'Nature as Symbolic Behavior': Cresol's *Autumn Vacations* and Early Baroque Acting Technique

ALFRED S. GOLDING

In 1620 a singular volume appeared in Paris under Jesuit imprimatur. Written in scholastic Neo-Latin, its nearly six hundred pages set out the complete canon of delivery for the orator. Never before had this oral aspect of rhetoric been treated quite so extensively and in such detail in a single literary work.¹

The author of *Autumn Vacations, or the Complete Action and Pronunciation for the Orator*,² was Louis Crésol, (also known as Louis de Cressolles or, in Neo-Latin, Ludovicus Cresollius) a quondam member of the junior faculty of the Collège de Clermont in Paris.³ With other Jesuit schools, Clermont was then recognized for its excellence in preparing the sons of the nobility and middle class for leadership in an evolving French nation.⁴ To this end the Jesuit college held up models of humanistic conduct and trained its students to speak and act in a socially approved manner through intensive, graded exercises in rhetoric and poetics. Crésol's work is both a documentation of proper oratorical conduct and an erudite rationale for its application in various kinds of speaking situations.⁵

Since the Renaissance the test of the pupil's mastery of classroom rhetoric had lain in the periodic formal presentation of addresses, recitations and plays before the school assembly and its invited guests.⁶ The practice of performing elaborate public theatricals was incorporated into the Jesuit order's educational mission.⁷ Especially at Clermont the staging of plays at the end of the school year for the honors convocation was considered of great importance, for the practice allowed distinguished visitors, including members of the court and sometimes even of the royal family, to see and admire the skill with which their sons enacted roles on the college's stage.⁸ The record of their comment is of importance to the theatre historian, for while praising the quality of Clermont's rhetorical

training, the guests also attested to the excellence of the acting performance by comparing the behavior of the amateur actors of Clermont to that manifested by professional players of the Parisian public theatre.

To the Jesuit teachers there was no question but that acting was a theatrical extension of the art of rhetoric. Even before the Renaissance that art had taken on a strongly poetic cast. Students learned to use tropes and figures of rhetoric as devices to persuade, inform and please.⁹ Truth and belief, for the student of early Baroque oratory, were not so much obtainable by the apparatus of logic as by the scheme of symbolic congruence. Fundamental was the idea that the orator could make use of 'natural' signs of expression universal in all men, the overt evidence of internal mental activity. When these individual signs of posture, gesture, facial feature and vocal delivery were displayed by the speaker so as to be in accord with each other and, at the same time, with an internal spiritual mechanism, a similar response was induced within the spectator/listener. Rhetoric, then, was the 'science' which furnished the student with the mental and physical means to affect public behavior.

Crésol's volume provides a detailed description of the means, both physical and mental, by which the orator – and, by extension, the actor – could move an audience. The work contains an extensive review of the conventionally used figures of action, how they were to be cast into the mind as images, modified according to the circumstances of the message, and produced as recognizable symbolic conduct in the voice and body. Significantly, in addition to this image-making process, Crésol also discussed how the orator was to make use of a special figure of rhetoric for the purpose of impersonating a role.

What were some of these mental images which the speaker was to translate into overt meaningful behavior?

Crésol's statement that the feet should be placed in a 'lamda-posture'¹⁰ in which the heels were set fairly close together and the toes turned out about thirty degrees, at first glance seems to rest on purely pragmatic grounds. In an age when indoor lighting tended to be low in intensity and acoustics were poor, it was highly desirable for the orator to present himself so that the audience could see his actions and hear his voice most easily. Hence the angled foot position forced the speaker to open himself to his viewers/listeners, which also promoted stability and so contributed to the force of his delivery. But additional remarks by Crésol reveal that the turned-out position of his feet, when augmented by a posture in which the orator placed his weight slightly more on one foot than the other, was to be interpreted symbolically as well." The resulting poised bearing was evidence of the speaker's 'probity,' (II, 12, 6) bold, generous nature, and the 'divine in man' (II, 8, 1). A 'stately bearing' with the body erect, chest slightly raised and shoulders squared,

betokened 'the noble and excellent gentlemen, possessed by great-heartedness and honor' (II, 8, 1). Contrarily, standing with the feet parallel to each other, Crésol thought so objectionable that he labeled it 'obscene' (II, 12, 6).¹² It was, he said, when coupled with slumping shoulders and a protruding belly, a carriage which was 'ridiculous, . . . the behavior of menials' (II, 8, 2 and 7). He termed equally undignified and crude a stance in which the weight was placed equally on both legs with the line of shoulders, hips and knees in the same plane, for this cloddish attitude was again a sign of low breeding (II, 12, 6). Another image which the speaker could use to advantage was the posture in which the left shoulder was brought forward by rotating the waist. This was the attitude of candor. Conversely, turning the right shoulder to the audience was the 'natural' sign of a secretive disposition (II, 12, 6).

But were these postural conventions designated for the rostrum and the pulpit also found on the stage? Two lines of argument may be advanced to show that they were. The first derives from the many comparisons which Crésol made between the actions of the orator and those of the actor. These include statements indicating that stage behavior was like oratorical behavior except that the first was more extreme than the second. Thus Crésol pointed out that the actor's twist of the torso and hip in counterposition was both more egregious and calculatedly graceful than that exhibited by the speaker (II, 8, 6). The second line of argument stems from the similarity of Crésol's description of oratorical behavior to that found in the iconographic record and literature on acting, dating from the late seventeenth through the nineteenth centuries. In both forms of evidence the researcher discovers that the *contraposto* attitude of nobility, recommended by Crésol for the orator, was used when impersonating upper class characters.¹³ Both the etiquette books¹⁴ and the Baroque instructional manuals for painters¹⁵ confirm the fact that these indeed were stances employed to show class distinction, thereby mirroring in art the symbolism practiced in daily life. It seems reasonable to suppose, therefore, that beginning with the Renaissance the stage posture of the actor was but a part of a larger aesthetic convention which in turn mirrored the conventional behavior regarded as 'natural' by that society.¹⁶

In much the same way that he did for posture, Crésol prescribed specific figurative images of activity for the body, limbs and head. These, too, were to signal meaning to an audience. These actions as well were to be used by the stage player, for, said Crésol, while both player and orator utilized movements of the head, arms, hands and fingers and the features of the face to 'reinforce magniloquence,' the actor did so more richly and intensively than did the speaker (II, 11, 2). All bodily actions were to be performed with great definition to enhance their visibility. To this end,

Crésol noted that the movements of the hands and arms were to be made at the side rather than directly in front of the body, where they could not as readily be seen (II, 11, 3). Furthermore, these figures of action were perceived as but the outward signs of internal mental activity. So, in demonstrating the overt behavior of arrogance, the speaker was to call to mind the image of the arrogant person in which the head was tipped back (II, 1, 4), the chest swelled, the eyebrows were raised, and the two middle fingers on the right or left hand were joined together (II, 5, 2; II, 8, 1; II, 10, 1). These actions, as well as the mental image which inspired them, the orator had previously committed to memory as a student and, as a result of diligent practice, seemed to him and to his audience as second 'nature.' Other positions of the head, associated with augmenting postures of the body and gesticulations, could indicate other mental states. So, when the head lolled to one side it was in indication of weakness (II, 1, 2 and 3); when somewhat forward, sensuality (II, 1, 3); and when it sagged forward so that it rested upon the chest, it was concrete evidence of moroseness (II, 1, 2).

Crésol's methodical description of the actions of the body as discrete semiotic entities, however, was not solely for the purpose of providing a systematic explanation of expressive behavior for the student. Rather, by forcing the student to concentrate upon the individual study of the actions which together comprised the mental image, he compelled the student to recognize – indeed, to memorize – them as distinctive bits of behavior. The recall of the image, itself a constellation of discrete actions, allowed the speaker to exert individual control over each of the components, and, simultaneously produced in his mind a moderate emotional response. In turn, the audience saw this constellation of figures performed by the speaker as a set of actions in symbolic congruence consonant with the figures of speech comprising the speaker's words, whose purpose was to replicate and enhance the meaning in a poetic way. However, in this process the orator was expected not to copy exactly the model which Crésol had provided, but to vary the elements according to the circumstances of the message, and to compound these elements of behavior in different ways. Crésol provided examples of this compounding process when he differentiated obsequiousness from moroseness or sensuality. Thus, he stated, the obsequious person bent his torso forward with his head tipped forward; but the sensual or morose person could hold himself upright even if the head was forward to a lesser or greater extent. Contrarily impudence was evident when a person inclined from the waist (as in obsequiousness), while tipping his head back somewhat (as in arrogance) II, 8, 2).

Crésol offered numerous examples of gesticulation as well as actions of the head and torso, in the expectation that the student would compile a

repertory of symbolic activity for his later use. In this regard he advised his students to utilize few arms actions, and these only of a 'grave' kind, when treating serious subjects. But when discussing something of a lighter nature he could be less restrained (II, 11, 2 and 3). Because overextended arm movements were ugly to view, he cautioned students against the practice, warning them that such movements were evidences of lower class behavior. Crésol also warned them against flapping the arms about if they wished to secure their audience's confidence, for action of this kind denoted that the speaker had a fickle and even treacherous nature (II, 9, 14 and 20). Ordinarily gesture was to accord with the tone of the speaker's words. Thus the rate of arm movement would be commensurate with the actual rhythm of speaking, itself a derivative of the substance of the orator's words. In this metaphoric fashion speaking and gesticulating were to augment and reinforce each other.

A distinct order of precedence was followed when presenting symbolic imagery from the platform. The thought-image was first to occur in the speaker's mind, to be translated a split-second later into facial expression, and only thereafter into bodily attitude and gesture. Speech was a laggard in this sequence, usually only being allowed to emerge after the body was set into an attitude predicting the meaning of the words to be spoken. These congruent postures and movements were usually held until the completion of the statement which they amplified; only then was a new attitude taken, as the speaker again produced an image in his mind to induce subsequent physical and vocal activity (II, 9, 20). Gesture, therefore, was not used simply for emphasis (although Crésol cited an instance when the speaker could pound the lectern, 'as if driving a spike into a beam') (III, 24, 1) but to accompany every statement (*sententia*) of the speaker. This symbolic movement was to flow in what Crésol called a *eurhythmia* orchestrated to the musicality of the intonation and cadence of the utterance (III, 19, 2; III, 16, 2). Therefore, at least when accompanying the recitation of verse, the movements of the declaiming performer had a graceful, dance-like quality, matching the aesthetic quality of the poet's line.

Among the examples of figurative gesture described by Crésol are several which are still recognizable today. One such was the conventional practice of holding the hand up with the palm away from the body to negate the remarks of an opponent or to ward off his attack. Another was raising the hands, palms up, in elation, or letting them fall in dejection (II, 9, 3). Still another was joining the palms together in entreaty or prayer. The two hands could also be used alternately to compare one thing with another, by proffering first the one hand and then the other (II, 9, 8). Conventional preference in handedness was manifest in Crésol's

regard for the right arm as the instrument for making noble or universal statements and the left for commonplace or private thoughts. So, the right hand was the preferred hand for blessing (II, 9, 6) and the left for touching the breast in pretended faithfulness or striking the thigh in anger (II, 9, 15). Ordinarily the action of the hand and its fingers was not to be a literal duplication of the spoken work (as when indicating an object in formal pantomime), nor a word-for-word translation of the speaker's idea (as in modern sign-language). Instead, the sense (*sententia*) of the speaker's words was to be conveyed by a symbolic gesture. So when the idea of accusation was to be conveyed, the speaker pointed the index finger of his right hand at the object of his accusation, while touching the other fingers to the thumb (II, 10, 3). In executing this action Crésol cautioned that the arm was not to be completely extended but was to remain flexed in order to convey the idea that the speaker was a graceful, hence noble, person (II, 11, 1 and 3). Merely joining the last three fingers to the thumb had significance in itself, for it denoted that the words accompanying the gesture were of great importance (II, 2, 2). Holding the two middle fingers together was a sign of hauteur, the *noli me tangere* gesture which warned inferiors away (II, 10, 1). Involuntarily rubbing the fingers of one hand with those of the other revealed a person who was anxious to wipe away a hitherto performed action – a piece of symbolic business recalling the figurative actions of Lady Macbeth in her sleep-walking scene (II, 10, 5). On the other hand, the lack of any gesticulation at all indicated a lack of animation and hence of gentility (II, 11, 2 and 3). Here again is strong evidence of the significance of vitality in expression, a quality which Crésol associated with persons of breeding and cultivation.

The face Crésol deemed so important that he broke down its actions according to its salient features. The forehead ordinarily lay smooth in moments of calm, joy, faith and confidence, but could wrinkle in gravity, disgust and pain, and could contort in horror (II, 3, 1). The eyebrows could be raised in surprise or shock, and be drawn together to denounce, terrorize or display indignation (II, 3, 2). The eyes could also reveal the speaker's feelings directly. They could open in warmth, blink rapidly as a sign of alertness, roll or wander in wantonness or levity (II, 4, 3), stare in impudence (II, 4, 3), and glance away in embarrassment. Of all the features, the nose had the fewest possibilities for figurative expression. The nostrils, however, could flair in anger or derision, and the nose tip itself wrinkle in disgust. The speaker, as well, could lay his finger aside the nose to signal cunning. But, Crésol hastened to point out, this last action was more a stage expression than one proper to the rostrum (II, 4, 4). In contrast, the mouth was capable of a wide variety of symbolic expressions. The upper lip, for example, could curl into a sneer of

condescension or truculence (II, 6, 3), the lips could be bitten in rage or despair (II, 7, 5), and the teeth could be bared in fury (II, 7, 7). As with other aspects of such mimetic activity, Crésol warned students against distorting the facial features, especially when strong feelings were to be shown (II, 7, 5).

Space does not permit the description of similar vocal actions of a semiotic character, although these played an equally significant role conveying the significance of the speaker's words. Instead the remainder of this article will be devoted to the techniques which the orator used to seem to be a person other than himself. In this regard one method has already been suggested, that of an 'image'-technique. But a second method also lay at the orator's disposal – making use of the rhetorical figure of action known as *personificatio* – or 'impersonation.'

For both modes, Crésol recognized that:

The orator often plays a role in his delivery by artful means, although not indeed as the common player [*histrion*] who assumes an alien personality, but rather as the author of his own words. Yet he tries to depict truth as does the player, and so is not frightened away by sighing [or other extreme emotional display] as circumstances warrant, providing he does his role-playing in moderation (III, 7, 15).

As one trained in the exercises of St. Ignatius¹⁷ which encouraged feeling in response to religious symbolic display, Crésol well understood the need for the orator himself to be moved if he was to stir the emotions of his audience. For inducing a moderate emotional response he utilized the image-making technique, hitherto alluded to, which also produced seemingly spontaneous symbolic deportment (II, 2, 4). Crésol took pains to describe this activity as much like that employed by the common player, 'except that the player does so more generously than the orator' (II, 2, 4). He also cited Philo Judaeus in this regard, that the orator should have the appearance of an emotion in his mind if it was to appear on the body's surface (III, 28, 2). He also quoted Crassus and Aristotle in support of the image-recall procedure to the effect that painters made use of mental images to provide them with the means to depict an object with feeling.

For nothing is so easy and simple as to have the orator adapt his mind to the expression of an emotion and to imitate its condition inwardly and so produce its sound and appearance outwardly . . . Providence has contrived that men have an inner power of the will [*arbitrium*] to control their gestures and actions, so as to exhibit varied expression to others in public (III, 26, 1).

Crésol then demonstrated how the emotion of joy can be rendered by recalling the image of a joyous person:

The face tranquil, . . . the eyebrows not frowning but in a normal or somewhat raised position, the eyes serene, the mouth smiling, the arm actions ample and smoothly executed, open and broad, the hands extended, etc. . . . That most happy image is set into the mind to inspire a most abundant flow of speech and gesture, and, by the orator's response, produce the same glorious feeling in others (III, 25, 1).

The imaging-process required careful preparation for the orator to muster his images in the proper order. 'Hence, the orator who must charge and accuse must previously set his mind to this purpose and compose his gesture and action accordingly.' The technique was to associate the desired expression with a previously memorized image. This image, albeit somewhat modified to fit local circumstance, he held in his mind while speaking his words – the charging and accusing actions aforementioned – and allowed the internal 'movements' of the mind and the external 'movements' of the body to occur, as it were, of their own volition. Crésol admitted that the method was 'subtle and complex . . . requiring an extensive and rigorous training . . . a maturity of judgment, . . . and an awareness of the variety of the emotions and how these may be adapted to the changing mood of the speaker, so that these may seem appropriate, believable and natural' (III, 28, 1).

Sometimes, however, the coolness of the image-approach was inadequate when strong feeling was wanted, or when the orator wished to assume the guise of another personage, fancied or real. This was done by the standard rhetorical practice of *personificatio*, one of the traditional figures of action which the student was expected to master. In this procedure the orator emphatically identified with the character he wished to impersonate. In this way the emotion generated by the association provided a strong motivating force for the action rather than a string of images. To illustrate the power of the 'personation' technique, Crésol recalled an incident in which a distinguished Jesuit professor of rhetoric used it to strongly affect his audience. In 1610, at the obsequies for the deceased Henry of Navarre, this eulogizing orator at one point 'assumed the aspect of Death's assistant.' He thereby created such startling changes in his appearance,

which were of an involuntary character, that the hairs of those watching bristled in horror. Hence, should not the orator speak boldly about exciting subjects and be forceful and spirited when describing frightful sights? And should he himself be deeply affected . . . *as the tragic actor, totally in mind and body?* [my italics] It seems incredible that the mind needs to be controlled by some image of great power in order to make the hairs stand up on the heads of the members of his audience. (II, 1, 7)

The orator/actor, therefore, moved his audience by the abundance and congruence of sets of figures induced through the image-making process, and by identifying intensely at particular moments as part of a role-playing procedure. Both techniques used internal means to produce external effects in bodily behavior. The first, however, produced actions which were cooler but which produced a clarity of understanding and an aesthetic enjoyment from the recognition of the symbolic expression which was at its base. The second, while obscuring the rational quality of the message, created through empathic means a strong emotional reaction in the audience. The mixture of both methods, according to Crésol's formula, was to produce

a golden speech, tinged with pleasure, adorned with ornament, crisp with figures, round and regular in dimension, perfumed with Ciceronian aroma and strong with Demosthenic power, shot through with the rays of the peacock, so that it is variegated with musicality and inlaid in its parts like a mosaic and as multicolored as a meadow of wild flowers; a marvelous Promethean configuration in which each and every part comes completely together. (III, 24, 1)

It has been argued that in the earlier Baroque era both player and orator shared a common methodology and convention of expression deriving from a poetic rhetoric. Because of the wide acceptance of the symbology which underlay the rhetorical method, as well as the acceptance of the method itself, rhetorical acting behavior was considered to be 'natural,' using the standards of Crésol's day. Overwhelmed by a current scientific view of nature, modern scholarship only now is realizing the different view of nature which was manifest in earlier centuries. The *Autumn Vacations*, with its fulsome and detailed account of early seventeenth-century platform behavior is both an illuminant of the concept of nature and an important guide to the reconstruction of early Baroque performance technique.

Ohio State University

Notes

- 1 Several of these earlier rhetorics may be mentioned: Philipp Melanchthon's *De Rhetorica libri tres* (Wittenber 1519), Leonard Cox's *Art or Craft of Rhethorike* (London 1529), Jodocus Willich's *De Pronunciatione Rhetorica* (Basel 1540). Except for Willich, they tended to treat delivery only briefly, in part because of the growing puritanism which stressed logical and written modes of expression rather than the oral and symbolic. Willich, although emphasizing delivery in his handbook, presents barely forty pages of material on the subject. For a detailed discussion of these and other works, see George Kennedy's *Classical Rhetoric and its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times* (Chapel Hill, N.C. 1980).
- 2 Louis Crésol *Vacationes Autumnales, sive De Perfecta Oratoris Actione et Pronuntiatione Libri Tres* (Paris 1620).

- 3 Crésol came from a noble Breton family. In 1588, after preliminary study, he became a member of the Jesuit order. He taught at Clermont and at several other Jesuit academies until 1619, when he was called to Rome to assume higher duties. From 1563 to 1762 the Collège de Clermont was the most celebrated and popular of the one hundred Jesuit colleges in France. It followed and made fashion, and its influence upon the nobility and bourgeoisie of the time was significant.
- 4 Corneille prepared at the Jesuit college in Rouen; Molière, Dancourt, Favart and Voltaire at Clermont in Paris. Members of the nobility, in particular, sent their children to be educated at the Paris college.
- 5 Despite great changes in education during the Renaissance, rhetoric remained a basic element in the Jesuit training of youth. It was a major subject in the intermediate and highest class of the curriculum of the Jesuit colleges.

The recent splendid volume by Marc Fumaroli, *L'Age de l'éloquence: rhétorique et 'res literaria' de la Renaissance au seuil de l'époque classique* (Geneva 1980) is instructive as to the significance of Jesuit rhetorical instruction and the *Vacationes autumnales* in particular. Fumaroli soundly argues that in their teaching of oratory the Jesuits provided a 'correct' model of Ciceronian delivery suitable for the public platform. The model mediated between an ornamented style of speaking then practiced by literarists, some preachers and common players, and a dry, laconic style favored by the lawyers of his time. Fumaroli further demonstrates that this model style was made evident in Crésol's work, and had its antecedents not only in Ciceronian precept and example, but in the work of the later Sophists, whose 'pagan' rhetoric was adapted to the purposes of Christian preaching and literature by the later Church Fathers. In his attempt to clarify the historical antecedents for this manner of speaking and gesturing, Fumaroli meticulously examines the first two books comprising the *Vacationes autumnales*, in which the theory underlying this chastened symbolic style is elaborated. Surprisingly, he glosses over the techniques of posture, gesticulation, facial expression, and voice which Crésol carefully described in the Third Book, an area no less significant to the historian of rhetoric than to that of the theatre.

Fumaroli's view, that Crésol delineated a style of artistic rhetorical expression that was a forerunner of French (and by extension, European) classicism, is confirmed by my own studies of theatrical behavior of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. This paper, excerpted from a forthcoming book on Crésol and the rhetoric and acting of his time, bases its conclusions preponderantly upon Book Three of the *Vacationes autumnales* as well as upon iconography and literary documents that furnish precise information on rhetorical-aesthetic behavior of the same period. Crésol's paradigmatic gesture and action, I conclude, was not a theoretical desideratum, but already a part of a communicative aesthetic practiced by public speakers at the French court, and imitated to perfection by the major tragic actors of the incipient professional troupes.

- 6 For recent discussions of this subject see Peter Bayley, *French Pulpit Oratory (1598-1650)* (Cambridge, Engl. 1980), particularly Chapt. 2, 'Rhetoric in the Schools'; see also Marc Fumaroli, 'Aspects de l'humanisme jésuite au début du XVII^e siècle,' in *Revue des sciences humaines* 50 no 158 (April-June 1975) 245-89.
- 7 See the classic study by J.-B. Herman, *La Pédagogie des Jésuits au XVI^e siècle: ses sources, ses caractéristiques* (Louvain 1914), and the updating of the subject in the light of new information by François de Dainville *L'Éducation des Jésuits (XVI^e-XVII^e siècles)* (Paris 1940).
- 8 The fact that children of the nobility and even of the royal family (including Henri Bourbon, the illegitimate son of Henri IV, to whom Crésol dedicated his book) were students at Clermont provided opportunities for their relatives and friends at court to visit, particularly on the occasion of the end-of-year honors assemblies and theatricals. By the middle and later seventeenth century, the college's dramatic presentations had proved so attractive that students were sometimes invited to play before Cardinal Richelieu (as occurred in 1641). In his youth Louis XIV attended the college's theatrical performances several times, according to the record, and in 1649 invited the exiled young Charles II of England and the Duke of Gloucester to attend a Clermont play presentation with him; see Ernest Boyssse, *Le Théâtre des Jésuits* (Paris 1880) 77, 79.

- 9 For a discussion of the role of rhetoric in Renaissance preparatory education see Wilbur A. Howell, *Logic and Rhetoric in England 1500-1700* (Princeton 1956) and Walter J. Ong, *Ramus, Method and the Decay of Dialogue* (Cambridge, Mass. 1958).
- 10 Crésol, *Vacationes autumnales* II, chapt. 12, sect. 6. Subsequent references to this work will not be footnoted, but will be indicated in parentheses immediately following the reference.
- 11 See also Quintilian *Institutes of Oratory* XI, ii, 125 as a possible source for *contraposto* posture. Graeco-Roman sculpture furnished the Renaissance and Baroque periods with models for appropriate aesthetic stance.
- 12 A century later the Jesuit Franz Lang also saw the posture as betokening servile, if not obscene behavior; see his *Dissertatio de actione scenica* (Munich 1727) 43.
- 13 See my *Classicistic Acting: Two Centuries of a Performance Tradition at the Amsterdam Schouwburg* (Lanham, Maryland 1984) for a detailed description of this development.
- 14 As in Castiglione's *The Courtier* (written 1513-1518), Anonymous *Bienséance de la Conversation entre les hommes* (Arras 1622) and Giovanni della Casa's *Galateo* (1551-1555; Florence 1598).
- 15 Gianpaulo Lomazzo *Trattato dell'arte de pittura* (Milan 1584), Carel van Mander's *Schilderboek* (Haarlem 1604), and Junius' *De pictura veterum* (Amsterdam 1634) furnish examples of appropriate positions to reveal class distinction.
- 16 The various books of instruction and briefer essays written during the eighteenth century from Franz Lang's *Dissertatio de actione scenica* (Munich 1727) through Johannes Jelgerhuis' *Theoretische Lessen over de Gesticulatie en Mimiek* (Amsterdam 1827) reveal the truth of this statement. See my *Classicistic Acting* for documentation of the view.
- 17 *The Spiritual Exercises of St Ignatius*, originally written in 1541, reveals the techniques of a mental process wherein meditation allows the formation of images which in turn produce profound emotional states. The work has been translated by Anthony Mottola (Garden City, N.Y. 1964).