No other novel epitomizes the 18th century cult of sensibility better than Henry Mackenzie’s *The Man of Feeling* (1771). However, despite the enormous popularity of this novel following its publication, today Mackenzie’s reputation is on the ebb, especially if we compare him to Laurence Sterne, the other genuinely sentimental writer of the 18th century and rightful pioneer of post-modernism. All in all, while Walter Allen claims that “Mackenzie wrote very well indeed”¹, we rather tend to agree with Brian Vickers when he states that “*The Man of Feeling* has little absolute literary value yet if we use it mainly to gauge the ‘tune of the time’ we must grant that Mackenzie caught it with some sensitivity”². No doubt Mackenzie worked in tune with his times, not only because in sensibility he sided with the precursors of the Romantics—on the side opposite to Goldsmith or Sheridan—but also because he was the heir to the tradition of sentimentality started in mid-century by Richardson. Precisely, what makes a modern renewal of Mackenzie’s success unlikely is his position at a crossroads between Romanticism and 18th century Sentimentalism. Henry Mackenzie’s Harley is no doubt a (proto)Romantic—just like Goethe’s young Werther—and, as such, not completely gone out of fashion, even in our hardly Romantic times. What makes his story less palatable now is the mode Mackenzie uses to represent his hero’s sensibility. It is not only that the text is aimed at awakening the emotional

---

response of the reader and, as the inheritors of Modernism, we regard this function of Literature as something rather inelegant; the problem is that we cannot successfully suspend our disbelief because the representation of sensibility in *The Man of Feeling* is simply too theatrical. Thus, this active use of theatricality in fiction to heighten emotional effects, which places Mackenzie well within the sentimental tradition of the 18th century, is what most distances him—and most sentimental novelists—from us; although, paradoxically, non-literary sentimentalism is still successful in aural-visual fields of communication, such as television and the cinema. Of course, in these media sentimentalism is more acceptable because they do not suffer from the dissociation of sensibility and intellectuality that often handicaps the popular success of modern Literature. This dissociation resulted both from the late 19th century fragmentation of the reading public and the Modernists’ view of the novel as art, which pushed sentimentality away from high-brow literature an into the cultural ghetto of low-brow fiction inspired by sentimentalism most despised heir: melodrama. Fred Kaplan summarizes well the distrust modern readers are likely to feel towards Henry Mackenzie and his Victorian successors, beginning with Dickens himself, when he states that:

The novelist of sentiment is particularly reprehensible, for any novelist aware of his genre and in control of his craft should know that the assumptions about reality upon which the novel as a genre is based allow no place for an idealistic depiction of human nature. Such a depiction must be either insincere or in bad taste.  

What seems questionable is whether *The Man of Feeling* is truly a novel, since it does not seem that Mackenzie feels he is bound to a definite genre or to have control over his subject matter; within the text itself, neither the narrator nor the curate of the introduction know how to define the text about Harley and the same framing narrator excuses the lack of consistency of the story on the grounds of its having been used by the curate as wadding. *The Man of Feeling* is a hybrid fiction, very much like Sterne’s *A

---

Sentimental Journey (1768) or even Dickens’s Oliver Twist (1837-39), which shares with these books a fragmentariness and an attention to individual scenes that seem closer to drama than to the novel. The absence of a clearly structured plot, the sudden shifts from moments of intense pathos to comic moments, the subordination of artistic craftsmanship to elicit a response from the reader which appear in The Man of Feeling are the same features that little educated audiences enjoyed in popular melodrama—a fact that perplexed Dickens but that did not prevent him from artfully using the very same features in his own novels. So, although Kaplan argues that the fragmentary form of The Man of Feeling reflects Harley’s acute sensibility and his consequent difficulties to see reality in any structured form, in all probability Janet Todd hits on a better motivation for the little organized plot when she connects sentimental novels with the greatest idol of 18th century theatre:

In Garrick’s expressive method, the emphasis was on character as attitude, on the individual scene rather than on the play as a totality, and on gesture rather than flow of speech. Consequently the emotional tableau, so common in sentimental writing generally, predominated over narrative coherence, a tendency supported by the fashion of the time for paintings of actors in high dramatic and static moments (...)4

The Man of Feeling contains a considerable number of these tableaux, ranging from the scenes in Bedlam to Harley’s death, which have in common their conventionality both in form and in content. Scenes like these were stereotyped situations appearing with small variations in all kinds of sentimental literature, both in drama and in the novel; they were inherited by Hollywood cinema and by TV soap operas where they still perform the original function of moving the viewers to tears, though adapted to modern circumstances and to cinematic, rather than to dramatic modes of representation. It seems, then, than thorough visualization is indispensable in sentimental fiction since, of course, emotional sympathy is more easily aroused by immediate imitation of the characters physical reactions than by detailed descriptions of an emotional state. Sometimes, the dramatic inheritance of sentimentalism is found

in the most unexpected places and times, such as the following tableaux, from Bram Stoker’s *Dracula*, will show:

We men were all in tears now. There was no resisting them, and we wept openly. She wept too, to see that her sweeter counsels had prevailed. Her husband flung himself on his knees beside her, and putting his arms around her, hid his face in the folds of her dress. Van Helsing beckoned to us and we stole out of the room, leaving the two loving hearts alone with God.⁵

Presumably, Stoker, who had been Henry Irving’s touring manager and secretary between 1878 and 1905, was well-versed in the art of arousing the audience’s response through dramatic effects. Moreover, he needn’t have felt no great qualms when mixing sentimentalism and horror, for, as Elizabeth Napier (1987) claims, Gothic fiction and the novel of sensibility spring from the same sentimental interest in the distresses of virtue threatened by misfortune. *Oliver Twist* itself could arguably be a better instance than Dracula as a descendant of both branches of sensibility, since it contains an even more bizarre mixture of sentimentalism, Gothic and Victorian melodrama. Napier further argues that Gothic novels are fragmented for the sake of effect just like sentimental novels, and that the Gothic novel (for instance, Horace Walpole’s *Castle of Otranto*, 1764) may often be read as burlesque because it depends on exaggeration⁶—a trait which *The Man of Feeling* perfectly mirrors in the field of pure sensibility.

The novel of sensibility appeals to our emotions rather than to our intellects, although the uses sensibility has been put to are not uniform and may even include politics, as Harriet Beecher-Stowe’s *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* (1852) proves. In the case of *The Man of Feeling*, Mackenzie uses sentimentalism for no other purpose than letting his readers indulge themselves in the pleasures of feeling sympathy for his hero Harley. Mackenzie was actually convinced that there was an instructional purpose in his novel and so he wrote to his cousin that he “was somehow led to think of introducing a Man of Sensibility into different Scenes where his Feelings might be seen

in their Effects, & his Sentiments occasionally delivered without the Stiffness of Regular Deduction”⁷. Moral instruction had been the excuse regularly offered by the practitioners of sentimentalism either to introduce elements hardly moral—violence, eroticism—or to indulge in the enjoyment of sentimentality for its sake, without any actual moral basis. Dickens himself justifies his choice of characters from the dark side of life by appealing to his predecessors in the craft in his “Preface” to *Oliver Twist*:

On the other hand, if I look for examples, and for precedents, I find them in the noblest range of English literature. Fielding, Defoe, Goldsmith, Smollett, Richardson, Mackenzie; all these for wise purposes, and especially the two first, brought upon the scene the very scum and refuse of the land.⁸

Apart from the mention of Mackenzie, the metaphor Dickens uses in reference to the fiction of these novelists—”brought upon the scene”—is interesting enough, for it points at a conception of the novel as fictionalized drama; another of his predecessors, Sarah Fielding, whom Dickens significantly ignores, also saw the return of her sentimental hero in the second part of *The Adventures of David Simple* (1744-1753) as a reappearance on the Stage, or so she claims in the very first chapter. Additionally, the passage by Dickens in the “Preface” to *Oliver Twist* hints at the introduction of a character like Nancy, the prostitute, for in 1837, more than sixty years after Mackenzie introduced in his book the episode of the prostitute who is redeemed by Harley and accepted by her father, Dickens still had to justify why he had included characters like Nancy—essentially ‘depraved’—in a book about how goodness is always rewarded. The terms in which he does so are fully sentimental since, like most sentimentalists, Dickens does not actually want to see the truth behind his characters, especially if they are women:

> It is useless to discuss whether the conduct and character of the girl seems natural or unnatural, probable or improbable, right or wrong. IT IS TRUE ... It is emphatically God’s truth, for it is the truth he leaves in such depraved and miserable breasts; the hope yet lingering there; the last fair drop of water at the

---

⁷ In Todd, p. 91.
bottom of the weed-choked well. It involves the best and worst shades of our nature; much of its ugliest hues, and something of its most beautiful; it is a contradiction, an anomaly, an apparent impossibility; but it is a truth. (p. 36-37, original ellipsis)

The same passage can be applied to Mackenzie’s Harley; the paradox is that sentimentality may be used to justify at the same time a thoroughly pure young man and a prostitute and precisely, this double-sidedness of sensibility is what, in part, led to its going out of fashion. The same sardonic impulse that moved Henry Fielding to write Shamela (1741) in answer to Richardson’s Pamela (1742) led many readers away from the easy temptation to succumb to the self-indulgence of sensibility.

Sarah Fielding herself seems insecure about what to do with his hero, David Simple—a clear predecessor of Harley and, incidentally, the protagonist of a much better book than The Man of Feeling—for after rewarding him with the usual happy ending of virtue rewarded in the shape of a lovely wife and faithful friends, she kills him off in the second part of the novel (written twelve years later) after piling misfortune after misfortune upon him. The most interesting characteristic of David Simple is, no doubt, the self-consciousness Sarah Fielding shows as a sentimental writer; a great portion of the second volume discusses two kinds of sensibility: the true one—which is essentially calm, reserved—and the fake one, which is all theatrical performance. So, the paradox is that while in The Man of Feeling we pity Miss Emily Atkins, the prostitute and heroine, when she is cruelly dismissed by her callous lover (when she is about to plunge a knife in her heart) with the memorable line “Madam, I confess you are rather too much in heroics for me” (p. 62) in David Simple a great deal of the hero’s misfortunes are caused by a Mrs Orgueil who cannot believe in feeling unless it is shown by tears or complaints, and who is herself rather too often in ‘heroics’.

II

The debate about which kind of sensibility was proper—Pamela’s fainting fits or David Simple’s resignation—was largely carried out in the theatre. There the battle
involved on one side those who sharply distinguished between a moderate use of sentimentalism to show that excessive sensibility led to folly (Goldsmith, Sheridan) and, on the other, those who exploited sentimentalism without any further concern (Barnwell, Garrick, Cumberland). Since for some obscure reason literary quality ranked higher on the side of the anti-sentimentalists, who were less popular, only they are remembered today and, so, the general impression is that sentimentalism was intrinsically self-parodic. Goldsmith’s *The Good-Natur’d Man* (1768) is the best instance of a sentimental comedy in which sentimentality is disparaged, since it includes a sentimental hero, Honeywood, severely reprimanded by his well-meaning uncle for being too good:

> Yes, sir, you are surprised to see me; and I own that a desire of correcting your follies led me hither. I saw, with indignation, the errors of a mind that only sought applause from others; that easiness of disposition which, though inclined to the right, had not courage to condemn the wrong. I saw with regret those splendid errors, that still took name from some neighbouring duty. Your charity, that was but injustice; your benevolence, that was but weakness; and your friendship but credulity. I see, with regret, great talents and extensive learning only employed to add sprightliness to error, and increase your perplexities. I saw your mind with a thousand natural charms; but the greatness of its beauty served only to heighten my pity for its prostitution.9

Oliver Goldsmith, who is today mainly remembered by his sentimental novel *The Vicar of Wakefield* (1766), fought his battle in the theatre against the mixture of sentimentality and comedy on the grounds that the spectator was led to condone folly in the characters because these characters were also shown to be good, while the very essence of the Aristotelian idea of comedy which Goldsmith followed stated that comedy should ridicule folly. Thus if the characters “happen to have Faults or Foibles, the Spectator is taught not only to pardon, but to applaud them, in consideration of the goodness of their hearts; so that Folly, instead of being ridiculed, is commended, and the Comedy aims at touching our Passions without the power of being truly

---

pathetic (...)

And, of course, if pathos does not contribute to moral regeneration it losses its edge and becomes simply ineffective bathos and bad literature.

This had not been the first stage in the battle, as it may be seen in the following passage from *David Simple*, in which several ladies play at being drama critics; their discussion reveals a rift in sensibility that was noticeable as early as 1744:

Fourth Lady. “There is nothing so surprising to me, as the Absurdity of almost every body I meet with; they can’t even laugh or cry in the right place. Perhaps it will be hardly believed, but I really saw people in the Boxes last Night, at the Tragedy of Cato [Richard Addison, 1713], set with dry eyes, and show no kind of Emotion, when that great Man fell on his sword; nor was it all owing to any Firmness of Mind, that made them incapable of crying neither, for that I should have admired. But I have even known those very People shed tears at George Barnwell [George Lillo, 1731]”

A good many Ladies speak at one time. “Oh intolerable! cry for an odious Apprentice-Boy, who murdered his Uncle, at the Instigation too of a common Woman, and yet be unmoved, when even Cato bled for his country”.

Sarah Fielding would have been pleased to know that although the fans of Pamela and Lillo’s *The London Merchant* prevailed upon those of *Cato*, the fashion for sensibility died its own death, killed by excessive sensationalism and, among others, by Henry Mackenzie’s *Man of Feeling*. What seems clear from her passage, slightly biased in favour of the less sophisticated audiences as it is, is that sentimental drama and fiction require less educated audiences or readers than truly high-brow Literature. The literature of sensibility was better appreciated by adolescents or by hardly educated women (who often remained in a state of dim adolescence for years): this is why Lady Louisa Stuart confessed to Scott that, despite his commendation of Mackenzie and her teenage love for the book, she could only laugh at the man of feeling’s distress as a grown-up woman. No wonder that Burns or Scott enjoyed Mackenzie, for it seems that Harley fed the adolescent dreams of many Romantics. The sensibility which Romanticism inherits from Mackenzie is, then, a sensibility devoid of moral content.


that can inspire young men–budding men of feeling–to pose as Romantics but that will lend itself to no further use. It is, in one word, theatrical.

Many of the dramatic scenes in *The Man of Feeling* do not even involve Harley or just involve him as a sympathetic by-stander. An instance of the first kind of episode would be the prison scene in which a character called Sedley is undeceived of his trust in a Milanese friend; this turns out to be the cause of all the misfortunes endured by the Sedley family as the would-be seducer of the wife; an example of the second sort is the reunion of old Edwards with his long-lost grandchildren. However, among the many dramatic, tear-jerking scenes that can be found in *The Man of Feeling*, there are two specially intense, involving Harley more closely, in which sentimentality appears transparently as theatrical performance. In both Harley features as the object of gratitude or love of a young woman, which, in the reader’s view, seems to prepare the ground for a long-expected love scene with Miss Walton that never actually takes place. This may be due to the fact that Harley seems to feel more comfortable when playing the role of a dead lover to the madwoman he visits in Bedlam or of honest saviour to Miss Atkins, than being himself in love with Miss Watson. Indeed, in the only scene he has with her he dies of embarrassment–or of extreme sensibility.

Both the Bedlam scene and the brothel scene involve women in distress because of some hopeless relationship with a young man. The failure of the relationship, which is carried out in defiance of the negative interference of the father or by disregarding him, turns both women into social outcasts. In these two pitiful cases Harley unwittingly represents the role of the lost lover of these girls, though, indeed, in the second case, the personality of the rake who seduces Miss Atkins could not be further from Harley’s. In a sense, his masculine, though highly sensitive, personality alleviates the misery of these girls and reconciles them–for a moment or for ever–with a world in which men are not usually so sensitive, thus perpetuating the same state of matters.

Mackenzie wrote *The Man of Feeling* at a turning point in the medical story of madness. The controversy about whether it was proper to visit Bedlam for
entertainment had been raging for years with true men of feeling defending the right of the inmates to be left alone. ‘Adam FitzAdam’, the journalist Edward Moore, published in 1753 a very critical article against Bedlam visitors with opinions Harley could have endorsed himself: “I saw some of the poor wretches provoked by the insults of this holiday mob into furies of rage; and I saw the poor wretches, the spectators, in a loud laugh of triumph at the ravings they had occasioned (...) Both women and men took advantage of the invitation to taunt the inmates”\textsuperscript{12}. However, Mackenzie’s man of feeling was not wholly original in his siding with Moore, for, already in 1769 Dr John Munro (1715-91), physician and director of Bedlam, had banished unwanted sight-seers. This decision, coinciding with the first developments of the idea of madness as curable mental disease, signals the conversion of the madman into an object of scientific interest. All in all, Mackenzie was exploiting one of the last chances to be sentimental about madness in the way Shakespeare deals with Ophelia, before madwomen became objects of pure horror in Gothic fiction, as it happens, for instance, in Charlotte Brontë’s \textit{Jane Eyre} (1848).

The scene with the daughter in distress is preceded by a few others with different male inmates of Bedlam, which are more laughable than pathetic. When we move with Harley to the place where “the insane of the other sex” are housed, the keeper shows us a woman whose face is different: it “showed a dejection of that decent kind, which moves our pity unmixed with horror” (p. 33). When the keeper tells the story of poor Billy’s mistress for the benefit and instruction of the visitors, the scene intensely reminds us of the Victorian freak show featuring in stories such as David Lynch’s film \textit{The Elephant Man}. The sorrowful tale of woe has the effect of making Harley pay “the tribute of some tears”, which indicates that her story is moving though not moving enough to deserve his habitual shower of tears. This is presently elicited by the performance of the lady herself: Harley exits after bursting into tears because of her speech about him and his dead-ringer Billy; quite a remarkably clear

way of showing that whenever sentimentalism is involved showing rather than telling is the key to the readers’ or the audience’s hearts.

The “unfortunate young lady” actually moves and speaks more sanely than Ophelia, but neither less theatrically, nor with less eroticism. She is transfixed by the thought that Harley looks like her dead Billy and so she performs a kind of erotic dance around him, mesmerizing him as she moves towards him with a barrage of exclamations. The sequence shows the lady drawing nearer to Harley, offering him her hand which he bathes in tears, pressing his hand to her bosom and finally symbolically marrying him by putting her dead Billy’s ring on Harley’s finger, all this punctuated by her song about the dead young man and her short, almost gasping sentences. For all her madness, she is sane enough to manipulate Harley’s feelings and those of the other visitors—excepting the keeper who possibly has witnessed her performance too many times for effect. What she does may be madness but there is certainly a method in it: first she declares she can no longer cry after having wept so long for the death of her Billy, which, of course, makes everybody around her weep in sympathy with her dry eyes; her plaintive song marks a climax after her confession that she has neglected her prayers, so the visitors are convinced that religious feeling pales by the side of purely human feeling. After this, she identifies Harley with the late Billy and so she toys with his hands and his feelings until, once her performance is over, she abruptly retires before the whole effect vanishes. Harley makes his friend pay cash (not just tears) for the show and he leaves in tears, fully persuaded that his heart is in the right place, which is exactly the effect Mackenzie was aiming at regarding his readers. Obviously, the problem is that what works so effectively on the stage or in fictional Bedlam fails in print: the sheer quantity of dashes (nineteen in forty lines) are enough to make the reader conclude that such a histrionic show really belongs to the stage, not to the novel.

The episode concerning Miss Atkins, the prostitute, is the longest one in the novel. Again, it shows sentimentality in close contact with eroticism (incidentally, the most conspicuous feature in Laurence Sterne’s *A Sentimental Journey*), for Harley
meets the lady in question as a client, not as a benefactor. Mackenzie chooses not to disclose Harley’s original intentions towards Emily, “as it has ever been against our nature to search for motives where bad ones are to be found—” (p. 49); however, there are hints that this darker side of Harley’s sensibility is punished by his being made a “cully” by her and the sharp waiter. In a sense, he atones for the crime of trying to become Emily’s client—the successor of the original seducer—by reconciling her to captain Atkins, her father. Although plenty of tears punctuate the dramatic narrative of Miss Emily’s misfortunes the truly theatrical moment occurs when captain Atkins suddenly intrudes upon sinner and confessor:

She saw his tears; her fortitude began to fail at the sight, when the voice of some stranger on the stairs awakened her attention. She listened for a moment; then starting up, exclaimed, “Merciful God! my father’s voice!”

She had scarce uttered the word, when the door burst open, and a man entered in the garb of an officer. When he discovered his daughter and Harley, he started back a few paces; his look assumed a furious wildness! He laid his hand on his sword. The two objects of his wrath did not utter a syllable. “Villain”, he cried, “thou seest a father who had once a daughter’s honour to preserve; blasted as it now is, behold him ready to avenge its loss!” (p. 66)

There follows a rather ludicrous scene in which the father draws his sword and threatens Harley; this feebly claims that captain Atkins is deceived and Miss Emily flings herself on her knees, with her hair spread on her shoulders like Mary Magdalen’s, crying for mercy. Harley fortunately decides that hers is the best policy and so he also kneels down just in time to see captain Atkins burst into tears in sympathy with his daughter’s. The very quintessence of melodrama, no doubt, and a truly affecting scene that works quite well in the mental theatre of the reader—or the listener, for *The Man of Feeling* often seems designed to be read aloud in company of other sensitive readers rather than on one’s own.

III

The intense drama of scenes like these usually masks the truth behind the characters. Thus, despite the fact that women figure at the centre of the novel of
sensibility, this kind of literature does little to search into the causes that make women the victims of fathers or lovers. *The Man of Feeling* is a clear instance of the social irresponsibility of the literature of sensibility, an aspect in which this 18th century genre most differs from the Victorian sentimental novel, despite Dickens and his Nancy. Harley’s retreat from the world may well obey to Mackenzie’s assumption of Rosseau’s thesis, as Walter Allen claims, or to the inability of the Shaftesburian soul to cope with a “materialistic, callous and Hobbesian world”, as Janet Todd puts it, but the fact is that it leads to a dead end–actually to Harley’s own death. Harley may be, as Fred Kaplan says, a “Romantic in embryo”—and anticipate especially Keats and Coleridge—but he is very far from the promethean, essentially rebellious Romantic man of Byron and Shelley, or Blake. In a sense, Romanticism often reads as a profoundly masculine reaction against the excessive feminization of sensibility to which heroes like Harley contributed.

In the two dramatic scenes with the mad lady and the golden-hearted prostitute Harley seems oddly passive in contrast with the women who encircle him within their narratives of distress or their performances of feeling, and, so, when faced with the erotic potential of pale Miss Watson, he would rather die than experience sexual love. Precisely, Todd links sexuality with the way we understand Mackenzie, when, speaking about heroes like his she says that “the man of feeling remains an awkward figure with his chosen female helplessness. Consequently this fiction frequently holds the possibility of ironic reading beyond the prompted mockery of the narrators and their detached stance.”

And so it is. Trapped between Sentimentalism and Romanticism, between his masculine body and his feminine sensibility, between the theatricality of his show of feeling and the lack of a truly sustaining sensitivity, Harley, the man of feeling, has little chance to live and little heritage to transmit to further generations. Unlike David Simple, who manages to leave a daughter behind him when he dies and who is killed by unabating suffering, or Sterne’s Yorick, who happily enjoys the erotic side of sentimentality, Harley fathers nobody, enjoys nothing

but his tears and dies in hardly romantic circumstances because of a fever. No wonder, then, that all readers have stopped mourning for him.
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