

DELIVERY IN ANCIENT TIMES: HOMER TO QUINTILIAN

Ray Nadeau

MODERN speakers, including Senator Dirksen, George Jessel, and Billy Graham, seem to us to be relatively inhibited in comparison with the speakers of ancient Greece and Rome, who were often the actors that the Greek word for delivery implies. The Greek noun for delivery is *ὑπόκρισις*, originally meaning "the playing of a part" and derived from *ὑποκρίνεσθαι*, a verb very early used to describe the responding of the actor to the chorus in Greek tragedy. The talents and skills required for the projection of the actor are obviously related in many ways to those required of the speaker, and the word for "responding" or "acting" soon came to mean "delivering a speech." Similarly, the word for actor, *ὑποκριτής*, was used to carry the burden of "speaker" as well.

The equivalent Latin terms for acting, to act, and actor are, as you would expect, *actio*, *agere*, and *actor*. All three also meant *delivery of a speech, to speak, and speaker*. More often, the Romans used *pronuntiatio* for delivery, *pronuntiare* for the verb form and, less frequently, *pronuntiator* as the noun. These words, too, had a theatrical flavor but they were more closely allied to reciting and declaiming. Among the ancients, in other words, the activities of delivering a speech, presenting a declamation, reciting poetry, and playing a part were regarded as having

much in common. In fact, references to the stage as a source of techniques are fairly frequent in the history of delivery; Valerius Maximus, for instance, tells how two well-known actors helped Hortensius "enrich the scene" with gestures borrowed for the bar.¹ In alluding to the "parts played" by declaimers in the schools, Quintilian (iii. 8. 51.) says that "actors in comedy have scarcely more parts to master. . . ."

Instruction in delivery may be as old as the art of rhetoric itself, and there are those who see a conscious art in the speeches of Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.² Apparently planned elements in the speeches of Nestor, Menelaus, Ulysses, and others are available to support the case. Certainly, we know from these speeches and from those paraphrased in Xenophon and Thucydides that among the ancients it was as necessary for a leader to be an able speaker as it was to fight well.³

The first Greek manuals on rhetoric, if the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* is a fair example, emphasized the three constituents of invention, arrangement, and style. However, we also find early recognition of the importance of delivery in Isocrates' comment that a discourse intended to be read has some

¹ Valerius Maximus viii. 10. 2.

² Cf. Marcel Delaunoy, *Le plan rhétorique dans l'éloquence grecque d'Homère à Démosthène* (Brussels, 1959), pp. 7-16. This work includes a bibliography of other works dealing in part with Homeric oratory.

³ Tacitus: "They attacked so unexpectedly that Vocula could neither harangue his men nor draw them up in line." See Tac. *Hist.* iv. 33.

Mr. Nadeau is a Professor of Speech at the University of Illinois. This article is adapted from a paper read at the Cleveland SAA convention in December, 1962.

disadvantages in that it is "robbed of the prestige of the speaker, the tones of his voice and the variations in . . . delivery."⁴ Aristotle and his contemporaries were very much aware of the need for effective delivery, and Demosthenes is often quoted as having said that "rhetoric is delivery."⁵ His alleged statement that delivery is the first, the second, and the third most important element in rhetoric is repeated *ad nauseam* by the ancients and by later writers.⁶ Plutarch adds that it was a demonstration by the actor, Satyrus, that convinced Demosthenes of the power of delivery.⁷ At the same time, Demosthenes did not hesitate to accuse Aeschines of using the histrionic arts: "He is putting on an act."⁸

In Aristotle's *Rhetoric* we have an allusion to earlier attempts to deal with delivery, notably that of the lost *Ap-*

⁴ Isocrates *Oration to Philip* 26. Other comments on the difference in persuasiveness between spoken and written discourses are found in 25, 27, and 29.

⁵ For an early reference, see Plutarch *Moralia* 845a.

⁶ See Val. Max. viii. 10. 3. Francis Bacon's reaction in his essay *Of Boldnesse* (written more than a thousand years later) reveals his amazement at Demosthenes' statement: "A strange thing that that part of the Oratour which is but superficial, and rather the vertue of a Player, should be placed so high above those other noble parts of Invention, Elocution, and the rest But the reason is plaine. There is in humane Nature generally more of the fool than of the wise; and therefore those faculties by which the foolish part of men's mindes is taken are most potent." For one of many early estimates of the depth of feeling engendered by Demosthenes' speaking, consult Dionysius Hal. *On Demosthenes* 22. (Criticism of him for foppishness in dress is noted in Gellius i. 5. 1)

⁷ Plutarch *Lives, Demosthenes* 7. For influence of the actor Andronicus on Demosthenes, see *Moralia* 845b.

⁸ Demosthenes *On the Crown* 15. Philodemus notes that the compliment was returned by Aeschines (e.g., *Against Ctesiphon* 218) and by Demetrius Phalereus, who criticized Demosthenes for being too theatrical in his delivery. See *The Rhetorica of Philodemus*, trans. H. M. Hubbell, in *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*, XXIII (September 1920), 301.

peals to Pity by Thrasymachus.⁹ The *Rhetoric* itself lists three constituents of the art: invention, arrangement, and style. Delivery, equated with the art of acting as "more a gift of nature" and somewhat beneath the dignity of philosophical inquiry, is introduced as a second and subordinate division of style.¹⁰ To Aristotle, delivery is concerned with the regulation of the voice which must be properly managed in accord with each emotion as to volume, pitch, and rhythm.¹¹ Without expressly going into the subject of bodily action, Aristotle does seem to make the point that different modes of delivery are appropriate to different kinds of speeches. His classification of speeches as forensic, deliberative, and epideictic is familiar to all; less frequently commented upon is his distinction between the *agonistic* style suited to the assembly and the courts, and the *graphic* style intended to be read and calling for very careful writing. In dealing with these two types, Aristotle pairs them off with psychological qualities proper to them. Agonistic forensic speeches must be precise, intimate, personal; the audiences are small and generally critical. Agonistic deliberative speeches, because they are usually delivered before larger bodies, are "more like rough sketching" and require less finish in detail. More important psychologically, the agonistic form in either mode is susceptible to development from the standpoints of ethical and emotional appeals. The graphic style, on the other hand, offers somewhat less opportunity for "full delivery" and is particularly well-suited to the polish, refinement, and display characteristic of speeches in

⁹ Aristotle *Rhetoric* 1404a. The general importance of delivery in exciting pity is cited in 1386a.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 1404a.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 1403b.

the epideictic classes.¹² In other words, Aristotle sees a definite relationship between style and delivery; he also recognizes that both are factors to be considered in approaching the problem of adaptation to the audience. The composer-speaker presumably has his audience in mind as he writes, and it is not stretching the imagination (or Aristotelian interpretation) to assume that he also envisions sound and gestures to match the words. Finally, Aristotle's general attitude may be summed up as this: facts and logic ought to be enough but, since delivery does affect results, especially through its impact on attitudes and emotions, it cannot be disregarded.

In his *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, written in the second century of the Christian era, Diogenes Laertius lists a work on delivery by Theophrastus,¹³ well known to us as one of the proteges of Aristotle. Two hundred years later, Athanasius of Alexandria cites this work of Theophrastus¹⁴ and, in our own time, Professor Harry Caplan says that Theophrastus was probably the first to make delivery the fourth formal duty of the orator.¹⁵ Unfortunately, we do not have the work of Theophrastus and can only speculate on what it really was.

Moving from Theophrastus to Chrysippus, a Stoic of the third century B.C., Plutarch quotes him as saying, "care is to be taken for proper delivery as regards the right elevation of the

voice and the composition of the countenance and hands."¹⁶ Chrysippus is quoted again about a hundred years later, this time by Diogenes Laertius, as listing delivery among four parts of rhetoric: invention, style, arrangement, and delivery.¹⁷

When we come to the second century B.C., Athanaeus, a rhetorician of that time, is not too sure how many parts there are to rhetoric but, according to Philodemus, he is sure of one thing: the most important is delivery.¹⁸ Writing in the first century B.C., Philodemus agrees that a good delivery lends dignity to the speaker, secures the attention of the audience, and sways its emotions. He believes, however, that formal instruction in delivery is foolish because that part of the art depends on natural endowments.¹⁹ In the same century, Dionysius of Halicarnassus wrote *On the Arrangement of Words* with a considerable emphasis on patterns for using the best words in the best order in accord with the demands of different situations. These patterns were intended to help one develop a flair for rhythmic collocations of harmonious sounds through attention to the austere, intermediate, and smooth styles. (Greek sensitivity to good melody and rhythm had been noted in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*,

¹⁶ Plutarch *Moralia* 1047a. This passage is from the critical essay, "On the Contradictions of the Stoics."

¹⁷ Diogenes Laertius vii. 43. Von Arnim says that the listing here (in a general account of Stoic schemes) is that of Chrysippus. See *Stoicorum veterum fragmenta*, ed. J. von Arnim (Leipzig, 1903-24), II, 96, fragment 295.

¹⁸ See the Hubbell translation (note 8, above), p. 300.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 301. We do not know to what extent there was actual training in delivery in this century or in any other of the classical period. The consensus seems to be that the rhetors criticized student delivery of the rhetorical exercises (*progymnasmata*) and of the more advanced declamations, the *suasoriae* and *controversiae*. Otherwise, an orator's delivery was the product of observation of others and of his own experience.

¹² *Ibid.*, 1413b-1414a. See Robert P. Sonkowsky, "An Aspect of Delivery in Ancient Rhetorical Theory," *Transactions . . . American Philological Association*, XC (1959), 256-274.

¹³ Diogenes Laertius v. 48.

¹⁴ Athanasius in *Prolegomenon syllogē*, ed. Hugo Rabe, in Vol. XIV of *Rhetores Graeci* (Leipzig, 1931), p. 177.

¹⁵ [Cicero] *Ad C. Herennium*, trans. Harry Caplan, in the Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Mass., 1954), p. 190, n. a. See also, George Kennedy, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece* (Princeton, New Jersey, 1963), pp. 282-284, with notes or articles available on Theophrastus.

where the keynotes of style are clarity and appropriateness but, except for the distinction between the graphic and agonistic types already referred to, Aristotle had apparently thought it superfluous to engage in a discussion of specific styles.²⁰ In the treatise *On Style*, Demetrius (name retained for an unknown author, date uncertain, of work once ascribed to Demetrius Phalereus) distinguished four types: elegant, grand, plain, and forcible. Demosthenes is most often quoted in that work to illustrate "the forcible,"²¹ and it is possible that Demetrius felt the need to assign a special term to the speaking of the master orator. In general, classical writers were content to list plain, middle, and grand styles, but there was no real agreement on them, unless it was that styles should vary in accord with the exigencies of the subject and of the audience. Certain it is that in an oral society suitability to delivery would be kept in mind during the process of composition.²²

Longinus, a Greek rhetorician of the second century A.D. (not to be confused with the unknown writer of the treatise *On The Sublime*), should be included

²⁰ Aristotle *Rhetoric* 1414a.

²¹ See the discussion of "the forcible" in *Demetrius On Style*, ed. W. Rhys Roberts (Cambridge, Mass., 1902), pp. 181-207; and in *A Greek Critic: Demetrius On Style*, ed. G. M. A. Grube (Vol. IV of supplementary volumes of *The Phoenix*; Toronto, 1961), pp. 114-129. (Grube translates *δευότης* as "force" or "intensity.") We find an echo of Demetrius' analysis in Hermogenes' *On the Method of Rhetorical Skill*, a treatise written in the second century A.D. as one of a series of manuals used by students of declamation. Here, the word *δευότης* means the ability to use all styles well. In Hermogenes' companion treatise *On Styles*, "skill" or "forcefulness" is the last of seven attributes and it is given additional and separate amplification in the work on method; figures of language (epanalepsis, asyndeton, polysyndeton, hyperbaton, antithesis, and others) are discussed in detail and, of course, Demosthenes is the prime exemplar of the ideal combination of the best in all the styles.

²² *Ad Her.* iv. 11 and, for modern comment, George Kennedy, p. 281 ff.

in this survey of early writers on delivery. In the Spengel-Hammer edition of the rhetoric attributed to him, declamation is described as a combination of emotional and ethical appeals and of the disposition (*διάθεσις*) of body and voice in ways appropriate to matters under consideration. "Delivery," he says in language akin to some of our twentieth-century jargon, "is [the] greatest."²³ The motion is seconded by an anonymous writer, possibly of the same period, who calls delivery "the finest" of the constituents of the art.²⁴

In reviewing early Greek views on delivery, then, we note a close and very natural association with the idea of projection or delivery in acting. In Aristotle, we find delivery associated with the theory of emotions, although it is given a position subordinate to style, and voice is its only explicit concern. By the time of Chrysippus in the third century B.C., delivery is, at least to the Stoics, a separate and full-fledged fourth constituent of rhetoric with subdivisions of voice and action. Although Theophrastus may have written a treatise on delivery in the preceding century, and although there is interesting comment on the subject from earlier and later writers, no really complete study of the subject in Greek has come down to us from those early centuries.

Let us turn now to the Latins.

In the first century B.C., the field was still relatively uncluttered, and the writer of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, in approaching the problem of delivery, echoes Aristotle and says in effect, "Nobody has undertaken this task, and I believe that it deserves serious consideration."²⁵

²³ Longinus in *Rhetores Graeci*, eds. Leonardi Spengel and C. Hammer (Leipzig, 1894), I, Part 2, 194.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 210.

²⁵ *Ad Her.* iii. 11. 20. In this work the subject of delivery is first introduced in i. 2. 3, and it is then developed in iii. 11. 19 to iii. 15. 27.

In the *Ad Herennium*, a practical manual, delivery is not so much an outgrowth of thought and emotion in the mind as it is the result of a prescriptive outline of numerous rules and techniques for effective oral presentation. The writer of that treatise divides delivery into vocal qualities and bodily movement. Then, he goes into a lengthy discussion of what are essentially the Latin equivalents for the vocal qualities mentioned by Aristotle: volume, stability (rhythm), and variety in intonation (pitch). Volume is described as a gift of nature; stability in handling periods, et cetera, can to some extent be improved through exercises; and tonal flexibility can also be gained in that way. The tones are three. First, there is the conversational tone; it is dignified, explicative, narrative, and sometimes facetious. Secondly, the debating tone is sustained or broken. Thirdly, the tone of amplification is either hortatory or it evokes pathos. Although the unknown writer does not say so, this three-fold tonal pattern seems to be inspired by the requirements of epideictic, forensic, and deliberative speaking.

Each of the tones (and its subdivisions) is described. On the facetious conversational tone, for instance, we have this advice: "with a gentle quiver in the voice, and a slight suggestion of a smile, but without any trace of immoderate laughter, one ought to shift one's utterance smoothly from the Serious Conversational tone to the tone of gentlemanly jest."²⁶

Insofar as bodily movement is concerned, facial expression should be animated and gestures should not call attention to themselves. Otherwise, the

Ad Herennium simply follows the tonal outline already established and very briefly suggests gestures appropriate to each one. For the sustained debate tone, for example, all you need is an occasional quick gesture of the arm, a mobile countenance, and a knowing glance. For the broken debate tone, you must use a very quick gesture of the arm, pace up and down, stamp the right foot, and have a look of intense concentration. For the pathetic tone within the classification of tone of amplification, the writer says: "slap one's thigh, beat one's head; and with a sad and disturbed facial striation goes a sometime calm and composed gesticulation."²⁷ The treatment of delivery closes with the observation that good delivery ensures that what the orator is saying seems to come from the heart.

That violent bodily movement and flamboyant gestures were commonplace we know. They are recommended above and, in Cicero's *Brutus*, Calidius is rebuked for his lackadaisical delivery: "Did you smite your brow, slap your thigh, or at least stamp your foot? No! In fact, so far from touching my feelings, I could scarcely refrain from going to sleep then and there."²⁸ In addition to its effect on the audience, slapping the thigh seems also to have been useful in keeping the speaker alert. According to Philostratus, Scopelian would often sway from side to side like one in a frenzy and would smite his thigh in order to arouse himself as well as his hearers.²⁹ However, on the matter of swaying from side to side, Quintilian draws the line; it was he who said that such action would only bring on the oft-quoted and satiric question,

See Caplan's Introduction (p. lii ff.) and his translation of those passages.

²⁶ Caplan's *Ad Her.*, p. 201, or iii. 15. 25 in other editions.

²⁷ My translation of *Ad Her.* iii. 15. 27. Cf. Quint. xi. 3. 123 and Lucian's cynical comments in his *Rhetor. Praeceptor* 19.

²⁸ Cic. *Brutus* 80. 278.

²⁹ Philostratus *Lives of the Sophists* 519.

"Who was it that was rocking the boat?"⁸⁰

Cicero's treatment of delivery has some points in common with the emphasis on external techniques in the *Ad Herennium*, but he returns to Aristotle's recognition of the relationships of delivery, style, and emotions. Delivery is included as one of the five parts of rhetoric and the subject comes up in the *De inventione*, *Brutus*, *Orator*, *De officiis* and, at some length, in the *De oratore*.⁸¹ In the *De inventione*, he uses the word *pronuntiatio* (as did the writer of the *Ad Herennium*) for delivery, which he defines as the control of the voice and body in a manner suited to the dignity of the subject and style of the speech. In the third book of the *De oratore*, he has Crassus using *actio* for delivery in the latter's description of it as the dominant factor in speech. The relationship of delivery to acting is again stressed. Orators are players who act *real life*; actors are players who *mimic reality*. For both, delivery is a kind of language of the body (*sermo corporis*) consisting of movement or gesture as well as of voice.

In Cicero, nature and training go hand in hand in producing a specific "voice" for each emotion and, in any attempt to analyze his views, his comparison of the tones of the voice with the strings of the lyre is illuminating: "The whole of a person's frame and every look on his face and utterance of his voice are like strings of a lyre, and sound according as they are struck by each successive emotion."⁸² The relationship between sound and emotion

is implemented by the oft-told story about Gaius Gracchus who apparently had a musician help him with his speeches by sounding notes on a *τονάριον* or pitch-pipe.⁸³ High notes would be used to excite the emotions of the speaker and low notes would be used to curb them. Cicero used the story to demonstrate his belief that, although we can only look to nature for a clear and musical voice, clarity can be improved by practice, and musical qualities, tied in closely with the emotions, can be improved by the imitation of experts.

Quintilian agrees with Cicero and other predecessors that a good delivery comes from nature but that it can be enhanced by training. He, too, places emphasis on the association of the emotions with delivery; like Aristotle and Cicero, he considers ethical and emotional appeals to be clearly within the province of that fifth constituent of the art, and he alludes to the practice of thinking of gestures as the speech is being composed.⁸⁴ To paraphrase a few salient points drawn from the advice of Quintilian, the voice should be easy, powerful, fine, flexible, firm, sweet, well-sustained, clear, pure, and one that cuts the air and penetrates the ear. One should not hiss, pant, cough, wheeze, or sing. One should be concerned with using appropriate tones; in a digression, for instance, the gentle tone is characteristic and the following quotation (inspired by experience at some early convention?) is cited from Cicero's lost *Pro Gallio* as one for which the gentle tone would be proper: "I seemed to see some persons entering the room and others leaving it, while others were mov-

⁸⁰ Quint. xi. 3. 129.

⁸¹ For Cicero's better-known passages on delivery, see *De inv.* i. 7. 9; *Brutus* 8. 34, 17. 55, 37. 142, and 80. 278; *Orator* 17. 55 to 18. 60; *De offic.* i. 37. 133; *De or.* i. 61. 261, ii. 19. 79, and iii. 56. 213 to 60. 227.

⁸² Cic. *De or.* iii. 57. 216.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, iii. 60. 225; Quint. i. 10. 27; Aulus Gellius i. 11; Val. Max. viii. 10. 1.

⁸⁴ Ch. 3 in Book xi of Quintilian is devoted entirely to delivery and includes the fullest treatment of gesture in ancient literature.

ing to and fro apparently under the influence of wine."³⁵

Up to Quintilian's time there had been no complete treatment of gesture. Alive to this particular gap in the art, Quintilian proceeds to close it. He starts with the head and moves on down, almost without missing a muscle. To note several highlights, gesture of the head can indicate humility, haughtiness, languor, or rudeness. The face can be suppliant, menacing, soothing, sad, cheerful, proud, humble. With your arms and hands, ask, promise, threaten, supplicate; show fear, joy, grief, doubt, acknowledgment, penitence; indicate measure, quantity, number, time. Strike the thigh to indicate indignation, but do not stamp the feet too often. As for the speech as a whole, open calmly and gain fire and momentum as you go.³⁶ So goes a long litany of positive and negative admonitions, even to the point of telling the reader how to crook specific fingers for equally specific purposes.

From Quintilian's time through the Middle Ages and well into the Renaissance and beyond it, rhetorics and commentaries provide a repetition of classical theory with whatever modifications are required to adapt it to the times. (The only new element that I have been able to find in basic textbooks is the treatment of visual aids.) "Vary the voice to suit the place, the subject, the audience, the issues, the occasion"—Julius Victor of the fifth century.³⁷ "The whole manner of delivery should be fashioned to accord with the nature

of the place where the speech is made, with the materials available to the speaker, with the persons concerned in the case, with the speaker's subject, and with the particular occasion"—Alcuin in the eighth century.³⁸ The Renaissance brings with it some protests reminiscent of Lucian. In the Latin texts, one encounters writers like Caussin inveighing against "the shrieking voice, stamping foot, 'rowing' of arms, and general flouncing about."³⁹ His treatment of gestures, like Quintilian's, is a lesson in physiology; he starts with the forehead and ends with the feet. Similarly, works in English prescribe adaptation of voice and gesture to the needs of the times. Thomas Henly's *Action of an Orator*, a late Renaissance text devoted entirely to delivery, states the case very well: "Quintilian treats of beating his brow, his head, his breast, his thigh, of stamping and such like . . . , but such motions are quite out of vogue with the age we live in."⁴⁰ He goes on to cover

³⁸ *The Rhetoric of Alcuin & Charlemagne*, trans. Wilbur Samuel Howell (Princeton, New Jersey, 1941), pp. 139, 141.

³⁹ N. Caussin, *De eloquentia sacra et humana* (Cologne, 1631), pp. 555-575. For other treatments in editions of widely varied Latin works, see J. Alsted, *Orator* (Herborn, 1612), pp. 116-120; M. T. Blebel, *Rhetoricae artis progymnasmata* (Erfurt, 1599), pp. 319-324; J. Caesar, *Rhetorica* (Cologne, 1565), folios 1r-4r; T. Farnaby, *Index rhetoricus* (London, 1633), p. 59 ff.; B. Keckermann, *Systema rhetoricae* (Hanover, 1608), pp. 377-403; J. Ringelberg, *Rhetorica* (Paris, 1536), p. 20; C. Soarez, *De arte rhetorica* (Cologne, 1570), pp. 190-192; A. Talaeus, *Rhetorica* (Paris, 1548), pp. 83-104; D. Valades, *Rhetorica christiana* (Perugia, 1579), pp. 150-156; A. Valiero, *De rhetorica ecclesiastica* (Venice, 1574), pp. 174-176; C. Valerius, *Tabula rhetoricēs* (Louvain, 1561), pp. 66v-69r; and G. Vossius, *Rhetoricēs contractae* (Leyden, 1621), pp. 409-415.

⁴⁰ [Thomas Henly], *Action of an Orator* (London, 1727), p. 9 ff. Thomas Wilson's *The Arte of Rhetorique* (London, 1553) provides a very early, interesting, and (to us) humorous treatment of delivery in folios 111-113. Cf. the later and more sedate approach in Hugh Blair's *Lectures on Rhetoric* (Brookfield, 1805), pp. 184-194. See also Abraham Fraunce, *The Arcadian Rhetorike* (London, 1588), pp. 55-69 (renumbered pages of photographic reproduction of

³⁵ Quint. xi. 3. 165.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 161-174.

³⁷ Julius Victor in *Rhetores Latini minores*, ed. K. Halm (Leipzig, 1863), p. 441. For typical comments on delivery by medieval writers, see Halm, pages 130-134 (Fortunatianus), 137 (Pseudo-Augustine), 178 (Victorinus), 321 (Sulp. Victor), 440-443 (J. Victor), 484-485 (Mart. Capella), 495 (Cassiodorus), 546-547 (Alcuin), and 599 (Grillius' commentary on the *De inventione*).

rules of delivery for both lawyers and preachers and warns against slavish imitation by telling the story of Archippus' hitting Alcibiades "in the teeth" for imitating the foppish manners of his father. Except for those gestures which he considers inappropriate, Henly's work is largely a synthesis drawn from earlier classical theorists.

In this brief commentary on delivery

imperfect copy in Bodleian Library); J. Glanvil, *An Essay Concerning Preaching* (London, 1703), pp. 78-80; and (a translation of) Hyperius, *The Practise of Preaching* (London, 1577), p. 176 ff. Perhaps this article should include details on John Bulwer's *Chirologia* and *Chironomia* (London, 1644); however, these two works on the "naturall language of the hand" and on gestures as "adjuncts of rhetorical utterance" go beyond what the classics had to say about gesture, and they introduced "elocution" in a sense outside the thinking of classical writers. See the introductory essay in the 1644 edition.

in ancient times, we have seen that major writers very early recognized the psychological connection between the orator's feeling of emotions and the effective exciting of them in an audience; we have seen, too, that they considered the so-called styles to be so closely intertwined with delivery that the writer of a speech would necessarily have both style and delivery in mind throughout the "literary" process of composing it; we have seen, finally, that delivery was more than a superficial gloss—it was a subtle and studied blending of emotions and style with appropriate oral techniques, all leading to the seizure of men's minds and emotions through the captivation of their eyes and ears by means of gesture and voice carefully attuned to the immediate situation and to the fashions of the times.

