocutio* and *memoria*. Gradually, Le Faucheur's classicist rules would be abandoned and the movement would put the orator's sensibility first.

As I will argue, a very similar development (albeit several decades later) can be traced in both Germany and the Netherlands. This phase was all part of a wider movement in the history of preaching that strove towards verbal clarity and both rational and emotional accessibility, as promoted by the Latitudinarian divines Bishop John Wilkins (1614–1672) and Archbishop John Tillotson (1630–1694). Fighting the often arcane and all too stilted preaching of their time, they stressed the importance of persuasion and edification by putting the audience and their reception of the sermon first.¹² After the middle of the century, however, there came a turning point which was no doubt informed by the elocutionary movement, the period's cult of sensibility and contemporary German Pietism. After an initial focus on reason and rational argument, the manuals on pulpit oratory gradually began to shift their emphasis to that of sentiment and sensibility.

2. Delivery Regained

As Wilbur Samuel Howell complained, typical of the British elocutionary movement was its almost exclusive interest in delivery or, to use the movement's own terminology, 'elocution'. Howell clearly deplores the whole episode. In advocating only the last of ancient rhetoric's five departments, the movement marginalised the other four. Its adherents liked to quote Demosthenes who, according to Cicero, considered delivery to be the first, the second and the third among the accomplishments of an orator.¹³

¹² Isabel Rivers, *Reason, Grace, and Sentiment: A Study of the Language of Religion and Ethics in England, 1660–1780*, vol. I (*Whichcote to Wesley*) (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 37–38; Paul Goring, *The Rhetoric of Sensibility in Eighteenth-Century Culture* (Cambridge, 2005), p. 37.

¹³ Wilbur Samuel Howell, *Eighteenth-Century British Logic and Rhetoric* (Princeton, 1971), p. 172.

The elocutionists' emphasis on delivery was exclusive – and new. Once their writings on rhetoric were rediscovered at the beginning of the fifteenth century, Cicero and Quintilian's influence took off. Together with the anonymous *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, they became primary models for every self-respecting Renaissance scholar and, for that matter, all contemporary eloquence. However, few fifteenth- and sixteenth-century authors on rhetoric devoted much space to delivery. With the exception of the German humanist Jodocus Willich (1501–1555), no one wished to quote Cicero or Quintilian on *actio*, rejecting the ancient precepts as anachronistic.¹⁴ Another humanist, the reformer Philipp Melanchton (1497–1560) wrote: 'delivery today is very different from that among the ancients'.¹⁵ Albeit across the religious divide, the Catholic rhetorician Bartolomeo Cavalcanti (1503–1562) agreed. Though these rhetoricians all deemed *actio* or *pronuntiatio* important, they relegated it to daily practice. Pointing to the period's motley displays of gesture – the Babel of vernaculars – and finding no support in the writings of Cicero or Quintilian, they simply refrained from theory. Delivery was based on convention, not on any formally articulated rules.¹⁶

In the second half of the sixteenth century, such views were gradually abandoned. From then on, scholars started to believe that a general set of rules could – and should – be developed. Proponents writing on the eloquence of the church included various authors such as the Catholic priests Luis de Granada (1505–1588) and Lodovico Carbone (d. 1597), as well as Wilhelm Zepper (1550–1607), a Calvinist minister at the Nassau court in Dillenburg. In both Protestant and Catholic churches, the sermon came to acquire a more prominent position. It also generated a new interest in the uses of physical eloquence, consequently also encouraging Protestant and Catholic schools (especially of the Jesuit order) to incorporate in their curricula school plays and general training in *actio*.¹⁷ Discussions on delivery were also taken up by other scholars such as the Italian lawyer and historian

¹⁴ Jodocus Willich, *Liber de pronvnciatione rhetorica doctus & elegans* (Basel, 1540).

¹⁵ Philipp Melanchton, *Elementorum rhetorices libri duo* (Wittenberg, 1531), quoted in Ursula Maier-Eichhorn, *Die Gestikulation in Quintilian's Rhetorik* (Frankfurt and Bern, 1989), p. 38.

¹⁶ For the present and the three following paragraphs, see Dilwyn Knox, "Ideas on gesture and universal languages, c. 1550 – c. 1650", in John Henry and Sarah Hutton eds., *New Perspectives on Renaissance Thought: Essays in the History of Science, Education and Philosophy in Memory of Charles B. Schmitt* (London, 1990), pp. 101–136.

¹⁷ Dilwyn Knox, "Order, reason and oratory: rhetoric in Protestant Latin schools", in Peter Mack ed., *Renaissance Rhetoric* (London, 1994), pp. 63–80; Erika Fischer-Lichte, *Semiotik des Theaters. Eine Einführung* (3 vols.; Tübingen, 1995) vol. II.

Giovanni Bonifacio (1547–1635) in his *L'arte de'cenni* (1616) and the German lawyer and Calvinist Johannes Althusius (1557–1638).

As Dilwyn Knox has suggested, much of this new interest in theory may have been furthered by the spread of Ramism. Around the middle of the sixteenth century, the French logician and philosopher Pierre de la Ramée (1515–1572) proposed a simplified classification of the existing disciplines, which included a restructuring of classical rhetoric. In this system, the five departments were abolished; more precisely, *inventio* and *dispositio* were assigned to logic, while *memoria* was dispensed with altogether. What remained were *elocutio* (in its original meaning of mastering stylistic elements)¹⁸ and *pronuntiatio* which in and of itself heightened the positions of the two departments. Indeed, in *Rhetorica*, published in 1552, Ramée's pupil Omer Talon (ca. 1510–1562) opined that *pronuntiatio* deserved an even higher position than *elocutio*, for unlike written or spoken communication, gestures formed a universal language that was shared by the whole of humanity.

According to Knox, this new methodological ordering, combined with the period's voyages of discovery, led Talon and a whole range of authors to believe in the universality of gesture and its being informed by general principles. Gesture offered a welcome and interesting means to overcome the confusion of spoken languages. Le Faucheur concurred. As stated in the first English translation of his work: 'by *Gesture*, we render our *Thoughts* and our *Passions* intelligible to *all Nations*, indifferently, under the Sun. 'Tis as it were the *common Language* of all Mankind'.¹⁹

3. *Embodying the Rules*

Born in Calvinist Geneva, Le Faucheur (1585–1657) spent most of his life in France, serving as a clergyman in Montpellier, Charenton and Paris. Though he published other writings, Le Faucheur is best remembered for his posthumously publicised book *Traitté de l'action de l'orateur* (1657). The *Traitté* inspired many authors writing in the last decades of the seventeenth century and the first decades of the eighteenth, not only in France,

¹⁸ For a discussion of *elocutio* and the elocutionists' use of the term, see Howell, *Eighteenth-Century Logic*, pp. 147–151.

¹⁹ [Michel le Faucheur], *An Essay upon the Action of an Orator* (London, [1702]) p. 171. On the work's dating to 1702, see Howell, *Eighteenth-Century British Logic*, pp. 165–168. For readability's sake, I have taken all quotations of Le Faucheur from this first, generally quite faithful translation.

but also in England, the Netherlands and Germany. With its new and refined rules for delivery, the work offered more than just another miscellany of what Cicero, Quintilian and other ancients had to say on the subject.²⁰ Even Howell praised the book as 'one of the most respectable works in the whole history of the elocutionary movement and one of the leading treatises on delivery in the history of rhetorical theory'.²¹

Unlike the eighteenth-century British elocutionists, Le Faucheur did not believe that the other four departments of the rhetorical programme were a matter of lesser concern. He did regret, though, that the ancients wrote relatively little on delivery. They provided few rules at all (although Quintilian did propose rules for the bar), and naturally, they had no rules for the pulpit. Le Faucheur subsequently aimed to fill this lacuna, as well as to elaborate on Quintilian's rules for the bar.²²

Orators, according to Le Faucheur, should stir the passions, and delivery – more so than any of the other departments – could help achieve this aim. It was believed that preachers and lawyers could learn from the stage. They should observe how actors can modulate their voices (Le Faucheur praised lively intonation), and how they use their eyes, hands and entire body. From actors preachers could even pick up how to break into tears.

As the French pastor admitted, such 'worldly' care for voice and gesture did not go uncontested. After all, religion is a spiritual thing, while voice and gesture are sensual and exterior. But one can hardly ban all sensuality from church; if that would be the case, church music should also be expelled. Moreover, the Bible tells us of the thunderous voices of St. John and St. James and the tears of St. Paul – the apostles already knew all about delivery. Le Faucheur's *Traité* aimed to demonstrate how preachers might touch the hearts of the faithful 'not only with their discourse and Style, but in some measure also by the decency of their *Speaking* and the Fineness of their *Action*'. Proclaiming the glory of God, they may use their voice, countenance and gestures in a holy and salutary manner. At the same time,

²⁰ For a typical and well-known example of such miscellanies, see Louis de Cressolles, *Vacationes autumnales, sive de perfecta oratoris actione et pronuntiatione* (Paris, 1620); on this work, see Marc Fumaroli, "Le corps éloquent. Une somme d'actio et pronuntiatio rhetorica au XVII^e siècle: Les *Vacationes Autumnales* du P. Louis de Cressolles (1620)", in *XVII^e Siècle* 33 (1981), pp. 237–264; in 1783 Hugh Blair described a similar text, Gerardus Vossius' *Oratoriarum Institutionum Libri Sex* (1616) as 'one heap of ponderous lumber (...) enough to disgust one with the study of eloquence'.

²¹ Howell, *Eighteenth-Century British Logic*, p. 168.

²² [Le Faucheur], *Essay upon the Action*, pp. 8–9.

they should take care not to be blinded by their own graceful action, not to turn 'the *Pulpit of Jesus Christ* into a *Theatre* of their own *Pomp* and *Vanity*'.²³

Le Faucheur's interest in the techniques of actors and, specifically, their ability to rouse the passions of their audiences, may have been new, but his interest in the passions was not. The seventeenth-century Puritan Perkins condemned acting in a passage that already looked forward to Constantin Stanislavski (1863–1938) and the method school of acting.²⁴ He urged the preacher to have a direct emotional involvement in his sermons: 'Wood, that is capable of fire, doth not burn, unless fire be put to it: and He must first be godly affected himself who would stir up godly affections in other men. Therefore what motions a sermon doth require, such the Preacher shall stir up privately in his own mind, that he may kindle up the same in his hearers'.²⁵ Similarly, Le Faucheur stated: 'The *Orator* (...) ought first of all to form in himself a *strong Idea* of the *Subject* of his *Passion*; and the *Passion* it self will then certainly follow in course; ferment immediately into the *Eyes*, and affect both the *Sense* and the *Understanding* of his *Spectators* with the *same Tenderness*'.²⁶ As he explained, this held true for the entire body, not only the eyes. Nonetheless, Le Faucheur saw eyes as the channel through which the passions were most contagiously exposed: 'this *Fire* of your *Eyes* easily strikes those of your *Auditors*, who have *theirs* constantly fixt upon *yours*; and it must needs set them *a-blaze* too upon the same *Resentment* and *Passion*'.²⁷ Much of this emphasis on emotional involvement derived from the oratory of the ancients and their notion that the best speakers are those who actually believe what they say. As Quintilian had already written: 'Pectus est, quod disertos facit, et vis mentis' (It is the heart which makes the orator, and his strength of mind).²⁸

Celebrating such emotionalism, Le Faucheur seems to anticipate the eighteenth century's culture of sensibility. At the same time, the emotional investment Le Faucheur expected was well defined; he added a long and detailed list of rules on how to use one's voice and body in accordance with

²³ [Le Faucheur], *Essay upon the Action*, pp. 14–22.

²⁴ Method acting, in which the character's motivations and emotions are first thoroughly analysed in order to reach psychological realism and authenticity, was developed by Stanislavski around 1900 to be perfected in the 1940s and 1950s by Lee Strasberg.

²⁵ Quoted in Crockett, "The act of preaching", p. 45.

²⁶ [Le Faucheur], *Essay upon the Action*, p. 189.

²⁷ [Le Faucheur], *Essay upon the Action*, pp. 184–185.

²⁸ *The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian*, trans. H.E. Butler (4 vols.; London, 1920–1922) IV, Bk. 10, Ch. 7, p. 15.

the contemporary codes of civility, propriety and stateliness. Le Faucheur championed a 'natural' delivery, by which he meant refraining, on the one hand, from vulgarity and extremes of force, and on the other hand, from affectation and pomp. Against the vehement gestures promulgated by Perkins, Caussin and Beeckman, Le Faucheur proposed a pulpit oratory consonant with the rules of civility, something which contemporary manuals on the subject often described as the 'science of conversing agreeably'.²⁹ As Le Faucheur explains, the orator should 'neglect nothing that may render him more *accomplisht* and *agreeable* to his *Auditors*'.³⁰ His views may be situated in what Marc Fumaroli has described as a 'new age of conversation', taking its inspiration from the writings of Jean Louis Guez de Balzac (1597–1654), among others, and advocating a written French that is as natural as spoken French.³¹ Balzac moved in the circles of Madame de Rambouillet (1588–1665), as did Valentin Conrart (1603–1675), secretary to Louis XIII and one of the founders of the Académie Française. Although Conrart has on occasion been attributed as the *Traité*'s author, he actually only supervised its publication after his friend's death in 1657.³²

Le Faucheur's treatise appears to be the first manual that successfully integrates pulpit oratory with both contemporary codes of civility and a view on how to deploy the passions to the greater honour and glory of the Lord. This integration may explain its long-lasting popularity well into the eighteenth century. Around 1750, however, especially in England, 'natural' delivery came to be perceived as 'unnatural'. It was dismissed as 'affected' and overly rule-based which, considering Le Faucheur's intentions, seems a bit unfair. Though he presented his rules as strict prescriptions, the Genevan also pointed out that delivery was a matter of practice, habit and internalisation. Once the orator started speaking he should forget about the rules, for 'the very thought of *Rules* and the *care* of *observing* them would mightily distract and amuse him upon *that Conjunction*'. To acquire a good habit of speaking in public, the orator should first

²⁹ Peter Burke, *The Art of Conversation* (Cambridge, 1993); Herman Roodenburg, *The Eloquence of the Body. Studies on Gesture in the Dutch Republic* (Zwolle, 2004), pp. 49–55.

³⁰ [Le Faucheur], *Essay upon the Action*, p. 217; see also p. 211: 'and as for his *Action* they are well enough satisfied, if it be but *reasonable* and *agreeable*, and do not offend their *Ears* or their *Eyes*'.

³¹ Marc Fumaroli, "De l'Age de l'éloquence à l'Age de la conversation: la conversion de la rhétorique humaniste dans la France du XVIIe siècle", in Bernard Bray and Christoph Strozetski eds., *Art de la lettre et art de la conversation à l'époque classique en France* (Paris, 1995), pp. 217–232.

³² Howell, *Eighteenth-Century British Logic*, pp. 162, n.35 and 254.

master the rules by testing them in private and then actually begin exercising them as soon as possible, before an 'ungenteel habit' might develop. By carefully selecting elders for imitation he might learn 'to fly the *Bad* and follow the *good*'.³³

Such interest in training 'habits' reminds us of what Rebecca Bushnell has described as the contemporary 'gardening metaphors', notions that compare raising children to the practices of pruning, bending and weeding in the garden. According to Bushnell, there were actually two sides to humanist pedagogy. Repression was one side; the other was a respect for nature's claims – a child's 'nature', 'seeds' and 'inclinations'. Similarly illustrating this, Erasmus wrote that, unless they are cultivated from the start, the shoots will grow wild: it will be the bad and not the good inclinations that will harden into habit.³⁴ At the centre of such pedagogy was a requisite for 'naturalness', or at least, the semblance of naturalness and spontaneity. According to Le Faucheur, '*all Affectation is odious* ... it must appear purely *Natural*, as the very *Birth* and *Result* both of the things you express and of the *Affection* that moves you to *speak* them'. Like his eighteenth-century critics, he already knew about the performativity of delivery, along with the feelings and meanings generated therein. Le Faucheur even seems to anticipate Pierre Bourdieu and Paul Connerton, and their concepts of habitus, habit and habitual memory.³⁵

4. Britain: the Elocutionary Movement

The *Traité* was to become a major influence on the British elocutionary movement, with its beginnings traced to 1702, the year in which the first English translation of Le Faucheur's manual came out. Though there is no mention of its author, the translation is clearly of Le Faucheur's *Traité*; the anonymous translator followed the original almost to the letter. It also appeared in a second edition in 1727 and a third edition in 1750. In 1710, the work was even adapted for the stage, namely Charles Gildon's *The Life*

³³ [Le Faucheur], *Essay upon the Action*, pp. 208–209; cf. Howell, *Eighteenth-Century British Logic*, pp. 175, 178.

³⁴ Rebecca W. Bushnell, *A Culture of Teaching: Early Modern Humanism in Theory and Practice* (Ithaca (NY), 1996), pp. 98–103.

³⁵ Pierre Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (Cambridge, 1977); Connerton, *How Societies Remember*. Cf. Roodenburg, *The Eloquence of the Body*, pp. 17–23; Roodenburg, "Pierre Bourdieu: Issues of Embodiment and Authenticity", in *Etnofoor* 17 (2004), pp. 215–226.

of Mr. Thomas Betterton. Gildon (1665–1724) did not offer his audience so much the biographical account suggested by the production's title, but rather, a summary of the translated *Traitté* delivered from the mouth of the famous actor.³⁶ Whether Thomas Betterton (c. 1635–1710) ever even read the author is unknown, but it seems clear that Gildon was convinced of the actor's capacity to embody Le Faucheur. Betterton's performance managed to incarnate Le Faucheur's defence of entwining passion with dignity, and of emotions working all the more powerfully through an orator's bodily restraint. Gildon may have recognised in Betterton's acting style enough of the Genevan's penchant for propriety and stateliness to make him a creditable spokesman for his own ideas on the stage.

As we will see, Gildon (who was an actor as well) took an interest in studies on delivery much as others were doing at the time. Around 1700, scholars discovering the importance of rhetoric as displayed through voice and gesture began to comment on the stage, while actors simultaneously came to realise they could learn from these learned writings and contemporary historical painting. Across Europe, actors began collections of drawings and paintings with the primary aim of documenting 'postures' that could be incorporated in their acting. Some took up drawing and painting themselves. Conversely, painters such as Gerard de Lairese (1640–1711) took an active interest in the stage, while preachers, hoping to improve their method of delivery, took lessons with actors. From the last decades of the seventeenth century onwards, and frequently inspired by Le Faucheur, authors on the pulpit, the stage and the bar all sought to adopt the contemporary codes of civility that were moulded by exercises such as dancing, fencing and horseback riding. These very corporal activities were considered integral to the cultivation of that other eloquence: a natural, elegant and stately body.³⁷ Le Faucheur's translator saw the connections as follows:

In fine, This *Book* is no Enemy to *Good Breeding*, and it intrenches upon no Mans *Education* or *Profession*. The *Dancing-School* indeed teaches *Gesture* or *Motion* wonderfully well, and the *Ballance of the Body* to Perfection; but it can never do the whole Business of an *Orator* nor accomplish him with all necessary *Action* either for the *Pulpit* or the *Bar*, till the *Feet* can speak *Figures*

³⁶ Charles Gildon, *The Life of Mr. Thomas Betterton, The Late Eminent Tragedian* (London, 1710); cf. Howell, *Eighteenth-Century British Logic*, pp. 182–189; Goring, *Rhetoric of Sensibility*, pp. 122–127.

³⁷ See Dene Barnett, *The Art of Gesture: The Practices and Principles of 18th Century Acting* (Heidelberg, 1987), pp. 121–135; Roodenburg, *The Eloquence of the Body*, pp. 83–109.

and the *Hands* plead *Causes*. 'Tis certain however, that *Eloquence* does not lay in the *Heels*, nor *Rhetorick* in *Frisking* and *Gesticulation*.³⁸

In other words, rhetoric and civility should be integrated to meet in mutually advantageous ways. As the *Traitté*'s translator continued to say, the work:

will make as excellent a *School-Book* for *Boyes* as any extant; to reform the *vitious Habits* of their *Pronuntiation*; to refine the affected Rudeness of their *Behaviour*; to polish the natural *Clownishness* of their *Gesture*, and to give them a true *Light* at last into the main end and design of *Rhetorick*, which is to express themselves *distinctly* and *handsomely* in their *Exercises* upon all Occasions.

In short: 'it will not be thought unworthy of any *Young Gentlemans Pocket* or *Study*, who has any value for the Graces of *Action*, and the Charms of *Eloquence*'.³⁹

Le Faucheur's rules would remain influential for much of the eighteenth century. However, things started to change around 1750 when, for instance, James Fordyce (1720–1796) proposed a pedagogical technique different from that of the Genevan. Fordyce was a Scottish Presbyterian minister who, already famous for his oratory in his home country, moved to London. There, he quickly attracted a crowd of admirers, among them long-time friend Samuel Johnson (1709–1784) and the actor David Garrick (1717–1779). Fordyce is the supposed author of a short and anonymous tract entitled *An Essay on the Action Proper for the Pulpit* (1753).⁴⁰ The essay goes so far as to eulogise Garrick, articulating ideas corresponding with his innovations on the stage, specifically, the introduction of a more 'natural' style than that of Betterton and his followers. The work marks a crucial phase in what Paul Goring has described as the 'sentimentalisation' of delivery, which puts a premium on the affective power of religious oratory. Playing a crucial role here is the preacher's voice and his gesture as a means to arouse the passions of the audience and work directly on their hearts.

According to Howell, Fordyce merely echoed Le Faucheur, but he apparently overlooked the *Essay*'s real intentions. Fordyce actually rejected the Genevan's didactics of internalising the rules, instead proposing training in pulpit performance that is grafted upon 'genuine feeling'. Religion would

³⁸ [Le Faucheur], *Essay upon the Action*, sig. A8r-Abv.

³⁹ [Le Faucheur], *Essay upon the Action*, sig. A9r-A11r.

⁴⁰ [James Fordyce], *An Essay on the Action Proper for the Pulpit* (London, 1753). Both the British Library catalogue and the English Short Title Catalogue (ESTC) attribute the essay to Fordyce.

thus become visible through the preacher's passions, manifesting themselves through the modulation of voice, in his eyes, gestures and bearing. A sermon ought to be emotionally contagious, and it was only the preacher's habitus – his 'warm and worthy heart' – that could effect such contagion.⁴¹

As Goring explains, Fordyce's new didactics worked by means of a preacher nurturing virtuous passions. If such emotions were genuine – truly felt – they would naturally and automatically mark themselves upon his body. Religion could only touch the hearts of the faithful through such marks that were manifested through the preacher's sentimental body: 'When they seem all possessed, expanded, exalted with those beautiful and sublime Perceptions which *she* inspires; when their Countenances brighten and their Eyes glow with her sacred Spirit ... is it possible for the Auditors ... not to be charmed into Love, or awed into Veneration?'⁴² The most important factor in affecting hearts was the orator's eyes, especially when they welled up with tears. Fordyce's ideal preacher, so writes Goring, was a lachrymose one.⁴³

In accordance with the open cultural climate, where actors were thoughtfully looking at drawings and paintings, even collecting them as inspirations to improve their gestures and postures, Fordyce illustrated his own arguments with Raphael's *St. Paul Preaching in Athens*, a highly esteemed painting at the time. Fordyce praises Raphael for his masterful portrayal both of the apostle's religiously inspired body and his hearers whose hearts are touched by the spiritual and bodily performance before them.⁴⁴

Closely related to Fordyce's didactics were those of the Irish educator Thomas Sheridan (1719–1788). Writing not only on the eloquence of the church, but also on eloquence in general (in addition to many other subjects), this former actor and charismatic public speaker defended his ideas in several books and numerous lectures throughout England and Scotland. In 1762, he published his *Lectures on Elocution*, an eight-part collection of his lectures.⁴⁵

Sheridan advocated general reform of the English language. On the one hand, he aimed 'to revive the long lost art of oratory', as he called it; on the other, he sought to finally establish a standard English pronunciation.

⁴¹ Goring, *Rhetoric of Sensibility*, pp. 52–59, esp. 56–57.

⁴² [Fordyce], *An Essay on the Action*, p. 25.

⁴³ Goring, *Rhetoric of Sensibility*, p. 57.

⁴⁴ [Fordyce], *An Essay on the Action*, p. 26.

⁴⁵ Thomas Sheridan, *A Course of Lectures on Elocution: Together with Two Dissertations on Language; and Some other Tracts relative to those Subjects* (London, 1762).

Within this ambitious and much lauded programme, Sheridan developed ideas very similar to those of Fordyce. Like the Scottish minister, he valued spoken over written languages, the former being the gift of God, the latter the invention of man. Living speech, voice and gesture could transmit our emotions. As he argued in his *Lectures*: 'All writers seem to be under the influence of one common delusion, that by the help of words alone, they can communicate all that passes in their minds. They forget that the passions and the fancy have a language of their own, utterly independent of words, by which only their exertions can be manifested and communicated'.⁴⁶ It is only through body language – 'sensible marks' like 'tones, looks, and gestures' – that emotions residing in the mind of one man may be communicated to that of another.⁴⁷

Like Fordyce, Sheridan did not attach much value to Le Faucheurian rules, preferring instead an elocutional didactics in which a speaker strives to put feeling first. The philosophy was that if a speaker could succeed in emotionally identifying with the subject of his speech, he would grasp how good oratory works, how the pertinent emotions would be marked upon body and face through his bearing and gestures: 'Let him speak entirely from his feelings; and they will find much truer signs to manifest themselves by, than he could find for them'.⁴⁸

A third interesting figure was the Presbyterian preacher Hugh Blair (1718–1800). In 1783, he published his *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*, a collection of lectures he gave while serving as the first Regius Professor of Rhetoric and Belles Lettres at the University of Edinburgh.⁴⁹ It seems he was not a very impressive speaker, his voice being weak and his delivery, poor. His writings, furthermore, indicated he was better at synthesising than innovating. As he all too modestly acknowledged: 'There is little in the lectures that is original'. But by adopting ideas on delivery very similar to those of Fordyce and Sheridan, Blair still contributed substantially to the elocutionary movement.⁵⁰ Until well into the nineteenth century, not only in England, but also in Germany, the Netherlands and elsewhere, his *Lectures* would serve as one of the major textbooks on the market.⁵¹

⁴⁶ Sheridan, *A Course of Lectures*, p. x.

⁴⁷ Sheridan, *A Course of Lectures*, pp. 99–100.

⁴⁸ Sheridan, *A Course of Lectures*, p. 121.

⁴⁹ Hugh Blair, *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres* (2 vols.; London, 1783).

⁵⁰ On Blair and Sheridan, see Edward P.J. Corbett and James L. Golden eds., *The Rhetoric of Blair, Campbell, and Whately* (New York, 1968), p. 14.

⁵¹ Hugh Blair, *Vorlesungen über Rhetorik und schöne Wissenschaften*, 4 vols. (Leipzig, 1785–1798); Blair, *Lessen over de redekunst en fraaie wetenschappen*, 3 vols. (Deventer, 1788–1790).

Though not as radical as Fordyce and Sheridan, Blair identified with their encouragement of delivery, 'for beyond doubt, nothing is of more importance'. He also agreed that, in the moment of speaking, orators should forget about the rules and merely follow nature. Ultimately, Blair stressed the orator's own sensibility. As he wrote: 'No kind of language is so generally understood, and so powerfully felt, as the native language of worthy and virtuous feelings. He only, therefore, who possesses these full and strong, can speak properly and in its own language, to the heart'. Furthermore, Blair continued: 'On all great subjects and occasions, there is a dignity, there is an energy in noble sentiments, which is overcoming and irresistible. They give an ardour and a flame to one's discourse, which seldom fails to kindle a like flame in those who hear; and which, more than any other cause, bestows on eloquence that power for which it is famed, of seizing and transporting an audience'. As Blair concluded: 'A true orator should be a person of generous sentiments, of warm feelings, and of a mind turned towards the admiration of all those great and high subjects, which mankind are naturally formed to admire'.⁵²

Blair thus demonstrates another notion of delivery fully similar to Fordyce's and Sheridan's, though distinct from Le Faucheur's. Typical of the elocutionary movement as a whole, it matches the period's interest in 'sensibility', in man's inherent capacity for emotion and his disposition to respond to sensation. It also relates to the contemporary pursuit of energy and vividness which, according to Geoffrey Carnall, had its 'most convincing application in the context of theatre and oratory, rather than in the written word'.⁵³ As Joseph Roach has shown, these notions and other similar ones came to be articulated by theoreticians of the theatre, such as Luigi Riccoboni (1674–1753) (who boldly wrote about 'Enthusiasm' and 'Divine Madness'), Pierre Rémond de Sainte-Albine (1699–1778) and the English physician, actor and playwright John Hill (1706–1775). These ideas were also expressed by Garrick, who wrote of the heart's 'instantaneous feelings, that Life blood, that keen Sensibility, that bursts at once from Genius, and like Electrical fire shoots thro' the Veins, Marrow, Bones and all, of every Spectator'. Clearly, eighteenth-century pulpit oratory should be studied in connection with contemporary theories on acting as well as physiology and the passions.⁵⁴

⁵² Quoted after Hugh Blair, *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres* (3 vols., Basel and Paris, 1801) II, pp. 224, 385; III, pp. 6–8.

⁵³ John Butt, *The Mid-Eighteenth Century*, Geoffrey Carnall ed. (Oxford, 1979), pp. 495, 505–506.

⁵⁴ Roach, *The Player's Passion* (see above, n. 11), pp. 93–103; Carnall and Garrick also quoted there.

Oratory, upon its break into sentiment and sensibility, was of course also closely related to contemporary literature. Among the religious orators celebrated for their *actio* was the Anglican clergyman Laurence Sterne (1713–1768). In 1759, he published the first parts of his 'sentimental' novel, *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy* (1759). The book would bring him international fame, with his most ardent admirers lovingly calling him 'Tristram'. One such fan was the political radical John Wilkes (1725–1797) who, in reference to Demosthenes, urged a friend to go hear the well-known preacher: 'Tho' you may not catch every word of Tristram, his *action* will divert you, and you know that *action* is the first, second, third, &c parts of a great orator'. Answering to Fordyce's ideal of the lachrymose orator, Sterne was a master at rousing the emotions of the faithful. Another contemporary noted how he 'never preached (...) but half the congregation were in tears'.⁵⁵

In his novel, Sterne also poked fun at contemporary manuals on delivery. Through the bodily eloquence of Corporal Trim, one of the book's main characters, he offered an amusing parody of Le Faucheurian rules (for instance, the description of Trim delivering a speech bending forward so 'as to make an angle of 85 degrees and a half upon the plain of the horizon'). However, in the same endearing character Sterne also depicted the perfect orator, the untrained amateur attaining eloquence by first living the very passions he must transmit. No gesture proved more touching than Trim throwing down his hat while speaking about the fickleness of life! As Goring has written, Sterne and other authors of sentimental fiction such as Samuel Richardson (1689–1761) or Henry Mackenzie (1745–1831) were masters at 'staging' somatic eloquence, thus reducing their readers to tears.⁵⁶ As we will see, even this shared weeping (often the novels were read aloud before company) was recommended as an instrument to enhance the sensitivity of the heart.

5. Praising 'Enthusiasm'

Inextricably bound up with the period's quest for sensibility, seen as an innate sort of vitality, was an interest in those champions of unpolished 'enthusiastic' oratory.⁵⁷ Their rhetorical qualities were suddenly taken

⁵⁵ Both accounts quoted from Goring, *Rhetoric of Sensibility*, pp. 185–185.

⁵⁶ Goring, *Rhetoric of Sensibility*, pp. 144–145.

⁵⁷ See especially Goring, *Rhetoric of Sensibility*, Ch. 2.

seriously because they offered a fine illustration of how orators could instrumentalise the passions and thus work directly on the hearts of their audiences.

For example, in his *British Education*, published in 1756, Sheridan praised 'the wild uncultivated oratory of our Methodist preachers', and even suggested that their 'canting and frantick gestures might be more forcible than the best regulated oratory'.⁵⁸ Considering the Methodists' dubious reputation and the condemning terms of 'enthusiasm' and 'madness' that were often employed to describe their gatherings at the time, Sheridan's appreciation was a provocation more than anything else. Methodists were hotly discussed, although they comprised no more than 24,000 adherents in the 1760s and the majority belonged to the lower classes of both town and country. They were censured as much as they were feared for a perceived lack of physical control witnessed, for example, in the seemingly involuntary convulsions they underwent while hearing the sermon. Gradually, however, Methodist preachers also came to be admired for their oratorical gifts, their genius in stirring up the feelings of the faithful. Most famous among the preachers were the two leaders of the movement in England, John Wesley (1703–1791) and George Whitefield (1714–1770). Most appreciated was Wesley's *actio*, always forceful though able to avoid giving in to Whitefield's extreme emotions. In his twelve-page *Directions concerning Pronunciation and Gesture* (1749), Wesley even borrowed from Le Faucheur.⁵⁹ Yet, Sheridan's praise of the Methodists' 'canting and frantick' ways, which many of his contemporaries equated with 'enthusiasm' and 'madness', was a gamble. Perhaps Sheridan realised this himself, for six years later, in his *Lectures*, he took a more cautious stance, assuring readers that his own idea of bodily eloquence was a polite and restrained one. Emotional and passionate, though not manic, this eloquence did not advocate the violent gesticulation cherished by the Methodists.⁶⁰

In the decades to follow, such polished esteem for a delivery unpolished would become standard phrase. In his influential *Essai sur l'éloquence de la chaire* (1777), Archbishop of Paris Jean-Siffrein Maury (1746–1817) praised the delivery of Jacques Bridaine (1701–1767), an itinerant preacher who worked mostly in the Midi.⁶¹ Much later, in 1817, the Dutch professor

⁵⁸ Thomas Sheridan, *British Education: or, The Source of the Disorders of Great Britain* (London, 1756), pp. 91, 153.

⁵⁹ Goring, *Rhetoric of Sensibility*, p. 73 n.39.

⁶⁰ Goring, *Rhetoric of Sensibility*, p. 112.

⁶¹ Jean-Siffrein Maury, *Essai sur l'éloquence de la chaire* (2 vols.; Paris, 1777) I, p. 144.

of rhetoric Joannes Matthias Schrant (1783–1866) wrote approvingly of the 'simple and unesteemed preachers, known in England by the name of *Methodists*, and in Italy by that of *Improvisatoris* (...), travelling the country or the streets of cities, and preaching penance'. Among them were 'men inspired by an apostolic spirit, true orators of the people (...) who know no other fruits than conversion, no other acclaim than tears'.⁶² Naturally, no cultured reader of Maury, Schrant or any of the other authors on pulpit oratory expected to have himself converted by such preachers. Praising their artless delivery had the express function of putting polite delivery on the table, of making it less artful and appear less grafted upon Le Faucheurian rules.

More than he did with the Methodists and their variety of Pietism, Schrant actually identified with the views of Johann Ludwig Ewald (1748–1822), a German Reformed minister whose beliefs merged the German tradition of Pietism with the late Enlightenment. Of course, what all Pietists, including the Methodists, had in common was religious subjectivism. It made them natural allies in the search for a more affective oratory of the pulpit. Mostly channelled through the contemporary cult of sensibility, the actual impact of the British elocutionary movement in Germany and the Netherlands may well have been equally informed by contemporary German Pietism.⁶³

6. Affective Oratory in Germany

Well received both in Germany and the Netherlands, Ewald's many publications included, among others, studies on the philosophy of Immanuel Kant, church and educational reforms and the social position of women and Jews.⁶⁴ For many years, Ewald conducted a lively correspondence with

⁶² Fenelon's *Gesprekken over de welsprekendheid in het algemeen, en over die van de kansel in het bijzonder*, J.M. Schrant ed., (Amsterdam and Zaltbommel, 1817), pp. 70–71; see also the comments by Johannes Clarisse in Johann Ludwig Ewald, *Over de uiterlijke kanselwelsprekendheid*, trans. and ed. J. Clarisse (Zutphen, 1814), pp. 203, 210–211.

⁶³ On Pietism taken in this integral sense and encompassing not only Methodism and German Pietism, but also the Dutch 'Further Reformation' with its eighteenth-century aftermath, see Martin Brecht, "Einleitung", in: M. Brecht et al eds., *Geschichte des Pietismus* (4 vols.; Göttingen, 1993–2004) I, pp. 1–5; W.J. op 't Hof, *Het gereformeerd piëtisme* (Houten, 2005), pp. 14–35.

⁶⁴ On the striking popularity of German theological writings in the Dutch Republic, especially in the second half of the eighteenth century, see Joris van Eijnatten, "History, Reform, and Aufklärung. German Theological Writing and Dutch Literary Publicity in the Eighteenth Century", in *Zeitschrift für neuere Theologieggeschichte* 7 (2000), pp. 173–204.

two Pietists, Johann Kaspar Lavater (1741–1801), also famous for his studies on physiognomy, and Philipp Matthäus Hahn (1739–1790). Later on, he also adopted ideas from Johann-Heinrich Pestalozzi (1746–1827).⁶⁵ Many of these inspirations, especially Kantian philosophy, may be traced in Ewald's influential *Ueber Deklamation und Kanzelvortrag*, published in 1809 and translated into Dutch five years later.⁶⁶

Like Le Faucheur, Ewald was well aware that his manual offered what was essentially a prompt to delivery.⁶⁷ A distinction between the 'archive' and the 'repertoire' was here also made, albeit in his own terms. On the work's very first page, he warns the young man with preacherly aspirations that his manual cannot replace actual exercise. Even after having read, studied, grasped and memorised the text – or, for that matter, all texts on the subject – the man will be no more of a good orator than a man who has read all the best existing violin manuals is a good violinist, or a man who has read all the best existing voice manuals is a good vocalist. In sum: 'there is little to read here, but much to do'.⁶⁸

'Oratory,' explained Ewald, 'is the capacity to act on other people's selves through one's own self and appearance – through ideas and sensations, and

⁶⁵ Hans-Martin Kirn, *Deutsche Spätaufklärung und Pietismus. Ihr Verhältnis im Rahmen kirchlich-bürgerlicher Reform bei Johann Ludwig Ewald (1748–1822)* (Göttingen, 1998), pp. 53–86, 324–352. See also Johann Anselm Steiger, *Johann Ludwig Ewald. Rettung eines theologischen Zeitgenossen* (Göttingen, 1996).

⁶⁶ Johann Ludwig Ewald, *Ueber Deklamation und Kanzelvortrag. Skizzen und Ergüsse; auch zum Leitfaden akademischer Vorlesungen brauchbar* (Heidelberg, 1809); Ewald, *Over de uiterlijke kanselwelsprekendheid*, J. Clarisse ed. (Zutphen, 1814); a second, revised edition of this translation was published in 1839 as Ewald, *Voorlezingen over de uiterlijke kanselwelsprekendheid* (Arnhem, 1839). On Kant's influence on the German theology of his time, see C.W. Flügge, *Versuch einer historisch-kritischen Darstellung des bisherigen Einflusses der kantischen Philosophie auf alle Zweige der wissenschaftlichen und praktischen Theologie* (3 vols.; Hannover, 1796–1798).

⁶⁷ The precise impact of Le Faucheur's *Traité* on German oratory still needs investigation. It was never translated into German, but did see a Latin edition in 1690: Michel le Faucheur, *De actione oratoria sive de pronuntiatione et gestu liber utilissimus* (Helmstadt, 1690). In the eighteenth century, German manuals on pulpit oratory often seem to refer to the *Traité*; both Le Faucheur and Francius are mentioned in Johann Jacob Engel's influential *Ideen zu einer Mimik* (2 vols.; Berlin, 1785–1786).

⁶⁸ Ewald, *Ueber Deklamation*, pp. 3–4: 'Diese kleine Schrift soll und kann dem Jünglinge keine Uebung ersetzen: sie soll ihn vielmehr überzeugen, daß er Uebung im Lesen, Deklamieren, in der anständigen Stellung des Körpers und in der Gestikulation bedürfe: daß er ohne sie, nie ein Redner werden könne. Und wenn er diese Schrift und alle Schriften über äusseren Vortrag gelesen, studirt, gefaßt und behalten hätte (...), so wird er dadurch eben so wenig einen guten Vortrag bekommen, wie mann durch das Lesen der besten gedruckten Violin- und Singschule, ein guter Geiger oder Sänger werden wird (...). Es ist hier wenig zu lesen, aber viel zu thun'.

through language, facial expression and bodily movements'.⁶⁹ Accordingly, it is the task of the religious orator 'to act through appearance on the self, to lead a throng of people to morality, to warm them to the high merit of virtue, of true religiosity'.⁷⁰ Ewald distinguishes between 'active' and 'passive' subjects, and from among the instruments available to both. The process as a whole presupposes reciprocity or 'sympathy', as he calls it, for what is 'needed' or 'coveted' by the one is 'imparted' by the other. Not surprisingly, we are reminded that man is a rational and a sensual being. People (certainly the 'uneducated mass') are motivated more by sensory impressions than by rational ideas. That is what makes delivery so all-important. As the German writer Jean Paul (the pseudonym of Johann Paul Richter, 1763–1825) asked: 'Why should the devil enlist all sensuality and God none of it?'⁷¹

Central to Ewald's thinking – and almost echoing the elocutionists' emphasis on the orator's 'fire' – is that the self comes first. Before he ascends the pulpit, the preacher should turn to his inner self in order to 'collect' all that may affect appearance: 'There has to be a life which must enliven, a warmth which must warm, a strength which must strengthen'. And he continues: 'One should never imagine to act on the self through appearance alone', such 'hypocrisy' will work 'nothing durable and lasting'.⁷²

Of course, rules are indispensable: a knowledge of counterpoint was necessary for Mozart, and Michelangelo needed to understand anatomy. But as Ewald reiterates, first something has to well up in an inner life before the self can enliven at all. What orators need, then, is a 'sensitivity of the heart', an openness 'to be lifted, touched and enflamed' by what their audience should also 'lift, touch and enflame'. Ewald quotes Quintilian on the orator's heart as well as Goethe's *Faust*: 'But from heart to heart you will never create, if from your heart it does not come'.⁷³

⁶⁹ Ewald, *Ueber Deklamation*, p. 9: 'Beredsamkeit ist die Fertigkeit, durch sein Inneres und Aeusseres, durch Ideen und Empfindungen, durch Sprache, Minen und Körperhaltung, auf das Innere Anderer zu wirken'.

⁷⁰ Ewald, *Ueber Deklamation*, p. 8: '(...) durch Einwirken des Aeussers auf das Innere, eine Menschenmasse zur Sittlichkeit lenken, sie erwärmen für den hohen Werth der Tugend, der ächten Religiosität'.

⁷¹ Ewald, *Ueber Deklamation*, pp. 29–31.

⁷² Ewald, *Ueber Deklamation*, pp. 17–18: 'Es muß ein Leben seyn, was beleben, eine Wärme, die erwärmen, eine Kraft, die stärken soll. Nie lasse man sich doch einfallen, durch bloß Aeusseres auf das Innere zu wirken. Diese Heuchelei, wenn sie auch bis zur höchsten Kunst geht, wirkt nichts dauerhaftes, bleibendes'.

⁷³ Ewald, *Ueber Deklamation*, pp. 86–87: 'Es gibt eine gewisse Reitzbarkeit des Herzens (...), die ein Haupttalent des Redners ausmacht.' 'Es ist die Fähigkeit, sich schnell in jede Art von Empfindung zu versetzen, die mann jetzt ausdrücken soll und will; die

If a young man does not know such sensibility, then Ewald has some devastating advice for him: 'If you are not touched by any poem, drama or choral song, if a simply 'majestic' and purely sung hymn leaves you cold and always left you cold, if you do not warm more to a touching song read or a heart-rending story told to you than to a newspaper article read or a town gossip told to you, then go and study cameralistics, loiter in the chaos of positive laws and in the labyrinth of legal proceedings; go and become a botanist, a transcendental philosopher, an algebraist, build machines, houses, mills, measure heaven and earth, do what you like. But renounce the calling to spread religiosity through public oratory among your people'.⁷⁴

Ewald's realisation was that some people have more sensitive hearts than others, though the heart may – and, in fact ought to – be cultivated by everything enlivening the emotions. Ways to do so include conversing with sensitive people and reading aloud heartrending texts, to either oneself or like-minded others. Ewald does not mention Richardson or Sterne, but he recommends Shakespeare, Klopstock, the young (sentimentalist) Goethe, Schiller's *Jungfrau von Orleans*, as well as Fénelon and Lavater.

Music and singing, especially, could also enhance one's sense of the heart. The aspiring clergyman should take every opportunity to hear vocal music. If he himself is a practitioner, he might perform songs written by Christian Gottlieb Neefe (1748–1798) on texts of Klopstock, hymns by Johann Friedrich Reichardt (1752–1814), arias and duets from Handel's *Messiah*, Haydn's *Schöpfung* and Mozart's *Requiem*. All pieces would deepen the sensitivity of the heart.⁷⁵

Geschmeidigkeit, jetzt selbst belebt zu werden, von dem was Andere beleben, selbst gehoben, gerührt, entflammt zu werden von dem was Andere heben, rühren, entflammen soll.' For the Quintilian quote, see above, n. 28; Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, *Faust. Eine Tragödie* (Tübingen, 1808), p. 43: 'Doch werdet Ihr nie Herz zu Herzen schaffen, wenn es euch nicht von Herzen geht'.

⁷⁴ Ewald, *Ueber Deklamation*, pp. 87–88: 'Wenn du darum von keinem Gedicht, keinem Drama, keinem Chorgesange gerührt wirst; wenn dich der einfach "erhabene", reingesungene Kirchengesang kalt läßt und immer kalt ließ; wenn du bei dem Vorlesen eines rührenden Liedes, bei dem Erzählen einer herzdurchdringenden Geschichte nicht wärmer wird, als bei dem Vorlesen eines Zeitungsartikels oder bei dem Erzählen einer Stadträtscherei; so studire Kameralwissenschaften, treibe dich im Chaos der positiven Gesetze, und im Labyrinth der Prozeßformen herum; botanisire, transzendentalisire, algebraisire; baue Maschinen, Häuser, Mühlen, – miß Himmel und Erde aus, – treibe, was du willst. Nur lasse dich von dem Berufe, Religiosität, auch durch öffentliche Reden zu verbreiten in deinem Kreis'.

⁷⁵ Ewald, *Ueber Deklamation*, pp. 88–91; Ewald also mentions the composer Carl Heinrich Graun (1704–1759) and his passion cantata, *Tod Jesu* (1755), and the poet Christoph August Tiedge (1752–1841) and his *Urania* (1801), containing poems 'composed in heaven'.

Finally, there are the notions of friendship and love, the former of which was preferred by Ewald. An intense bond with another young man who shares life's joys and sorrows with you, opens his heart to you and will caution, encourage and restrain you, was believed to function better than a woman's love. After all, in the former kind of love, the emotions remained more chaste, spiritual and powerful.⁷⁶

At the end of his manual, Ewald compares the oratory of the pulpit with the stage techniques of an actor, as many authors before him, such as Le Faucheur, had done. As Ewald explains it, crucial to the preacher is *Miene*, the expression indicated in his eyes, forehead, mouth and all the animate aspects of his face. Revealed here are vanity, humility, frivolity, absent-mindedness, timidity, complacency, feeling and concern. But *Miene*, a person's facial expression, and *Mienenspiel* are two distinct concepts, for the preacher, unlike the actor, plays nothing. The preacher should take care to be truly moved by the emotion he is expected to express; failing to do so means he is merely playing and proffering forth no more than some *Mienenspiel* – precisely what actors do.⁷⁷ Though Ewald does not mention Diderot, he implicitly refers to the *Paradoxe sur le comédien*, in which the French *philosophe* and encyclopaedist, distancing himself from Garrick's art of the stage, argued that acting was not about feeling, but only mimicking gesture, posture and expression.⁷⁸ In fact, Diderot offered a perfect argument for why religious orators would profit from visiting the theatre and how, while actors were faking, preachers were not.⁷⁹

In consonance with such views, Ewald emphasises that imitation should be absolutely forbidden – it is a negative, artificial thing. By contrast, one's delivery should seem totally genuine, a convincing alliance of politeness and nature: 'Everything has to grow so natural to the young man, as if he never moved otherwise, could not move otherwise'.⁸⁰ For as long as the aspiring preacher is conscious of the rules and fears failure, he will be far less convincing. But, according to Ewald, that will change because in the end: 'the rules (...) will turn into a kind of instinct in him. No longer does he need to watch his movements. He will perform those rules so lightly, so

⁷⁶ Ewald, *Ueber Deklamation*, pp. 91–92.

⁷⁷ Ewald, *Ueber Deklamation*, p. 110: 'Also muß es das Hauptbemühen des öffentlichen Religionslehrer seyn, in dem Augenblick des Redens wirklich von der Empfindung ergriffen zu seyn, die er auszudrücken hat, wenn er anders durch seine Miene wirken will'.

⁷⁸ On Diderot and his *Paradoxe*, see Roach, *The Player's Passion* (see above, n. 11), pp. 133–136.

⁷⁹ On faking and the *Paradoxe*, see William Ian Miller, *Faking It* (New York, 2003), pp. 195–200.

⁸⁰ Ewald, *Ueber Deklamation*, p. 118.

fluently, and so flexibly, yet move with certainty, propriety and expressiveness, and as perfectly as can be'.⁸¹ It seems another instance of Bourdieu's notion of the *habitus*, whereby exercises turn into bodily automatisms, and 'history' turns into 'nature'.

7. *Affective Oratory in the Netherlands*

Compared to other German texts on sacred oratory, Ewald's innovations were remarkable. He may have profited from earlier authors on the subject, especially Gotthilf Samuel Steinbart (1738–1809), Carl Friedrich Bahrdt (1741–1792) and a couple of authors publishing in the 1790s.⁸² But for most of the eighteenth century, the German manuals tend to emphasise the practical rules elaborated by Le Faucheur and his successors.

The texts published in the Netherlands reveal a similar pattern, though they usually refer less to Le Faucheur than to Petrus Francius (1645–1704), professor of rhetoric (and also of history, Greek and Latin) at the Amsterdam Athenaeum Illustre. Francius reaped a great deal of fame after his *Specimen eloquentiae exterioris* was published in 1697. The book did not only offer a new edition of Cicero's oration *Pro Archia*, but also provided a set of 39 rules concerning pronunciation and a set of 56 rules on delivery.⁸³ Surveying the presence in Francius' library of Balzac and a selection of manuals on civility, from Baldassare Castiglione and Giovanni della Casa to Antoine de Courtin and the Chevalier de Méré, he was as much an exponent of the 'new age of eloquence' as Le Faucheur. He may have found new models within the eloquence of the church in the writings of Antoine Arnauld (1612–1694), René Rapin (1621–1687) or Etienne Dubois de Bretteville (1650–1688), whose works were also present on his shelves.⁸⁴ Rapin,

⁸¹ Ewald, *Ueber Deklamation*, p. 118.

⁸² Gotthilf Samuel Steinbart, *Anweisung zur Amtsberedsamkeit christlicher Lehrer unter einem aufgeklärten und gesitteten Volke* (Züllichau, 1779); Carl Friedrich Bahrdt, *Versuch über die Beredsamkeit nur für meine Zuhörer bestimmt* (Dessau and Leipzig, 1782); Franz Christian Cordes, *Ueber die Action angehender Prediger auf der Kanzel* (Wittenberg and Zerbst, 1791); Johann Gottlob Marezoll, *Ueber die Bestimmung des Kanzelredners* (Leipzig, 1793); Johann Gottfried Pfannenberg, *Ueber die rednerische Action mit erläuternden Beispielen; vorzüglich für studierende Jünglinge* (Leipzig, 1796); Christoph Friedrich von Ammon, *Anleitung zur Kanzelberedsamkeit* (Göttingen, 1799). Clarisse mentions a translation of Marezoll's manual by the Groningen professor of theology, Eelco Tinga (1762–1828): *Over de bestemming van den kerkelijken redenaar* (Franeker, 1804); I have not been able to trace a copy of this book.

⁸³ Petrus Francius, *Specimen eloquentiae exterioris, ad Orationem M. T. Ciceronis Pro A. Licin. Archia accomodatum* (Amsterdam, 1697).

⁸⁴ *Catalogus librorum Petri Francii* (Amsterdam, 1705), pp. 224, 230, 233–234.

whom Francius met in Paris in 1669 while on his grand tour of France, lamented the lack of sacred eloquence as much as Francius did. 'It is a striking thing,' Rapin wrote, 'that among the persons devoting themselves to preaching one finds so few who distinguish themselves'.⁸⁵ Leafing through De Bretteville's *L'eloquence de la chaire et du barreau*, we come across many of the rules mentioned by both Le Faucheur and Francius.

Francius' *Specimen* was well received in the Netherlands. Indeed, it may have prevented Le Faucheur's *Traité* from becoming as influential in the Dutch Republic as it had in Britain. In 1701, the *Specimen* was translated into the vernacular and included in a convolute containing the first Dutch translation of the *Traité* as well as another text on delivery, also in Dutch, taken from Jean Le Clercq's *Parrhasiana*.⁸⁶ Clearly, as the first English translation of the *Traité* is dated 1702, it was only in these years that Le Faucheur's merging of oratory and civility found a larger audience in the two countries. In the Netherlands, however, the *Traité* may well already have been known among the French-speaking elite.⁸⁷

Like the English translation, the convolute would see two reprints in the first half of the century, in 1741 and 1748,⁸⁸ followed in 1753 by a new Latin edition of the *Specimen* alone.⁸⁹ However, as the Dutch manuals on sacred oratory reveal, Le Faucheur's and Francius' rules would be valid until the end of the century. According to a number of sources, from Francius' pupil Franciscus Fabricius (1663–1738) to Jan Konijnenburg

⁸⁵ René Rapin, *Les oeuvres du P. Rapin, qui contiennent les Reflexions sur l'Eloquence, la Poétique, l'Histoire et la Philosophie* (2 vols.; Amsterdam, 1707) II, pp. 61–62.

⁸⁶ *Verhandeling van de uitspraak en gebaarmaaking van eenen redenaar door Michiel Le Faucheur; als mede Bestieringen aangaande de uitspraak en gebaarmaaking door Petrus Francius, en ten laatsten, Aanmerkingen aangaande de uitspraak, uit de Parrhasiana*, trans. J. van Zanten (Haarlem, 1701). Like Francius, Le Clercq expresses his admiration for the *Traité*, which he calls 'a masterpiece of its kind'. Unlike Francius, he also knew the author's name.

⁸⁷ Howell mentions two French editions of the *Traité* published in Leiden in 1686 and in Amsterdam in 1697; see Howell, *Eighteenth-Century Logic* (see above, n. 13), p. 163 n.86; other French editions were published in France itself.

⁸⁸ Michel le Faucheur, *Verhandeling van de uitspraak en gebaarmaaking van eenen redenaar. Als mede Bestieringen aangaande de uitspraak en gebaarmaaking door den here Petrus Francius; en ten laatste Aanmerkingen aangaande de uitspraak uit de Parrhasiana. Ten nuttigen gebruike voor godgeleerde, regtsgeleerde, en alle openbare redenvoerders opgesteld*, trans. J. van Zanten (Amsterdam, 1741); Le Faucheur, *Verhandeling van de uitspraak en gebaarmaaking van eenen redenaar* (Groningen, 1748).

⁸⁹ Petrus Francius, *Specimen eloquentiae exterioris, ad Orationem M. T. Ciceronis Pro A. Licin. Archia accomodatum* (Groningen, 1753). Rather surprisingly, the *Traité* even went through another Dutch edition as late as 1845: Michel le Faucheur, *Over de voordragt des redenaars, of Over de uitspraak en het gebaar. Naar het Fransch, met aantekeningen door J.M. Schrant* (Leiden, 1845).

(1758–1831),⁹⁰ what must be emphasised are the rules and the preacher's dignity – his *defigheid* – not the sensitivity of the heart, his or his hearers'.⁹¹ Judging by the manuals, it would even seem as though it were only Ewald's text, translated and amply commented on by the Reformed minister Johannes Clarisse (1770–1846), which would force a break into sentiment and sensibility.⁹² But the manuals only tell us one side of the story.

Like Schrant, Clarisse looked up to Ewald and his adoption of Kant's philosophy. His comments served to inform readers on the Kantian terminology employed by Ewald, explaining the philosopher's notion of *Sinnlichkeit*, or sensory perception, and cautioning that, without any knowledge of the critical philosophers, no theologian would still be able to understand his discipline.⁹³ Though he also criticises Ewald for his discussion of 'sympathy' or for overly graphic and rather irreverent terms (such as *Verkörperung Gottes*) that are occasionally used to describe the working of God on man's inner self, Clarisse fully endorses the German's views on the relevance of the emotions and the preacher's sensibility. As he rhetorically asks: 'What will he bring forth (...) whose heart is not touched itself, is not filled, warmed, cheered, formed and enlivened itself by the truths of the Gospel and their reverential embrace?'⁹⁴ He also dutifully lauds the Methodists, especially Whitefield, who knew how to appeal to the heart

⁹⁰ Franciscus Fabricius, *De heilige redevoerder* (Leiden, 1728); Fabricius, *Orator sacer* (Leiden, 1733); Jan Konijnenburg, *Lessen over het leeraars-ambt in de christelijke kerk* (Utrecht, 1802); on Fabricius, see P.J. Schuffel, 'From minister to sacred orator. Homiletics and rhetoric in the seventeenth and early eighteenth century Dutch Republic', in: *The Low Countries as a Crossroads of Religious Beliefs*, Arie-Jan Gelderblom et al eds. (Leiden, 2004), pp. 221–245.

⁹¹ See for instance Salomon van Til, *Methodus Concionandi* (Utrecht, 1717); Taco van den Honert, *Rhetorica ecclesiastica in usum auditori domestici conscripta* (Leiden, 1742); Henricus van Ravesteyn, *De Nasireer Gods tot den heiligen dienst toegerust, of heilzame raadgeving aan studenten, proponenten en jonge leraren, hoe zy in het huis Gods met vrugt kunnen verkeeren* (Amsterdam, 1743); Jan Wagenaar, *Zeven lessen over het verhandelen der Heilige Schrift in de godsdienstige byeen-komsten* (Amsterdam, 1752).

⁹² Johann Ludwig Ewald, *Over de uiterlijke kanselwelsprekendheid, uit het Hoogduitsch, met breedvoerige aantekeningen door J. Clarisse* (Zutphen, 1814); Ewald, *Voorlezingen over de uiterlijke kanselwelsprekendheid* (Arnhem, 1839). Clarisse did a thorough job. He supplemented his translation with numerous observations of his own, often on the oratory of the pulpit in the eighteenth-century Dutch Republic. Moreover, in referring to a host of ancient and modern authors on delivery, he turned Ewald's elegant treatise into a weighty compendium aimed at all ministers *in spe*. While the original totalled 123 pages, Clarisse's translation totals almost 400 and a second edition, published in 1839, over 500 pages. Interestingly, Clarisse was a pupil of Utrecht professor of theology Gisbertus Bonnet (1723–1805), who took acting lessons to improve on his delivery.

⁹³ Ewald, *Uiterlijke welsprekendheid*, pp. 10–12, 108–109.

⁹⁴ Ewald, *Uiterlijke welsprekendheid*, p. 29: 'Wat zal hij voortbrengen (...), wiens hart niet zelf getroffen is, niet zelf vervuld, verwarmd, bemoedigd, bewerkt, levend gemaakt is door de waarheden van het Evangelie en derzelver eerbiedige omhelzing?'

and the senses. While other preachers' audiences were yawning and sleeping in church, witness the caricatures by Rowlandson, Whitefield's hearers were moved to tears.⁹⁵ Interestingly, neither Clarisse nor Schrant praised any of the Dutch Pietists. Similarly, the Dutch 'spectatorial papers', modelled after Richard Steele's and Joseph Addison's *The Spectator*, used to condemn all preachers appealing more to the passions than to reason. They especially denounced the mid-century 'Nijkerker troubles' (*Nijkerker beroeringen*), a striking number of revivals, similar to the earlier Scottish revivals, in which the faithful were reduced to tears and lost all control over their bodies.⁹⁶

Commenting on the instruments available to the young preacher to foster his sensitivity of the heart, Clarisse recommends not only the music already mentioned by Ewald, but also reading the works of Sterne, Fielding, Richardson, the young Goethe and the Dutch sentimentalist writer Rhijnvis Feith (1753–1824). Similarly, Sterne's Corporal Trim is held up as a model of pure, natural eloquence. However, Clarisse also cautions against shedding too many tears in the pulpit: it will hamper the preacher's pronunciation, causing him to fiddle with handkerchiefs and, above all, enervating his 'manly dignity'. Similar objections were raised by Schrant, in his comments on Fénelon. He criticises those colleagues who considered 'novels and all kinds of sentimental pieces' as homiletic handbooks, or that one colleague who used to appeal to the sentimentalist poet Edward Young (1683–1765) as if he were one of the apostles.⁹⁷ However, like Clarisse, he subscribes to Quintilian's 'Pectus est, quod disertos facit'. In a central passage quoting not only the Roman orator, but also Ewald and Blair, he finally concludes: 'The heart must feel, and the mouth must speak the overflow of the heart: that is oratory'.⁹⁸

⁹⁵ Ewald, *Uiterlijke welsprekendheid*, p. 210.

⁹⁶ Dorothee Sturkenboom, *Spectators van hartstocht. Sekse en emotionele cultuur in de achttiende eeuw* (Hilversum, 1998); Joke Spaans ed., *Een golf van beroering. De omstreken opwekking in de Republiek in het midden van de achttiende eeuw* (Hilversum, 2001).

⁹⁷ Schrant ed., *Fénelon's Gesprekken over de welsprekendheid* (see above, n. 62, pp. 25–26, 32). Young was the author of the melancholy *Night Thoughts* (1742–1745), one of the most popular poems of the period and also translated into Dutch; for a general background, see Annemieke Meijer, *The Pure Language of the Heart: Sentimentalism in the Netherlands 1775–1800* (Amsterdam, 1998).

⁹⁸ Schrant ed., *Fénelon's Gesprekken over de welsprekendheid*, pp. 72–73: 'Het hert moet gevoelen, en van dat gevoel moet de mond overvloeijen: dat is welsprekendheid.' Cf. p. 26, where Schrant, again quoting Ewald and Blair, opines: 'Therein lies the great aim of the orator: to work on the inner self of others and to rouse their passions.' ('Daar in bestaat het grote doel des Redenaars: op het innerlijke van anderen te werken en hunne harstogten op te wekken.')

By the time Clarisse and Schrant recorded their comments on Ewald and Fénelon, the impact of the British sentimentalists, like that of Feith and the Dutch sentimental poets and novelists, had lost much of its former significance. Both ministers preferred Ewald's synthesis of German Pietism and Kantian philosophy, though they could see affinities between Ewald's thinking and the older developments in the elocutionary movement and the cult of sensibility. It may explain why they both appealed to this prior history and at the same time, writing in the 1810s, felt compelled to dissociate themselves from their colleagues' sentimentalist exaggerations, or what was often referred to as the 'Herveyan' style of preaching, after the English clergyman and former friend of Wesley, James Hervey (1714–1758).⁹⁹

8. Conclusion

In this exploratory chapter, I have sketched some contours of eighteenth-century pulpit delivery in England, Germany and the Netherlands, arguing how from mid-century onwards, manuals and other writings on the subject start to emphasise the preacher's sensitivity of the heart, his disposition to literally embody belief in his voice, eyes, hands, arms and the whole body. Important vectors that emerged were the British elocutionary movement, the cult of sensibility, and late German pietism.

The manuals on pulpit oratory offer a crucial and fascinating source for studying these developments. We may study the manuals from the stance of intellectual history, as did Howell. Or, we may adopt a Foucauldian stance, as did Goring, bringing in the body, though construing it merely as a surface, another text we can read in order to grasp broader cultural changes.¹⁰⁰ When viewed from the perspective of embodiment (Taylor's approach, though also Bourdieu's and Connerton's), we gain insight into the body as another important medium of transmission.¹⁰¹ We realise that these manuals, much like those on civility, only served as a prompt to

performance; delivery was first and foremost a matter of observation, imitation and incorporating practices. Everything was meant to look 'natural' and, at the same time, be 'polite'. How to accomplish this task could also be learned by looking at historical paintings and, more than anything else, by watching the stage.

Of course, in accordance with the axioms of neo-classicism, 'nature' should be helped; that is what all the exercise was about. Consequently, what was understood to be 'nature' constantly changed. What was regarded 'natural' or authentic by one generation was often considered 'affected' or even 'fake' by the next. To be taken seriously, preachers were to follow the codes of civility, or at least follow them precisely enough so as not to be dismissed as 'affected' or, on the other end of the spectrum, 'uncultured' (as the average village priest and itinerant preachers were considered). Yet, naturalness should also reveal a spiritual dignity that transcended the codes of civility. And, like actors, preachers were expected to know how to play to the passions of their audiences, though without forgetting their sense of dignity. This complicated task, which is returned to in every manual on the oratory of the pulpit, is what made practice so important. The discussions all revolve around constantly changing notions of authenticity.

When looked at superficially, Blair's or Ewald's treatises hardly seem to differ from Le Faucheur's *Traité*. They keep emphasising the importance of a literal incorporation of the rules, of no longer having to reflect on them at the pulpit. But what changed was the prominence of the rules. Once the emotional accessibility of the sermon was recognised as being no less, or even more, important than its rational accessibility, it was the preacher's sensibility that was put forward. And with this, there came a new, more subjective and corporeal twist to the notions of fake and authenticity.

⁹⁹ Jelle Bosma, *Woorden van een gezond verstand. De invloed van de Verlichting op de in het Nederlands uitgegeven preken van 1750 tot 1800* (Nieuwkoop, 1997), pp. 315–316. Hervey reaped fame with his *Meditations among the Tombs, Reflections on a Flower-garden, and Contemplations on the Night*. His work was often translated into Dutch.

¹⁰⁰ Goring, *Rhetoric of Sensibility*, pp. 18–19.

¹⁰¹ For a more recent approach, focusing on religion and embodiment and introducing the helpful notion of 'sensational forms', see Birgit Meyer, *Religious Sensations: Why Media, Aesthetics and Power Matter in the Study of Contemporary Religion* (Amsterdam, 2006).