SPEECH CHARACTERISTICS OF ALEXANDER CAMPBELL AS SHOWN IN THE REMARKS OF HIS CONTEMPORARIES AND HIS SUCCESSORS

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the Department of Speech

Indiana State Teachers' College

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

---

by

Grace Lillian Swisher

July 1952

The thesis of Grace Lillian Swisher, Contribution of the Graduate School, Indiana State Teachers College, Number 139, under the title -- Speech Characteristics of Alexander Campbell as Shown in the Remarks of His Contemporaries and His Successors is hereby approved as counting toward the completion of the Master's degree in the amount of 8 hours' credit.

Committee on thesis:

Charles W. Hardaway

B.W. Masters

_____, Chairman

Representative of English Department:

_____

Date of Acceptance August 28, 1952

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

CHAPTER PAGE

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Through all the ages man has endeavored to plead his cause. In so doing, he has found himself in one of four categories: a man with a weak cause and a weak ability, a man with a weak cause and a strong ability, a man with a strong cause and a weak ability, or a man with a strong cause and a strong ability.

By means of a thorough investigation of the remarks of Alexander Campbell's contemporaries and successors, it is possible for the public to know to which of these four categories he should be classified.

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. In this paper a study was made of the comments that have been printed about Alexander Campbell's characteristics as a public speaker. It was the purpose of this research to compare these comments with the characteristics of a good speaker, as described by authorities of the past and present, and then to summarize those characteristics in which Alexander Campbell excelled and those in which he was weak.

Importance of the problem. Since people of the present profit by the successes and failures of those of the past, it is worth our time to study anyone with as much prestige as Alexander Campbell had. As the reader will note in Campbell's biography in the appendix of this writing, Campbell is credited with having had 300,000 followers as a result of his characteristics as a public speaker.

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Some material has been written about Alexander Campbell as a preacher and as a promoter of the religion that he believed to be right; but no writing of the nature of this thesis has been published either in the form of magazine articles, theses, dissertations, or books.

III. LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

The term "speech characteristics" in the title of this thesis is not an all-inclusive term. Instead, it is used to mean informal and formal public speaking; consequently, all remarks about Alexander Campbell's ability as a conversationalist are purposely omitted.

IV. METHOD OF PROCEDURE

Sources of data. The primary source of this information was remarks made about Alexander Campbell by people who

actually heard him preach. The secondary source was remarks made by writers who judged him from the comments of the people who heard him.

Historical research with library technique. All information used was material which had already been recorded in the past. Card catalogues and periodical guides of libraries were used to trace any information leading to remarks in books, encyclopedias, and unpublished materials about Alexander Campbell as a speaker.

V. ORGANIZATION OF REMAINDER OF THESIS

Chapter II contains a brief outline and resume of the criteria of good speech as recorded by early and contemporary authorities in public speaking.

Chapter III reports the comments of Alexander Campbell's contemporaries and successors about his speeches; and these are classified according to the criteria of good speech given in Chapter II.

Chapter IV is a treatment of the findings, a summary and conclusion, showing wherein Alexander Campbell's speeches were qualified and wherein they failed to meet the test for the criteria of good speech. Chapter IV also contains recommendations for further study.

CHAPTER II

THE CRITERIA OF GOOD SPEECH

The question of the importance of speech is of great concern to us if we consider how many speakers fail to accomplish their purpose. To be a good speaker one must do more than have something to say; he must speak "in accordance with the laws of the human mind which govern conviction," says Phillips.[1] And he adds the following:

> When we realize that speech. . .is the medium by which men must convey their ideas; that it is the only vehicle for communicating truth; that society, individually and collectively, every moment may be swayed and molded by it; that it is, in fact, the very foundation of intellectual and moral progress, the question of its effectiveness is seen to be of vital moment.[2]

Since hearers are influenced by a speaker's character and personality, his style of language, and his manner of delivery, these phases of speech are discussed in this writing.

I. THE SPEAKER HIMSELF

Surely no one would question the fact that personality traits are important factors in determining speaking effectiveness.[3] In one form or another, "Seneca, Cicero, St. Augustine,

---

1 Arthur E. Phillips, Effective Speaking (Chicago: The Newton Company, 1938), p. 14.

2 Ibid., p. 13.

3 A. Craig Baird, Argumentation, Discussion, and Debate (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1950), p. 247.

and many other rhetoricians have declared that great speaking cannot be divorced from great personalities committed to good causes."[4] Quintilian insisted upon the speaker's having a high moral character, if he would aspire to eminence in the field. "Good oratory," he said, "represents a good man speaking well."[5]

And Winans insists it is a matter of much importance whether the hearers hold toward the speaker a doubting or a trusting attitude. He says this:

> One of the most important elements in persuasiveness is the impression made by the speaker himself. His personal influence depends upon his reputation, the mastery of his subject which he manifests, his skill in presenting his proposal, and his attitude and personal characteristics.[6]

Personality. A magnetic personality is a quality which can be recognized rather than cultivated quickly. Public speakers need strong personalities and personal magnetism if they expect to attain great heights.

There is surely some connection between personal appearance and personal magnetism. The tall, well-proportioned

---

4 Lew Sarett and William T. Foster, Basic Principles of Speech (Revised Edition), (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1946), p. 30.

5 Lester Thonssen and Howard Gilkinson, Basic Training in Speech (Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1947), J. S. Watson (London, H. G. Bohn, 1856), XII, 2, I.

6 James A. Winans, Speech Making (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1938),pp. 378-379.

man has an advantage. But Webster, "the godlike Daniel," though spoken of as a giant, was really of only moderate height; and Stephen A. Douglas, called the "Little Giant," a leader of rare influence whether before the people or in the Senate, was less than five feet in height. But Winan advises those who lack physical impressiveness not to worry about the lack. He says, "One can develop some of the qualities that enter into personality, and one can be a sincere, straightforward gentleman on the platform."[7]

It takes a very extraordinary speaker to attract large crowds and to interest the hearers. People usually do not go through great difficulties or put forth enormous effort to get to hear the mediocre speaker. Therefore, it is the speaker's responsibility to secure and to hold attention. In order to do this he must have a clear, objective purpose,[8] he must be seen and heard easily,[9] he must make his speech instantly intelligible by the use of familiar illustrations and figures of speech,[10] and he must alter his language according to the mood of the audience.[11]

---

7 Winans, op. cit., pp. 390-391.

8 James O'Neill and Andrew Weaver, The Elements of Speech (New York, London, Toronto: Longmans, Green and Co., 1935), p. 11.

9 Loc. cit.

10 O'Neill and Weaver, op. cit., p. 453.

11 Ibid., p. 455.

Characteristics as an authority. Winans[12] says that an audience's confidence in a speaker is enhanced when it feels that experience and investigation have made him an authority on his subject. In determining to what extent a man is relied upon as an authority by his hearers he lists, besides personality, the following characteristics: sincerity, fairness, courtesy, self-respect, modesty, geniality, self-control, preparation, humor, exaggeration, and respect for his audience. Other authorities have added these factors: desire for truth, in contrast with exaggeration, and choice of authority.

Regarding sincerity, Winans states that nothing is so destructive of confidence in a speaker as suspicion of his sincerity. And he discusses the point further in the following paragraph:

> The best way to be believed sincere is to be sincere. A speaker should not permit himself to declare a belief that he does not hold. Apart from the question of common honesty, he cannot afford to develop the insincerity which is bound to show in the tones of his voice and in other subtle ways.[13]

Fairness adds to the hearer's confidence in the speaker. If the speaker is willing to grant the worth of the valid arguments of the opposition, the audience decides

---

12 Winans, op. cit., pp. 378-379.

13 Ibid., p. 389.

that he is honest and trustworthy; and, instead of weakening his case, it strengthens it.[14]

Surely all would agree that there is great need for courtesy on the platform. Acts of courtesy aid the effectiveness of the speaker's words because they help to win the good will of the audience.[15] The courteous speaker can say stern things with impunity. Sarcastic remarks may occasionally be justified but are seldom persuasive.[16] Brigance maintains that no speaker ever really loses anything by being courteous, but he always loses much by being boorish. He states further, "A courteous speaker can say severe things without offense, but the boorish speaker can make pleasant things seem offensive."[17]

A speaker must have self-respect[18] and self-confidence;[19] otherwise, no audience will respect him. However, the ideal speaker-personality has no pride or suggestion of superiority. He must be modest and entirely free from arrogance or conceit.[20]

---

14 Ibid., p. 393.

15 Margaret Painter, Ease in Speech (Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1943), p. 277.

16 Winans, op. cit., p. 400.

17 William Norwood Brigance, Speech Composition (New York and London: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1937), p. 144.

18 Winans, op. cit., p. 396.

19 Painter, op. cit., p. 275.

20 Loc. cit.

Parrish[21] asserts that it is possible to be authoritative without seeming pompous or domineering; and it is possible to express strong opposition to the beliefs of an audience without seeming unfriendly.

Geniality, another name for good humor, is one of the surest ways of being able to meet all situations and of winning a hostile audience. It is a characteristic that is far more important than humor, for it enables a speaker to meet all sorts of situations good-naturedly. Usually one of the worst things a speaker can do is to show irritation.[22]

Self-control is closely related to geniality and to poise. For a speaker to be master of a situation, he must first be master of himself. People automatically turn for guidance to men who are unruffled during strong feeling and calm in a crisis. Such a man will be able to judge the mood of the audience and adapt himself to the situation.[23]

Audiences have no respect for the speaker who does not prepare himself. Their confidence is increased when they feel that he knows what he is talking about.[24]

There are arguments for and against humor. It would be pleasant to be regarded as a humorist but less pleasant

---

21 Wayland Maxfield Parrish, Speaking in Public (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1947), p. 373.

22 Winans, op. cit., p. 399.

23 Ibid., p. 392.

24 Ibid., p. 380.

to discover that people refuse to take one seriously.[25] Brigance[26] says that it is an element of highly controversial merits. It can help to hold attention, or it can descend to a clownish level that sets off the audience into paroxysms of laughter at the expense of their respect for the speaker. Some people can enjoy a funny man, but, if they need advice or leadership, they turn to another and leave the funny man to his jokes. Yet a small amount of humor can be found in many great speeches.

It is very necessary to refrain from the habit of rash and exaggerated statements. If one habitually overstates, all his claims will be discounted. Even if exaggerated statements are understood as exaggeration when spoken, "they still can play into the hands of opponents."[27]

A speaker with a love for truth will have no desire to exaggerate. Aristotle asserted, more than two thousand years ago, that truth and justice are by nature more powerful than their opposites; "so that when decisions are not made as they should be, the speakers with the right on their side have only themselves to thank for the outcome."[28]

---

25 Ibid., p. 385.

26 Brigance, op. cit., p. 127.

27 Winans, op. cit., p. 381.

28 James H. McBurney, James M. O'Neill, and Glen E. Mills, Argumentation and Debate (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1951), p. 10, citing Aristotle's Rhetoric I, 1.

Authorities agree that no great speaker ever rose to success without respecting his audience.[29] If a speaker sets himself above an audience, he will evoke an inferior feeling so that he cannot persuade them. Then, too, no matter how illiterate, every audience will contain people with surprisingly sound judgment.[30] Winans[31] stresses the importance of respect for an audience by saying that hearers expect familiar words, but they do not want anyone to talk down to them.

Whether a speaker is an authority or not, himself, he needs to cite references to others accepted by the audience. Therefore, he needs to be extremely careful in his choice of authority. Painter[32] says that most people do not like to be asked to accept blindly a statement simply because someone else says it is true. If their own conclusions are confirmed by authorities, conviction becomes stronger.

II. QUALITIES OF LANGUAGE IN SPEECH

It is extremely important that speakers take great care to use only language which will be instantly understood by their hearers. Speakers should choose their words,

---

29 Brigance, op. cit., p. 144.

30 Loc. cit.

31 Winans, op. cit., p. 399.

32 Painter, op. cit., p. 224.

illustrations, analogies, and allusions carefully in order to have the audience get the full meaning of their remarks.[33] Style of language may be defined as a "choice of words and their arrangement."[34]

The following desirable qualities[35] of language in speech are listed as factors important enough to justify some discussion:

1. Variety.
    a. Comparison.
    b. Climax.
2. Euphony.
3. Economy.
    a. Brevity.
    b. Simplicity.
4. Vividness.
    a. Reference to experience.
    b. Specific language.
    c. Concreteness.
    d. Familiar words.
    e. Illustrations.

---

33 James O'Neill and A. T. Weaver, The Elements of Speech (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1935), p. 453.

34 Parrish, op. cit., p. 383.

35 Ibid., p. 452.

Variety. Variety, the opposite of monotony, is the life of a speech. O'Neill and Weaver[36] insist, among other things, that monotony in words, in sentence structure, in paragraph organization, or in the use of evidence and illustration is likely to kill the interest of the audience. One can avoid monotony by securing variety of material, and variety of words, phrases, and sentences.

Comparison and climax. Two rhetorical devices that aid in securing the quality of variety are comparison and climax.[37]

To compare the unknown with the known is a very effective method of exposition.[38] Analogy, the comparison of things somewhat different, is an effective means of holding attention.[39]

Hearers seem to expect a speaker to work toward a climax at all times. As a rule, the order of climax should be followed within the sentence, in the paragraph, and in the whole speech.[40] Shurter[41] agrees with Winans in saying

---

36 Ibid., p. 456.

37 Loc. cit.

38 O'Neill and Weaver, op. cit., p. 491.

39 Winans, op. cit., p. 166.

40 Parrish, op. cit., p. 163.

41 E. D. Shurter, The Rhetoric of Oratory (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1909), p. 141.

that the habit of withholding an idea through a succession of clauses, or of sentences, or even of paragraphs will usually arouse the curiosity of the hearer.

Euphony. To have euphony is to have good sound. Harsh, unpleasant sounds are usually disgusting and non-persuasive. Words should have euphony as well as proper denotation and connotation.[42] And, while a certain alliteration and rhythm is allowable, any suggestion of rhyme like the following should be avoided: "The sailors mutinied and set him afloat in an open boat."[43]

Economy. To be an efficient, effective speaker, one must bear in mind the principle of economy.[44] No audience wants to waste time.

Brevity. A speaker does not attain brevity by omitting necessary details; he obtains it by leaving out all extraneous material that does not help to clarify thought. He violates brevity when he talks to fill up time or does not stop when he has said enough. The shortest adequate explanation and the shortest allusion that will create desired thinking are the most persuasive.[45]

---

42 O'Neill and Weaver, op. cit., pp. 456-457.

43 Shurter, op. cit., p. 149.

44 O'Neill and Weaver, op. cit., p. 457.

45 Ibid., p. 458.

Hill gives a pointed warning when he says:

> He should beware of putting in a word of introduction that is not necessary to prepare the way for his argument, and of adding a word at the end that is not necessary to enforce his conclusion. "Is he never going to begin?" "Will he never have done?" are questions equally fatal.[46]

Simplicity. Simplicity is another way of practicing economy. O'Neill and Weaver[47] say that a speaker's purpose should be to communicate and not to exhibit; therefore, he should speak simply and avoid the artificial, ornate, bombastic style that calls attention to eloquence instead of content.

Vividness. "Audiences," said Aristotle, "like words that set an event before their eyes, that show things in a state of activity."[48] The term "vividness" means brightness, animation, and life-likeness. A reference to anything with which one's audience is unfamiliar distracts the hearer's attention and does not create a vivid image.[49]

Reference to experience. Parrish[50] thinks it is wise for the audience to know that the speaker has had experience

46 A. S. Hill, The Principles of Rhetoric (Revised Edition) (New York: American Book Company, 1895), pp. 388-389.

47 O'Neill and Weaver, op. cit., p. 460.

48 Parrish, op. cit., p. 392.

49 O'Neill and Weaver, op. cit., p. 461.

50 Parrish, op. cit., p. 372.

in the field upon which he speaks. And Phillips[51] thinks the speaker should bring his idea within the vivid experience of the listener if he wishes to attain his end.

Specific and concrete language. Since the word "special" is given as a synonym for both "specific" and "concrete," it seemed wise to use them together in this discussion. However, O'Neill and Weaver[52] emphasize the fact that the opposite of "specific" is "general" and the opposite of "concrete" is "abstract." "Measles" is more specific than "disease." "Liveliness" is an abstract term; "a live boy" is a concrete term.

Familiar words. It is necessary to use words that belong to the language of the audience. If a speaker's audience is composed of sea-faring people, he should use the familiar expressions of the sailor's vocabulary. If his audience is composed mainly of prairie farmers, he should use the idioms of people of that section. Such words have maximum connotation, and the connotative word is the word that makes the deepest impression. A speaker can use connotative words without lowering his language to the quality of that of the illiterate.[53]

---

51 Phillips, op. cit., p. 33.

52 O'Neill and Weaver, op. cit., pp. 463-465.

53 Ibid., pp. 467-468.

Parrish[54] insists that, although some people say the speaker should prefer Anglo-Saxon words to those of Latin origin, and short words to long, it isn't the origin or the length of a word that matters, but its familiarity. He gives "unconstitutionality" as an example of a long Latin word that the audience will understand and "wain" as an example of a short Anglo-Saxon word that it will probably not understand.

Illustrations. A speaker should make his discussions vivid by illustrating his meanings. It is said that "examples and illustrations do for the ordinary public speech what photographs do for the narrative of a journey through a strange country."[55]

III. DELIVERY

Aristotle[56] says one must know not only what to say, but also how to say it. During the ages authorities have disagreed about the last of that statement--how to say it. Some might expect a speaker to be very literary and oratorical; others might prefer him to be quite conversational.

---

54 Parrish, op. cit., p. 388.

55 O'Neill and Weaver, op. cit., p. 468.

56 Lane Cooper, The Rhetoric of Aristotle (New York: D. Appleton-Century, 1932), p. 182.

Margaret Painter[57] lists three essentials of prime importance for effective delivery: (1) conversational contact with the audience. (2) enthusiasm for the subject, and (3) a sincere desire to achieve the purpose of the speech. These, along with forms of style, were the standard of measurement used in this thesis in judging the delivery of the speaker under consideration.

Style. Parrish[58] says that, since style is conditioned by one's own personality, the most appropriate style for one person may not be right for another. Hence, there is need for originality and uniqueness in delivery as well as in expression. Not only the choice of words, as has been discussed, but also the arrangement[59] and the manner of delivery[60] make a noticeable difference in the speech.

Enunciation and pronunciation. Parrish insists that pronunciation should be distinct, natural, and easy, and it should conform to the customary usage of cultivated speakers. Syllables must be distinct and clearly articulated. "Good speech," says he, "is fluent and unconstrained. It demands

---

57 Painter, op. cit., p. 283.

58 Parrish, op. cit., p. 385.

59 Ibid., p. 384.

60 Ibid., p. 24.

a deftness and delicacy in its precision that will keep it smooth and fluid."[61]

Voice and emphasis. The voice must be loud enough to be heard by all of the audience but not so loud as to offend the ear. It should be flexible enough to show changes in thought and feeling. The rate of utterance should be neither so slow as to dull attention, nor so rapid as to make comprehension difficult.[62] Words will be distinct if the speech organs are used correctly, and they will have power if the speaker breathes properly.[63]

Sincerity and clarity of thought are necessary for good voice and correct emphasis, for we are told, "Wrong emphasis is due to failure at the moment to discriminate values; wrong pausing is due to failure to distinguish the units of thought; wrong tone is prompted by the wrong feeling."[64] Complete thinking and sincere feeling will remedy these faults.

Platform action. We usually hear "platform action" referred to as "gestures" or "gesticulations." Webster's

---

61 Parrish, op. cit., p. 27.

62 Ibid., p. 26.

63 Max Crombie, Secrets of Success in Public Speaking (London: George Allen & Unwin LTD, Museum Street, 1931), pp. 70-72.

64 Winans, op. cit., pp. 37-38.

International Dictionary, Second Edition, discriminates between the two words in modern usage in the following definitions: "GESTURE applies to any excessive bodily movement. GESTICULATION commonly suggests the use of rapid, unrestrained, or undignified gesture."

Authorities do not agree entirely on the use of gestures, as is noticed in the remarks that follow:

> Gesture is the communication of thought and feeling through posture and movement, including facial expression...a speaker who makes easy and expressive gestures will make a much better appearance, and at the same time will attract less attention to his person than one who holds himself rigidly or slumps into inactivity.[65]

Max Crombie contends, "We can convey love, hatred, anger, sympathy, pity, disgust, horror, amazement, sorrow, joy, and so on, by facial expressions"[66] but he goes ahead to say, about gestures in general, "I am convinced that a little gesture goes a long way in public speaking."[67]

Length of discourses. Winans[68] says that no one complains of the length of a speech which he finds interesting. However, an audience will not consider a speech interesting

---

65 Ibid., pp. 428-429.

66 Crombie, op. cit., p. 66.

67 Ibid., p. 72.

68 Winans, op. cit., p. 197.

if the speaker wastes words and becomes long-winded. Winans adds the following remarks about amplification:

> The old saying, 'The briefer the better,' like all short sweeping assertions, needs a deal of qualification. If this confident assertion were accepted at its face value, many of the greatest books, essays, and poems should be condensed into a few sententious sayings.[69]

One should realize, then, that although verboseness is to be condemned, it is all right to amplify a thought that deserves emphasis. Lack of proper amplification might mean loss of clarity.

Eloquence. The word "eloquence" is a word that can be used to summarize a speech in general. Webster's New International Dictionary, Second Edition, page 833, gives the meaning of eloquence as follows:

> a discourse characterized by force and persuasiveness suggesting strong feeling or deep sincerity; especially, discourse marked by apt and fluent diction and imaginative fervor; also, the art, action, or power of using such discourse;--applied primarily to oral utterance.

In summarizing the criteria of good speech it can be said that authorities agree that a speaker, to be eloquent, must be a capable man of high moral character; he must choose and arrange his words carefully; and he must use an effective style of delivery.

---

69 Ibid., pp. 197-199.

CHAPTER III

ALEXANDER CAMPBELL'S SPEECH CHARACTERISTICS

In studying Alexander Campbell's speech characteristics, he is analyzed first as a man. We know that it would take a person "of tremendous energies, of dynamic forcefulness, of powerful intellect, and of deep abiding convictions"[1] to attract large crowds with such crude transportation as there was at that time.

The first part of this chapter contains remarks about Campbell's character and ability. The next describes his quality of language. And the last section reports comments on his platform delivery.

I. ALEXANDER CAMPBELL HIMSELF

In commenting on Campbell's discourses, remarks were often made about him as a man. That the characteristics of his personality had much to do with his success as a speaker cannot be denied. Further discussion in this thesis shows that, as Quintilian said about a great speaker, he was "a good man speaking well."[2]

---

1 Benjamin Lyon Smith, Alexander Campbell (St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1930), p. 272.

2 Lester Thonssen and Howard Gilkinson, Basic Training in Speech (Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1947), pp. 233-234, citing Institutes of Oratory, translated by J. S. Watson (London, H. G. Bohn, 1856), XII, 2, I.

His personality and appearance. It is said that Campbell had an attractive personality.[3] Robert Graham, President of Kentucky University, who was a noted speaker himself, stated, "He charmed all alike, the old and young, the educated and the uneducated."[4]

We can appreciate his strength of personality still more when we remember that preachers, even Alexander's father, often received threats[5] in those days. However, Richardson says that there was something commanding in Alexander's appearance and something expressive of power in the eagle glances of his eye that kept him from being molested.[6]

At the time of his first sermon, it is said that physically he was very attractive. He was six feet tall, and his face, although "not handsome in regularity of feature, was striking in its cleanness and strength of line."[7]

---

3 Thomas W. Grafton, Alexander Campbell (St. Louis: Christian Publishing Company, 1897), p. 179.

4 Benjamin Lyon Smith, The Millennial Harbinger, Abridged (Cincinnati: The Standard Publishing Company, 1902), II, 614. (To avoid confusing this reference with Benjamin Lyon Smith's Alexander Campbell, henceforth in this thesis it will be cited as Smith, The Millennial Harbinger, Abridged, op. cit.

5 Ira Lutts North, "The Rhetorical Method of Alexander Campbell" (Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Illinois, 1945), p. 11.

6 Robert Richardson, Memoirs of Alexander Campbell (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott and Co., 1871), I, 432.

7 Smith, op. cit., p. 86.

A noted minister said that not one man in a thousand was so well endowed as Campbell. He thought that nature was in a fertile mood when she molded his large and sinewy body without a pound of flesh too much, nor a pound too little.[8] Campbell must have looked highly intelligent, for it is stated that, as he walked the streets of London, a man who did not know him said, "There goes a man with enough brains to govern Europe."[9]

Moses Lard gives the following picture of Campbell:

> Mr. Campbell's chief greatness lay in his intellect. In resources of mind no word but opulent will describe him. Here he was great, preeminently great, in the true sense of that fine simple word. No one could gaze on that grand head, or look on that bold, unique face, without feeling impressed with this fact. His head was large, very large; his forehead high, with all the breadth necessary to amplitude; while the distance from the point of the ear to the centre of the frontal bone revealed the capacious home which God had built for his thought. His head I think [was] the finest I ever saw. It was simply faultless. After the first look, you never criticized it; you only admired it.[10]

His character and speaking ability. Perhaps one can have an insight into Campbell's character by noting the description of his solemn and simple prayers and thanksgivings at home and in public. It is said, "His petitions

---

8 Smith, The Millennial Harbinger, Abridged, op. cit., II, 627.

9 Loc. cit.

10 Loc. cit.

possessed a breadth, fullness, and appositeness, which at once exalted the thoughts and tended to sanctify the heart."[11]

When Campbell first began to speak publicly, his power of generalization and his ability to take wide and expanded views were very evident.[12] After his first sermon was finished, the youth gazed at each other in awe and wonder, and the older members said that he was a better preacher than his outstanding father, Thomas Campbell. Both the theme selected and the surrounding circumstances seemed so remarkably appropriate that the listeners almost believed that Providence had arranged them in order to "show forth the future."[13]

Campbell seemed to be a man of courage and perseverance. Regarding a meeting in Lexington, Kentucky, it is said that he spoke before a large crowd when he was so exhausted from dyspepsia that he was "unable to stand entirely during the delivery of his surpassingly eloquent sermon."[14] Another time he spoke with a severe sore throat without attempting to shorten his sermon. Dr. Heman Humphrey,

---

11 Richardson, op. cit., II, 664, 665.

12 Ibid., I, 315.

13 Ibid., I, 316.

14 Ibid., II, 92-93.

a prominent Presbyterian minister who was in that audience, stated that few people could have endured so much mental and physical labor as had raised Mr. Campbell to the high level he occupied.[15]

At that Lexington meeting a very strong impression was made upon his hearers. They immediately rated him as the mightiest intellect that had ever visited Lexington. They greatly admired him because of his "inexhaustable interior power"[16] in discussing the subject of redemption.

In speaking of that sermon later, Dr. Theodore S. Bell, who at the time was a youth in the audience and who later became a very distinguished physician of Louisville, said that he had never heard anything that approached the power of that discourse. Although his own early training had been so that he was as familiar with the Bible as with the alphabet, he said that speech on Hebrews lifted him into a world of thought of which he had previously known nothing. After forty-five years, Dr. Bell said the sermon was as vivid in his memory as when he first heard it.[17]

From the time of the Lexington meeting on, Campbell was esteemed by the people of Kentucky as "great among the

---

15 Ibid., op. cit., II, 581.

16 Ibid., op. cit., II, 93.

17 Loc. cit.

greatest of her public men and without a rival in the department to which he had devoted his powers."[18] It was his refined manners and unblemished character, as well as his intellect, that gave him such a high standing in the state.

The best description of his ability comes from his listeners: Ex-President Madison, who often heard him preach, regarded him as the ablest and most original expounder of the Scriptures that he had ever heard.[19] Elder Vardeman remarked, "I once thought I could preach, but since I have heard this man I do not seem in my own estimation, to be any larger than my little finger."[20] And Robert Graham said, "...in the pulpit I am sure he had few equals, and no superior, according to my standard."[21]

His ability to attract crowds. With such outstanding characteristics, both as a man and as a speaker, it is not surprising that crowds came from great distances to hear Campbell. It was said that at Lexington, at the hour he was to speak, the house was crowded to its utmost capacity.[22]

---

18 Richardson, op. cit., II, 94.

19 Archibald McLean, Alexander Campbell as a Preacher (St. Louis: The Christian Publishing Co., 1908), p. 11.

20 Richardson, op. cit., II, 120.

21 McLean, loc. cit.

22 Richardson, op. cit., II, 92.

Dr. Heman Humphrey published the following statement in the New York Observer regarding the crowds that gathered to hear Mr. Campbell:

> Though on the first evening I went half an hour before the time, I found the house and aisles densely crowded from the porch up to the pulpit stairs. Very many, I am sure, must have gone away because they could find no room even to stand within hearing of the preacher's voice. . . .[23]

Young men, desiring the ability to attract crowds and impress their listeners as Campbell did, tried to imitate him in even the most insignificant ways. It is stated that, when the students of Bethany went out to preach, they carried canes and leaned on them while speaking just as Campbell did. In his later years he wore a long beard; the students then encouraged their beards to grow long.[24]

His ability to interest his hearers. It is said that in Campbell's day, people were eager to listen and that they "were hungry and wanted a full meal."[25] We read that, when Campbell spoke, minutes became as seconds and hours became as minutes to the listeners and, even during his longest sermons, they never became weary and disinterested.[26] The

---

23 Ibid., II, 581.

24 McLean, op. cit., p. 17.

25 Ibid., p. 30.

26 Richardson, op. cit., II, 584.

people were so engrossed with the subject under consideration that they forgot everything else.[27] Campbell attracted great audiences--lawyers, physicians, teachers, and editors--whom he held firmly in his grasp and sent away deeply impressed.[28]

Mr. Fall, a teacher in whose schoolbuilding Campbell preached, asserted that one night Mr. Campbell accepted Dr. Blackburn's invitation to speak at the Presbyterian Church. There he lectured upon the evidences of the Messiahship, to a large and attentive audience. And despite his bad cold and sore throat, he "enchained the attention of the audience by his masterly exhibition of the claims of our Lord to the homage of mankind."[29]

Jeremiah Sullivan Black, who was a lawyer, Chief Justice of Pennsylvania, and Attorney-General of the United States, heard Campbell many times during his life. He told of one time particularly when he went to hear him. At the beginning of the service he was standing upon the steps of the court-house. At the close of the sermon he found himself inside the railing and within a few feet of the speaker "not knowing how he had been drawn there, but realizing he had been greatly impressed by what he had heard."[30]

---

27 McLean, op. cit., p. 31.

28 Ibid., p. 30.

29 Richardson, op. cit., II, 121.

30 McLean, op. cit., p. 10.

Not long after, Mr. Black made a journey from Somerset, Pennsylvania, to what is now Bethany, West Virginia, to hear more and to make a confession of his faith in Christ and to be baptized[31] as many others did upon hearing him.[32] Judge Black said that the first sentence of Campbell's discourses "drew the audience still as death,"[33] and every word was heard with unusual attention to the close. His logic, explanation, and argument were so clear that everybody followed without an effort, and all felt that they were being raised to the level of a superior mind. He was so persuasive that prejudice melted away under his fluent speech.

Mr. Black's remarks are confirmed in the following report:

> On one occasion it is said, when he was addressing one of the most intelligent audiences that ever assembled in Kentucky, quite a number of highly gifted and educated men rose unconsciously to their feet and leaned forward toward the speaker, as if fearing to lose a single word that fell from his lips; and what made the case more remarkable was that many of them were public advocates of the views he was assailing, as being in his judgment, contrary to the Word of God; . . . .[34]

And from what James S. Lamar, a prolific author and a gifted speaker, of Georgia, related, we know it was not infrequent that he captivated the interest of his listeners:

---

31 McLean, loc. cit.

32 Ibid., p. 25.

33 Ibid., pp. 10-11.

34 Ibid., p. 28.

> People would come from far and from near to hear him, some of them making a day's journey. Others would follow him from place to place, so as to hear him from day to day. The difficulty generally was to procure a house that could accommodate the crowds that flocked to hear him. The people admired him, loved him, hung enchained upon his lips, quoted him, trusted him, and spread his name and fame wide and far.[35]

His characteristics as an authority. From the remarks previously made in this chapter, one would not question the fact that many of Campbell's listeners accepted him as an authority. The discussions which follow show which of his characteristics as an authority were most predominant.

His sincerity. Campbell was not only sincere himself, but he assumed, without question, that his opponent was intellectually honest.[36] He usually commented on the sincerity of his opponent before starting a debate.

Mr. Owen spoke of Mr. Campbell's honesty and sincerity and said that Campbell was the "only Christian minister in America with the courage of his convictions, with the moral bravery and sincerity to come forward in defense of his imperilled religion."[37]

---

35 Ibid., pp. 12, 13.

36 Smith, op. cit., p. 165.

37 J. J. Haley, Debates, That Made History (St. Louis: Christian Board of Publication, 1920), pp. 103-104.

Smith describes Campbell's face, at the time of his first sermon, as being "convincing in its sincerity."[38] Evidently Campbell believed the "best way to be believed sincere was to be sincere,"[39] for it was said of him that, while he was a noted debater, he never contended for any ideas which he did not firmly and sincerely believe.[40] By one of his acquaintances it was said, "Alexander Campbell's reputation was without a spot. His bitterest enemies failed to find a flaw in his character for truth, integrity, and goodness."[41]

His fairness. Tolbert Fanning, one of Campbell's great admirers, wrote of Campbell at the time of the Campbell-Rice debate: "For. . . . fairness it is barely probable Alexander Campbell has an equal living. . . ."[42]

Smith says, "Mr. Campbell was restrained by the courtesies of fair play,"[43] and again he tells us, "He used every

---

38 Smith, op. cit., p. 86.

39 James A. Winans, Speech Making (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1938), p. 397.

40 North, op. cit., p. 15.

41 A. J. Campbell, Familiar Lectures on the Pentateuch, edited by W. T. Moore (St. Louis, Christian Publishing Company, c. 1867), p. 41.

42 Earl West, The Search for the Ancient Order (Nashville: Gospel Advocate Co., 1949), p. 37, citing Robert E. Lee, "The Late R. E. Lee's Letters," Apostolic Times, Vol. III, No. 4 (May 4, 1871), p. 27.

43 Smith, op. cit., p. 131.

fair means at his command to establish his own position"[44] North assumes that he considered it unfair tactics to appeal violently to the emotions of his listeners.[45] It is stated, "In his debates he was absolutely fair to his opponents. He resorted to no tricks for the sake of an apparent triumph."[46] His opponents commented on his fairness. Owen said that he ascertained Campbell's "disposition for fairness of fight"[47] and Bishop Purcell, with whom Alexander Campbell debated the subject of Catholicism, said of him:

> Campbell was decidedly the fairest man in debate I ever saw, as fair as you can possibly conceive. . .He never misrepresented his case nor that of his opponent; never tried to hide a weak point. . .He came right out fairly and squarely. . .Rather than force a victory by underhand or ignoble means, he preferred to encounter defeat. . .[48]

His courtesy. From the many remarks made by those who heard Alexander Campbell, one could believe he was courteous when speaking in public. It is said, "His refined manners and unblemished character gave him a high standing in society."[49]

---

44 Ibid., p. 167.

45 North, op. cit., pp. 22-23.

46 Disciples of Christ, op. cit., p. 42.

47 Haley, op. cit., p. 60.

48 Ibid., p. 14.

49 Richardson, op. cit., II, 94.

A writer, who signs himself "I. C." in The Christian Evangelist, of September 1898, said, after one of Campbell's debates: ". . . . my prayers were daily lifted up for Mr. Campbell. In his discussions with our clergy, he had always been kind, affable, courteous. . ."[50]

Smith speaks of Campbell as a perfect gentleman, the pattern of Christian courtesy and friendliness, but says that he lacked something of the warm emotional fervor and intensity which a great minister must possess.[51] However, in speaking of the Campbell-Owen debate, he says that Campbell reveals himself to us as a man of remarkable courtesy and wisdom.[52]

In the Apostolic Times, Tolbert Fanning mentioned Campbell's dignity of manner and Christian courtesy.[53] One author speaks of "Mr. Campbell's own sweetness and light, high motives and kindly spirit";[54] and still another reminds us of his speaking of his opponent as "my friend,"[55] and notes that he did not talk down to his audience.[56]

---

50 Haley, op. cit., pp. 247-248.

51 Smith, op. cit., p. 159.

52 Ibid., p. 165.

53 West, op. cit., p. 37, citing Robert E. Lee, "The Late R. E. Lee's Letters," Apostolic Times, Vol. III, No. 4 (May 4, 1871), p. 27.

54 Haley, op. cit., p. 42.

55 North, op. cit., p. 13.

56 Ibid., pp. 14-15.

From another reliable source we read that Campbell was as courteous and polite "to the day laborer as to the greatest and noblest. He repulsed no man, no matter how humble his sphere, or how rude and uncultivated his mind and manners."[57] It is worthy of our note that, in his last days, he continued to be the "grand old man; the gentleness was still there. In the weakness and suffering that preceded the end, politeness and gratitude were most conspicious in him."[58]

His self-respect. Mention is not made of Alexander Campbell's self-respect as such. However, that he did have self-respect, though not egotism, is inferred in many places.

Richardson mentions "the reverential bearing"[59] of Campbell at the time of his first sermon. He speaks also of his having stood in the most "natural and easy attitude, resting upon his innate powers of intellect and his complete mastery of the subject."[60] We are told that Campbell spoke without embarrassment.[61] One does not stand in a natural easy attitude and talk without embarrassment if he lacks self-respect; hence, that must have been a quality that was his.

---

57 Disciples of Christ, op. cit., p. 42.

58 Loc. cit.

59 Richardson, op. cit., I, 315.

60 Ibid., II, 584.

61 Ibid., I, 315.

His modesty. Despite his large enthusiastic crowds and his newspaper publicity, Campbell did not lose his humility. He seemed to ignore such remarks as this found in the Methodist Christian Advocate: "The distinguished gentleman whose name heads this article is now on a visit to this city."[62]

It is stated that "in spite of his voluminosity, as a speaker and writer, his ultra-modesty forbade reference to that which might bring the panegyrics of men."[63] He continued through his life to be more and more modest "to the day laborer as well as to the greatest and noblest."[64]

Perhaps the best description of his humble spirit is in the words of his biographer:

> Amidst the most equivocal indications of unabounded admiration, he retained constantly the most unassuming gentleness, and seemed every wholly unconscious that he had accomplished anything remarkable or performed more than a simple duty. Preserving ever his humbleness of mind, he was insensible to flattery, and seemed constantly so impressed with the great truths he delivered that no compliments could extract from him more than an expression of grateful thanksgiving for having been allowed the privilege of presenting them to others.[65]

---

62 Richardson, op. cit., II, 608.

63 James Maurice Thompson, "Stewardship Principles of Alexander Campbell" (unpublished Master's thesis, Butler University, Indianapolis, 1946), p. iv.

64 Disciples of Christ, op. cit., p. 42.

65 Richardson, op. cit., II, 587.

His geniality or good humor. Since so many of Campbell's listeners commented on his courtesy, one could assume the following story to be typical of his good humor:

> Once, when caught in a blinding snowstorm, he knocked at the door of a cabin to ask shelter, and, when the woman of the house saw who it was, she drove him away. He always remembered the lady with respect, evidently because he liked the courage of her convictions.[66]

His self-control. That Campbell was a man of self-control was mentioned by his opponent, Mr. Owen.[67] Any reference to Mr. Campbell's manner was similar to the words of his biographer in speaking of "his reverential bearing,[68] his perfect self-possession and quiet dignity of manner."[69] It seemed that he was always at ease and that he never lacked self-control.

Dr. Heman Humphrey, after hearing Campbell speak, said that he thought he was the most perfectly self-possessed, and most perfectly at ease in the pulpit of any preacher he ever listened to, except, perhaps, the celebrated Dr. John Mason of New York. He thought that no man could be more relaxed and unembarrassed in his own home.[70] He mentioned,

---

66 Smith, op. cit., p. 139.

67 Haley, op. cit., pp. 103-104.

68 Richardson, op. cit., I, 315.

69 Richardson, op. cit., II, 583.

70 Ibid., II, 581-582.

too, that Mr. Campbell's manner was calm but full of assurance and that his appeals were "not very earnest nor indicative of deep feeling; but, nevertheless winning and impressive in a high degree."[71]

His preparation. It is said, "He read the Bible as if he were the first and only man that ever read it. He read it each day as if he had never read it before."[72] Consequently, before starting to preach he had "mastered the one book which was to furnish the material and inspiration of his preaching."[73]

At first, he memorized his discourses; but this method was soon abandoned, and he spoke extemporaneously without notes. He spoke so fluently that people marvelled at his great intellect. When he was asked how he came to have such a vast amount of knowledge with which he illumined his discourses, he replied, "By studying sixteen hours per day."[74]

His humor. It is held by Campbell's biographer that he "would never, in sacred things, tolerate the slightest

---

71 Richardson, loc. cit.

72 Disciples of Christ, op. cit., p. 42.

73 Grafton, op. cit., p. 179.

74 Ibid., p. 183.

approach to frivolity."[75] And according to another writing, we find that in his preaching he refrained from witticisms and puns and satire. He contended that in preaching "good temper, love, and tenderness were more powerful than all the censures, sarcasms, ironies, and smart sayings of all the wits of the ages."[76]

His desire for truth. Campbell seemed to love truth above everything else. According to a prominent authority, "Mr. Campbell's great joy was the discovery of truth. He could not build upon another man's foundations. . . he must have the truth."[77]

Grafton,[78] Richardson,[79] Smith,[80] Haley,[81] McLean,[82] and other authors testify to the same effect in giving statements of one kind or another regarding Campbell's love of truth and his reliance upon it in the conviction of his

---

75 Richardson, op. cit., II, 664, 665.

76 Disciples of Christ, op. cit., p. 43.

77 Smith, Millennial Harbinger, Abridged, op. cit., II, 607.

78 Grafton, op. cit., pp. 160, 182.

79 Richardson, op. cit., II, 121, II, 586, 587.

80 Smith, op. cit., pp. 86, 268.

81 Haley, op. cit., pp. 14, 58, 60.

82 McLean, op. cit., p. 20.

hearers. Campbell felt it was always his duty, one of them says, to know exactly what the Bible said and why it said it.[83]

Fleming emphasizes Campbell's zeal for truth by quoting Mr. Owen at the time he challenged Mr. Campbell for a debate. Owen said of him, "I concluded he was conscientiously desirous of ascertaining truth from error on these momentous subjects."[84] The same author also cites words of Campbell at the beginning of the McCalla debate: "My prayer to God is, that for the sake of his Son Jesus Christ I may speak as I ought to speak; that in the spirit of truth I may contend for the truth."[85]

Again Fleming mentions Campbell's desire for truth in saying, ". . . we have Mr. Campbell's aim as he himself expressed it in the concourse of the [Campbell-Rice] debate."[86] He gives Campbell's words as follows: "I contend for the truth, and not for victory without truth. My prayer is, that truth, immutable, eternal truth, may prevail."[87]

---

83 Richardson, op. cit., II, 121.

84 Haley, op. cit., p. 58.

85 Sam L. Fleming, "A Religious Disputation between N. R. Rice and Alexander Campbell" (unpublished Master's thesis, Butler University, Indianapolis, 1946).

86 Ibid., pp. 54-55.

87 Fleming, op. cit., pp. 54, 55, citing Campbell-Rice Debate, p. 642.

Exaggeration. There is no evidence, either from the words of Campbell's opponents in debate or his listeners, that he ever exaggerated in his speeches. Even his opponents agree that he wanted truth above all else, as is mentioned under the previous heading of this thesis.

His respect for his audience. Mr. Humphrey said that Campbell had the utmost deference for his audience.[88] He did not talk down to them. One writer states, "He did not mistake 'slowness for stupidity or small schooling for ignorance' as Winans says . . ."[89] Even in Campbell's lectures to his students he did not speak as though he were talking to a group inferior to himself.[90]

His choice of authority. Campbell aimed not only to be an authority, himself, but also to choose his authority wisely.

When speaking before a group who believed the Bible, he used the Bible as authority. Grafton says that Campbell loved the Bible with an intense, passionate love. "This,"

---

88 Richardson, op. cit., II, 582.

89 North, op. cit., pp. 14, 15.

90 Loc. cit.

he would say, pointing to the Word of God, "is perfect, and I fall a martyr ere the profane finger of mortal shall smut it or change it."[91]

When debating Archbishop Purcell, a Catholic, he quoted from "the moral Theology of Alphonsus de Ligoria,"[92] as well as from the Bible. In that way Mr. Purcell could not question his interpretation of it.

II. QUALITIES OF LANGUAGE IN CAMPBELL'S SPEECH

In speaking of Campbell's language, Dr. Heman Humphrey remarked that, although he used no notes, his language was remarkably pure and select, his statements were simple, clear and succinct, and his topics were logically arranged.

Richardson recognizes him as a "master of assemblies"[93] and refers to his language when he says:

> New revelations of truth; themes the most familiar invested with a strange importance, as unexpected and yet obvious relations were developed in a few simple sentences; unthought-of combinations; unforeseen conclusions; a range of vision that seemed to embrace the universe and to glance at pleasure into all its varied departments,--were, as by some magic power, presented to the hearer, and so as wholly to engross his perceptions and his understanding.[94]

---

91 Grafton, op. cit., p. 179.

92 Richardson, op. cit., II, 431, 432.

93 Ibid., II, 582.

94 Ibid., II, 584.

Variety. One writer cites many examples of Campbell's sentences and paragraphs which did not possess the same force, brilliance, or energy.[95] Some sentences were long, and some were short;[96] some paragraphs were more stately and more elegant than others.[97] But, whether his sentences were long or short or his paragraphs were elegant or otherwise, they were usually constructed in a clear manner; and his variety seemed to add power and emphasis to his style.[98]

Comparison and climax. One writer, in the study of Campbell's rhetorical method, calls our attention to his clarity, forcefulness, and beauty by the effective use of analogies,[99] metaphors,[100] similes,[101] comparison and contrast,[102] and climax.[103]

---

95 North, op. cit., p. 43-44.

96 Ibid., p. 35.

97 Ibid., p. 48.

98 Ibid., p. 43.

99 North, op. cit., p. 27.

100 Ibid., p. 39.

101 Ibid., p. 44.

102 Ibid., pp. 45-46.

103 Ibid., pp. 40-41.

This same writer[104] cites examples of Campbell's use of metaphors and similes in his speech "Destiny of Our Country"; and of comparison and contrast in the Campbell-Owen debate, in which he contrasts Christianity and infidelity. To show Campbell's use of climax, this writer takes very forceful sentences from "Destiny of Our Country" and reverses them to show their loss of effectiveness in a different order.

Campbell's biographer says, regarding his comparisons and figures of speech:

> He never employed figures of a homely character or such as were calculated to lower his subject. On the contrary his comparisons, which were not very frequent, were always such as tended to elevate it, or were at least in harmony with it. These he usually drew from the Scriptures, and his familiarity with the language of the Bible enabled him to employ its glowing expressions and beautiful similes with great effect.[105]

And he adds later, ". . . . he employed Scripture metaphors much more frequently than comparisons, but it was upon analogies that he seemed chiefly to rely for illustration as well as argument."[106]

Euphony. References are not usually made to his use or to his lack of use of harsh, unpleasant sounds. But we read of his eloquence and smoothness. For example, one

---

104 Ibid., pp. 39-46.

105 Richardson, op. cit., II, 585.

106 Ibid., II, 586.

who heard Campbell said, "His ideas flowed on in a perpetual stream, majestic in its stately volume, and grand for the width and sweeping magnificence of its current."[107]

North cites Campbell's careful choice of words and proper sentence structure as some of the reasons for his energetic and forceful style.[108] If Campbell's words or sentences had lacked euphony, one could readily assume that his style would have been neither energetic, forceful, nor eloquent.

Economy. Despite the fact that Mr. Campbell's discourses lasted from one and one-half to three hours, it still is said that redundancy and verbacity did not often apply to his speaking.[109] Surely his hearers did not feel he was wasting their time, or he could not have held their attention for such great length.

North says that when one reads Campbell's works, and particularly his debates, "he might think that his style was too loose and that he held one idea before the people too long."[110] But he insists that this kind of style was necessary for clarity and persuasion in such extemporaneous speaking as Campbell did.

---

107 Campbell, Familiar Lectures on the Pentateuch, op. cit., p. 41.

108 North, op. cit., p. 46.

109 Ibid., p. 44.

110 Ibid., pp. 37-38.

Brevity. North says that Campbell's style is characterized neither by extreme brevity nor by prolixity. To expand his thoughts, he used "repetition, appropriate illustrations, and proper division of his speeches."[111] North insists that when Campbell repeated his arguments, it was necessary for the sake of clarity and force.[112]

Simplicity. From the time of Campbell's first sermon his listeners were conscious of his unaffected simplicity of manner.[113] It is said that when he was older, clearness and simplicity of arrangement and manner of delivery were features of his style.[114] During his preaching at the notable meeting at Lexington, Kentucky, he filled everyone with admiration with the simple yet comprehensive way in which he opened up entirely new trains of thought.[115] From the above statements and from the fact that multitudes of uneducated as well as educated people gathered to hear him, one might conclude that his style was always clear and simple. But

---

111 North, op. cit., p. 38.

112 Ibid., p. 44.

113 Richardson, op. cit., I, 315, and II, 93.

114 Smith, op. cit., p. 264.

115 Richardson, op. cit., II, 93.

we also read that his discourses were "by no means destitute of ornament. He had a correct fancy which was rather fastidious than lively."[116]

Vividness. North says that the type of description, found in "Destiny of Our Country" demonstrates Campbell's power to set a picture before his audience in a vivid and active way.[117] North also states that because Campbell's purpose was to persuade, "his style was first of all clear, and yet it was characterized by beauty because of the easy flow of words, simplicity, and vividness."[118]

In Campbell's day his style was characterized by one as "transparently clear."[119] Another said, "He was clear. He was generally understood by the masses, always by the cultivated."[120]

North states that it is very infrequent that one finds a sentence of Campbell's that is so constructed as to make it necessary for him to wait until he hears the last

---

116 Ibid., II, 585.

117 North, op. cit., p. 50.

118 Ibid., p. 50, 51.

119 Smith, The Millennial Harbinger, Abridged, op. cit., II, 617.

120 Campbell, Familiar Lectures on the Pentateuch, op. cit., pp. 45-46.

clause before he can comprehend its meaning.[121] He adds that brief sentences were well constructed by Campbell, and occasionally an asyndeton was used, as: "I knew him well. I knew him long. I loved him much."[122]

Reference to experience. The writer of this thesis was unable to find any comments regarding Campbell's reference to his own experience in his discourses; but one could expect this rhetorical device to be purposely omitted in keeping with Campbell's humility and modesty.

Neither were any quotations found pertaining to his reference to the experience of the audience. He seemed to rely entirely on other factors of interest.

Specific and concrete language. North insists that Campbell's "vigorous thinking resulted in his excellent choice of terms which served to strengthen the force of his style."[123] And, too, he says, "Campbell was equipped by education and nature to choose the term that would more

---

121 North, op. cit., p. 35, citing Alexander Campbell, The Christian Baptist, revised by D. S. Burnet (St. Louis: Christian Publishing Co. n. d.), p. 69.

122 North, op. cit., p. 36.

123 Ibid., p. 40.

nearly serve his purpose, and this he did."[124] The following paragraph by North cites examples of what Richardson also speaks of as Campbell's "remarkably correct use of words":[125]

> In his first speech, for example, in his debate on baptism with N. L. Rice, we find him using specific terms. Instead of Catholicism, he used popery, and immersion was used in place of the more general term baptism. The specific term immersion strengthened his style and helped to add force to his argument, as he was contending against the practice of sprinkling for baptism.[126]

Familiar words. Perhaps one of Campbell's most noticeable faults was the use of strange words. He occasionally used expressions from the Greek and the Latin without explaining their meaning. Just how much loss of effectiveness was caused might be judged somewhat from the paragraphs below. It is said:

> The Latin and Greek derivatives were so familiar to him and so wrought into the very fiber of his thought and mind, that coming from him, they seemed not strange, but near and homelike. His hearers might not always have been able to define all the words he used, but they saw and felt what was wrapt up in them. Thus it was that the learned and the unlearned listened with rapture

---

124 North, loc. cit.

125 Richardson, op. cit., II, 94.

126 Ibid., pp. 40-51.

to his preaching, notwithstanding he was at no pains to accommodate his language to lower grades of intelligence. . .[127]

And North comments:

> Because of Campbell's remarkable knowledge of the ancient Greek and Hebrew as well as Latin he could use these foreign idioms with great ease, yet this would not alter the fact that they were strange words to many of his audience. It is logical to think that some of the cultivated of his audience and probably the majority of the masses could not comprehend the meaning of these strange words. Some examples of his use of foreign idioms are'. . . we feel it our duty, and would regard it our privilege to meet it calamo vel ore, as any champion of infidelity may choose,[128] and education, religion, morals and politics are, therefore, the fields and realms over which Protestantism, de jure Divino, presides.'[129]

North states further that in debate Campbell frequently "quoted the original language of difficult phrases and explained in detail the meaning and the grammatical significance. This added weight to the argument and many times made the meaning clearer."[130] Hence it is possible to conclude that, although Campbell did use unfamiliar words, not always were his listeners left confused about their meaning.

---

127 Smith, The Millennial Harbinger, Abridged, op. cit., II, 617.

128 North, op. cit., p. 37, (citing Alexander Campbell, The Evidences of Christianity (Nashville: McQuiddy Publishing Company, 1912), Debate VIII.

129 North, op. cit., p. 37, Alexander Campbell, "Destiny of Our Country" (Canonsburg, Pennsylvania: Philo Literary Society of Jefferson College, 1852).

130 North, op. cit., p. 37.

Illustrations. Grafton says, "He trusted to the fertile resources of his great intellect to marshal at his command fact and argument and illustration."[131] And North cites examples of some of Campbell's arguments presented by illustration, on pages fifty-seven and fifty-eight of the Campbell-Rice Debate.[132]

III. ALEXANDER CAMPBELL'S DELIVERY

Not only Campbell's style of language can be regarded as the highest type, but also his style of delivery. He was not like the other preachers of his day. His method of reading the Scriptures and his method of presenting great facts commanded the respect of all his audience. They often remarked that they had never heard anything like it before.

His conversational contact with the audience. In reading the words of Campbell's biographer[133] and of the distinguished editor[134] of the Christian Standard, we learn that he often stood and spoke in true conversational style for two hours at a time.

---

131 Grafton, op. cit., p. 182.

132 North, op. cit., p. 27.

133 Grafton, op. cit., p. 182.

134 McLean, op. cit., pp. 27-28.

Then we read from another authority:

> While Mr. Campbell's style was conversational for the most part, there were times when he spoke with the utmost fervor. Thus one of his pupils says that sometimes he was like a living fire or a sweeping tornado, forcing you to forget all idea of logical connection, and impressing upon you only the idea of power. . . He convinced his auditors; he did more than that--he stirred them.[135]

His enthusiasm for his subject. The fact that Campbell traveled all over the Central and the Middle West, as well as other parts of the United States and countries in Europe, devoting his life to what he considered a worthy cause, without pay for his preaching, is reason to believe that he was very enthusiastic about his subject. During his early life he made a resolution that he would never accept pay for preaching. He kept this resolution.[136] From the same author we also read, "His gifts were used always in the interests of the cause he loved so well: the upbuilding of the Kingdom of God on earth."[137]

Stuart, who discusses what he considers errors of Campbellism, says that Campbell had "firm faith in his own

---

135 Ibid., p. 17.

136 Smith, op. cit., p. 100.

137 Ibid., p. 272.

convictions."[138] And we see evidence of his enthusiasm for his subject in the report, by Dr. D. S. Burnett, who gave an address before the students of Bethany College shortly after the close of Mr. Campbell's career. He describes this great speaker as follows:

> We can imagine few more pleasurable sights than this grand preacher, delivering an extempore discourse, while supporting himself, enfeebled by dyspepsia, on his cane, in the midst of the largest and most intellectual audiences our country could afford. Thus he stood like Paul on Mars' Hill among orators and statesmen of Kentucky, at an early day, in the largest hall of Lexington; thus he entranced the elite of Richmond in 1830, and of Nashville shortly after; thus shortly before that, he held spellbound for two hours the Legislature of Ohio... it was thus, in 1833 he addressed with great power, the skeptics of New York, two successive evenings, in their own Tammany Hall, with such suavity as to draw praise from every lip and secure a vote of thanks from the men....[139]

His sincere desire to achieve the purpose of his speech. Grafton relates that from early manhood Campbell had shown a deep interest in everything that would contribute to the intellectual development of his fellow being.[140] He reports also that after the Campbell-Owen debate, Mr. Campbell invited Mr. Owen to his home, where he treated him

---

138 T. McK. Stuart, Errors of Campbellism (Cincinnati: Jennings and Graham; New York: Eaton and Mains, 1890), p. 14.

139 Grafton, op. cit., pp. 185, 186.

140 Ibid., p. 97.

most kindly and graciously, and he urged and implored him to abandon infidelity and accept Christ as a Savior.[141]

It seems that Campbell was so eager to accomplish the purpose of his speeches that even great statesmen were cognizant of the fact. It is said that Robert E. Lee, who was a personal friend of Mr. Campbell, after hearing of his death, wrote a letter in which he applied to him the words another had used in reference to John Milton:

> He was a man in whom were illustriously combined all the qualities that could adorn or elevate the nature to which he belonged. Knowledge the most various and extended, virtue that never loitered in her career, nor deviated from her course. A man who, if sent to one of the many superior worlds, would have suggested a grand idea of the human race.[142]

His style--originality and uniqueness. Campbell's style was his own. He had no desire to imitate any of the famous orators of ancient or modern times.[143] He always aimed to appeal to the intellect, rather than to the emotions, as some had done. One writer quotes him as having said, "I am rather a matter-of-fact man, and logic more than rhetoric has occupied my attention."[144]

---

141 Ibid., p. 153.

142 Smith, op. cit., p. 286.

143 McLean, op. cit., p. 16.

144 North, op. cit., p. 18, citing Campbell-Purcell, A Debate of the Roman Catholic Religion (Cincinnati: U. P. James, 1837), p. 26.

He used novel combinations of related truths,[145] and his mind in his sermons moved in the realm of generalizations. He took sweeping views: a whole book, a chapter, rarely a text.[146] In this way he thought and spoke as no other man.[147] It was said, by someone who heard him, that his method of reading the Scriptures and presenting their truths was so entirely new and clear that he commanded the respect if not the approval of all the multitudes who listened.[148] They often went away saying, "We have never heard it like this."[149]

It seems that on important occasions his method was often peculiar. He would take a glance and instantly measure the level of the average mind before him. Then, after reading a portion of Scripture which embraced his theme, he would take up several simple points, one at a time, and explain them until he had made them perfectly clear to the audience. These points were so simple that at first an ordinary mind could hardly perceive their relationship to each other or to the subject.

---

145 Richardson, op. cit., II, 584, 585.

146 Smith, op. cit., p. 262.

147 Grafton, op. cit., p. 180.

148 Richardson, op. cit., II, 120.

149 Smith, op. cit., p. 262.

At length, however, he would introduce some other point of wider range, and, through his discussion, the hearers would then begin to perceive an intrinsic and necessary relation between it and the previous positions. From there Campbell would lift his listeners to great heights and carry them on indefinitely.[150]

He then would close with a strong, serious, resolute, and tender call to obedience. But there was no appeal to intense emotion. If silence reigned for a moment, he would step down from the platform, upon the ground, and, moving forward toward the audience, begin with a more ardent and zealous appeal. He would seem to capture their minds at the highest point of attainment, carry his listeners forcefully to a still higher level, and pour around them a more radiant light; then with a little quiver in his voice, he would close by beseeching them to hesitate no longer.[151]

His enunciation and pronunciation. Richardson lists Campbell's clear enunciation, his chaste and simple diction, and his clear and forcible sentences as some of the reasons

---

150 Richardson, op. cit., II, 584, 585.

151 A. G. Riddle, The Portrait (Cleveland: Cobb, Andrews and Co., 1874), pp. 131-133.

for his popularity as a speaker;[152] and North cites a quotation saying that it was observed that Campbell's whole presence was commanding--his enunciation was sonorous and magnetizing, his pronunciation was accurate and scholarly in first degree.[153]

McLean asserts that he did not alarm any by the way he pronounced certain words.[154] This remark evidently refers to the manner in which he pronounced words and not the speed, for Smith claims that he often articulated one word too fast in hurrying to the next.[155] Grafton tells us that his utterances were sometimes too rapid for the listener to keep pace with the torrent of ideas that issued forth in an endless stream.[156] And, on rare occasions during times of unusually strong feeling, it is said that Campbell spoke with a rapidity and fervor "which literally defied phonography, and so enchained the mind and heart as

---

152 Richardson, op. cit., II, 94; II, 581; II, 584.

153 North, op. cit., p. 58, citing Campbell, Familiar Lectures on the Pentateuch, pp. 35-36.

154 McLean, op. cit., p. 20.

155 Smith, op. cit., p. 272.

156 Grafton, op. cit., p. 182.

to paralyze the hand that would otherwise have reported his every sentence."[157]

Whether Campbell's hearers would have enjoyed his discourses more if he had spoken more slowly, or whether his fluency increased their confidence in him, there is no way to know. Grafton describes his words as having flowed from his lips "like the water from the rock smitten by the prophet, and the people felt, like famished Israel as they drank the cooling draught, that a hand of power had relieved their thirst."[158] And W. T. Moore adds:

> His ideas flowed in a perpetual stream, majestic in its stately volume, and grand for the width and sweeping magnificence of its current. With a voice that thrilled the majestic, as his mind was vigorous and commanding, no one could hear him and see him, and fail to discover that he was in the presence of one on whom nature had set the stamp and seal of transcendent greatness.[159]

His voice and emphasis. Richardson, in describing Campbell's first sermon, speaks of the earnest and distinct intonations of his clear ringing voice as it resounded through the grove and commanded attention.[160]

---

157 Smith, The Millennial Harbinger, Abridged, op. cit., II, 621-622.

158 Grafton, op. cit., pp. 185-186.

159 Campbell, Familiar Lectures on the Pentateuch, op. cit., p. 43.

160 Richardson, op. cit., I, 315.

It is said that, while Campbell's silvery voice was heard, "nothing could dissolve the charms,"[161] and those emphatic tones soon filled the mind with other thoughts. He adapted his tones to the sentiment, while, by his strong and bold emphasis upon important words, he imparted to what he said an unusual force and authority.[162]

However, when Campbell became older, it seems that he lost one of his outstanding characteristics, for when he was about sixty-five, Dr. Herman Humphrey wrote of him, "His voice is not strong, evidently owing, in part, to the indifferent state of his health, but it is clear and firmly modulated."[163]

Platform action. Biographer Richardson, in describing Campbell's first discourse, says that the sermon was almost wholly without gesticulation.[164] He names John Smith,[165] Dr. Humphrey,[166] and others who, after having heard Campbell speak, mentioned the fact that no gestures

---

161 Ibid., II, 584.

162 Ibid., II, 583, 584.

163 Ibid., op. cit., II, 581.

164 Richardson, op. cit., I, 315.

165 McLean, op. cit., p. 20.

166 Richardson, op. cit., II, 582.

called attention from what was being said; they said that he used "no adventitious aids on which ordinary men find it necessary to rely."[167]

Another writer in comparing Mr. Campbell later with John Knox reports:

> There was nothing in the least dramatic in Mr. Campbell's manner. He rarely made a gesture of any sort. There was no attitundinizing; no nervous flourishings; no pointing upward to the stars; no stretching forth of outspread arms as if to embrace mountains. He was seldom tender or pathetic. His style reminded some of the apostles as he reasoned with the people from the Scriptures, opening and alleging that the Jesus whom he preached was the Christ. It reminded others of the Master as he sat on the mountain or in the boat, and spoke as man never spake to those who sat around Him on the mountain or on the shore. When Mr. Campbell spoke, there was no gesticulation and no sign of perspiration and no beating of the pulpit.[168]

Contrast is also made between Alexander Campbell and Henry Ward Beecher and Patrick Henry regarding platform action. Mr. Beecher had said that no words could describe the "manifold evidences of the surging feelings that roll out from an orator and submerge the hearers, as the waves roll in from the deep and cover the beach."[169] Patrick Henry was somewhat the same in his belief about the need for facial

---

167 Richardson, loc. cit.

168 McLean, op. cit., p. 20.

169 Loc. cit.

and bodily action. It was said of Patrick Henry that:

> Attracted by some gesture, struck by some majestic attitude, fascinated by the spell of his eye, the charm of his emphasis, and the varied and commanding expression of his countenance, juries lost sight of the law and the facts and their duty, and the judges bathed in tears perverted equity, and the people carried the orator in triumph on their shoulders.
>
> Mr. Campbell never sought to carry the minds of his auditors by stratagem or by assault. Nothing would have been gained by such a victory as Patrick Henry won over judge and jury. Mr. Campbell sought to inform and to persuade.[170]

When one of the strong pioneer preachers of Kentucky told Campbell he noticed an entire absence of gestures and mannerisms in his preaching, Campbell replied that he had studied the arts of elocution but that he had purposely refrained from making any use of them. He reasoned as follows:

> The apostles were sent out as witnesses to a certain great fact. Suppose that one of them should, in making his statement before the people, have plied his arms in gesticulation, stamped his foot in vehemence, and declared his testimony in the ears of the people in a loud, stentorian voice? But how weightily fell the words of those first preachers, when, with composure of manner, natural emphasis, and solemn deliberation, they spoke forth the words of truth and soberness.[171]

Length of discourses. In reading Alexander Campbell's goals for himself as a speaker it was noted that he said that

---

170 McLean, op. cit., p. 21.

171 Ibid., p. 16.

sermons should be brief.[172] Whether he became so interested in his subject that he was unaware of the passing of time or whether he had a unique connotation of the word "brief" is a question perhaps no one will ever be able to answer.

One person reports his having held an audience in rapt attention for one and one-half hours.[173] And he appeared before a crowded house during a meeting in Kentucky, at a time, following an illness, when he was unable to stand entirely erect during the delivery of his sermon, yet he spoke for two hours.[174] Another time, when discussing the book of Hebrews, he held perfect attention for the same length of time.[175]

John Smith, a noted Baptist minister mentioned earlier in this thesis, enjoyed hearing Campbell speak. One time after the congregation was dismissed, he said to his friend, who accompanied him, "Brother Vaughan, is it not a little hard to ride thirty miles to hear a man preach thirty minutes?" "Oh," said Mr. Vaughan, "he has been

---

172 Appendix, last page of this thesis.

173 Richardson, op. cit., II, 582.

174 Richardson, op. cit., II, 93.

175 Ibid., II, 120.

longer than that. Look at your watch." Mr. Smith, finding it had been two hours and thirty minutes, said, "Two hours of my time are gone and I know not how, though wide awake."[176]

Whether Mr. Campbell ever gave any short sermons, it is difficult to know. Comments are made on the great length of his sermons but not on the brevity of them. In discussing Mr. Campbell as a preacher, it is said that in America he often spoke from an hour to an hour and a half. Abroad, and on special occasions in America, he spoke twice as long. He never seemed to want for an audience, for he often spoke two or three times a day. His biographer says, "The length of his sermons was in harmony with the customs of the times, and barely met the expectations and wishes of the people."[177]

His eloquence. From the remarks of Campbell's contemporaries and successors we often read of his eloquence. Whether the word "eloquence" had the same connotation to his contemporaries as it does to his successors, one can judge only by the definition of the word in the criteria in Chapter II compared with other remarks made about Alexander Campbell as a speaker.

---

176 Richardson, op. cit., II, 110.

177 McLean, op. cit., p. 30.

In regard to the notorious meeting, mentioned previously, in Lexington, Kentucky, Richardson says that Campbell preached on the first chapter of Hebrews in which he dwelt upon the "divine glory of the Son of God--a theme upon which he was always surprisingly eloquent."[178] Another time he speaks of one of Campbell's sermons being "surpassingly eloquent."[179] This same biographer contrasts Campbell's delivery with that of other men of our country, and he says Campbell "had little of that fervid outpouring which characterized Western and Southern eloquence,"[180] and that "there was nothing vociferous or impassioned in his manner."[181]

In Dr. Heman Humphrey's account of Alexander Campbell, we read, "There were many fine and truly eloquent passages in the two discourses I heard, but they seemed to cost him no effort. . ."[182] Another person who heard Campbell many times mentioned his pulpit efforts as having been clothed with "oratorical eloquence."[183]

---

178 Richardson, op. cit., II, 92.

179 Ibid., p. 92, 93.

180 Richardson, op. cit., II, 582.

181 Loc. cit.

182 Loc. cit.

183 McLean, op. cit., p. 17.

Smith, although not mentioning Campbell's eloquence as such, in describing his first speech on the work of the Holy Spirit, insists that he reached the height of his oratorical powers at that time. He says this particular address has been declared to equal, if not surpass, the greatest efforts of Webster, Phillips, and Henry, "in rhetorical sublimity, literary finish, beauty and brilliancy of diction, and argumentative effect."[184]

From the preceding remarks about Campbell it is evident that he was eloquent: he was a man of high moral character, he chose his words carefully, and he used an effective style of delivery.

---

184 Smith, op. cit., p. 228.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

From the remarks of Alexander Campbell's contemporaries and successors it is evident that he was truly one of the greatest ministers America has ever had. Few men have been able to enjoy as much prestige and success as he.

The summary which follows compares the speech characteristics of Campbell with those listed as criteria of good speech in Chapter II of this thesis.

I. SUMMARY

Alexander Campbell was judged by his friends and foes alike as being a man of rare ability, enthusiasm,and perseverance. He had a face that was not particularly handsome but was attractive in its strength of line and cleanness. Being six feet tall, and having a commanding figure and a magnetic personality, he was able to attract great crowds and keep them interested for two hours or more at a time.

He had many characteristics that influenced his hearers to accept him as an authority. Even his enemies spoke of his sincerity and his scrupulous fairness in debate. He was never known to take advantage of any opponent for the sake of winning.

He was a straightforward, courteous gentleman on the platform. And he always treated old and young, the intellectual and the uneducated with the greatest deference.

He had self-respect, but he was ever modest. He always seemed unaware of his greatness and never seemed tempted with arrogance or egotism. Perhaps much of his popularity was a result of his geniality and self-control. He was poised, dignified, and calm.

He was always thoroughly prepared before attempting to speak. He memorized his first sermon; but later he spoke extemporaneously without memorizing and without using notes. Each time he read the Bible he read it as if he had never read it before. He often studied sixteen hours a day.

He had no use for humor or witticisms or any frivolity in sermons; instead, he relied upon logic with its beautiful combinations of words and figures of speech to keep the audience interested.

He loved fact and truth; especially Bible truth. He scorned exaggeration and was never guilty of resorting to its use.

Although he was extremely firm and frank, he had the greatest respect for his opponent and his audience.

He always endeavored to meet his opponent and his audience on common ground and was careful to cite authorities which they recognized and approved. This method, as

well as the characteristics described above, gave the audience much confidence in him as an authority.

In using the criteria of O'Neill and Weaver regarding the desirable qualities of language in speech, it can be said that Campbell used variety, not as much in his action as in the tone of his voice, the length and type of his sentences and paragraphs, and the order of his presentation.

He used comparison and contrast in such a way as to add animation and energy to his style. And he made his language attractive with the use of figures of speech. He used climax in sentences and paragraphs and in the entire discourse. His use of climax helped him in his appeal for action at the psychological moment.

From the references made to Campbell's beautiful diction, one can infer that he was careful to attain euphony.

Whether he used the qualities of brevity and economy in his speeches is a point for disputation. Some might say that he dwelt too long on one idea or that he could have said as much in less time, since his discourses were quite lengthy. However, his listeners sat with such rapt attention that they did not seem to realize he was speaking for so long a time.

Campbell was known for his simplicity of manner. Generally speaking he was vivid in his expression. Very infrequently did he violate this rule of good language.

He did not often refer to his or the listeners' experience, but his language was specific and concrete as a result of his excellent choice of terms and illustrations. One noticeable fault in his speech, however, was the occasional use of strange words, particularly those from Greek and Latin, which he failed to explain to the audience.

He had conversational contact with his audience and enthusiasm for his subject; he always put forth great effort to achieve the purpose of his speech.

His enunciation was distinct, and his pronunciation was accurate. However, at times he spoke too rapidly for the listener to keep pace with his endless stream of words.

His voice was considered an asset in that it was clear and firmly modulated. With his bold emphasis on important words he made the audience feel that he was an authority.

Except for his change of expression, he spoke, leaning on his cane without much platform action. His discourses lasted from one and one-half to three hours, in which he held the enthusiastic attention of his listeners in profound stillness.

Many of Campbell's contemporaries and successors speak of his eloquence. However, others say that he lacked

that Southern and Western eloquence, but he equalled the great speakers of the nation in rhetorical grandeur, literary polish, beauty and brilliancy of diction, and argumentative fervor.

II. CONCLUSION

It can be said that Alexander Campbell was truly a great man and an exemplary speaker, with few faults. The prestige he enjoyed and the influence he had over the religious life of thousands of people in America make him worthy of our study.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

Many other subjects about Campbell are worth consideration for study. A few recommended for further study for theses are listed below:

1. Alexander Campbell as a Conversationalist.
2. Alexander Campbell's Influence on the Politics of Our Country.
3. The Influence of John Locke on the Life of Alexander Campbell.
4. The Influence of James Beattie on the Life of Alexander Campbell.
5. The Influence of Religious and Political Conditions on Alexander Campbell's Early Life.
6. Alexander Campbell's Crowd Psychology.
7. Comparison and Contrast of Alexander Campbell's Writing and Speaking.

8. Alexander Campbell's Search for Truth.

9. Alexander Campbell's Contribution to the System of Education.

10. Alexander Campbell's Speech Technique Compared with That of Woodrow Wilson.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

Athearn, Clarence R., The Religious Education of Alexander Campbell. St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1928. 202 pp.

Baird, A. Craig, Argumentation, Discussion, and Debate. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1950. 422 pp.

Brigance, William Norwood, Speech Composition. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1937. 385 pp.

Campbell, Alexander, Familiar Lectures on the Pentateuch, edited by W. T. Moore with occasional notes. St. Louis: Christian Publishing Company, 1867.

Clark, Elmer T., The Small Sects in America. Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1937. 311 pp.

Cooper, Lane, The Rhetoric of Aristotle. New York: D. Appleton-Century, 1932. 259 pp.

Crombie, Max, Secrets of Success in Public Speaking. London: George Allen & Unwin LTD, Museum Street, 1931. 78 pp.

Disciples of Christ. [Author unknown.] Cincinnati: American Christian Missionary Society, 1909. 207 pp.

Fisher, George Park, History of the Christian Church. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902. 583 pp.

Garrison, J. H., The Story of a Century. St. Louis: Christian Publishing Co., 1909. 278 pp.

Grafton, Thomas W., Alexander Campbell. St. Louis: Christian Publishing Co., 1897. 234 pp.

Haley, J. J., Debates That Made History. St. Louis: Christian Board of Publication, 1920. 249 pp.

Hedley, George, The Christian Heritage in America. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1926. 177 pp.

Hill, Adams Sherman, The Principles of Rhetoric. (Revised Edition) New York: American Bank Company, 1895. 431 pp.

McBurney, James H., James M. O'Neill, and Glen E. Mills, Argumentation and Debate. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1951. 336 pp.

McLean, Archibald, Alexander Campbell as a Preacher. St. Louis: The Christian Publishing Co., 1908. 46 pp.

O'Neill, James Milton and Andrew Thomas Weaver, The Elements of Speech. New York, London, Toronto: Longmans, Green and Co., 1935. 512 pp.

Painter, Margaret, Ease in Speech. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company. 456 pp.

Parrish, Wayland Maxfield, Speaking in Public. Chicago: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1947. 461 pp.

Phillips, Arthur Edward, Effective Speaking. Chicago: The Newton Company, 1938. 384 pp.

Richardson, Robert, Memoirs of Alexander Campbell. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott and Co., 1871. 2 Vols.

Riddle, A. G., The Portrait. Cleveland: Cobb, Andrews, and Company; Boston: Nichols and Hall, 1874. 378 pp.

Sarett, Lew and William Trufant Foster, Basic Principles of Speech (Revised Edition). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1946. 604 pp.

Shurter, E. D., The Rhetoric of Oratory, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1909. 309 pp.

Smith, Benjamin Lyon, Alexander Campbell. St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1930. 399 pp.

Stuart, T. McK., Errors of Campbellism. Cincinnati: Jennings and Graham. New York: Eaton and Mains, 1890. 292 pp.

Thonssen, Lester, and Howard Gilkinson. Basic Training in Speech. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1947. 551 pp.

West, Earl Irvin, The Search for the Ancient Order. Nashville: Gospel Advocate Co., 1949. 352 pp.

Winans, James Albert, Speech Making. New York and London: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1938. 488 pp.

B. ENCYCLOPEDIA ARTICLES

Moore, Frank and Talcott Williams, editors, "Alexander Campbell," The New International Encyclopedia, Second Edition. New York: Dodd, Mead, and Company, 1930. 23 Vols.

Yust, Walter, editor, "Alexander Campbell," Encyclopedia Britannica. Last edition, 24 Vols.; Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., 1946.

C. PERIODICALS

Smith, Benjamin Lyon, editor, The Millennial Harbinger, Abridged. Cincinnati: The Standard Publishing Company, c. 1902. 2 Vols. (This was originally a periodical published and edited by Alexander Campbell from 1830 to 1865.)

D. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Fleming, Sam L., "A Religious Disputation between N. L. Rice and Alexander Campbell." Unpublished Master's thesis, Butler University, Indianapolis, 1946. 86 pp.

North, Ira Lutts, "The Rhetorical Method of Alexander Campbell." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, 1945. 62 pp.

Thompson, James Maurice, "Stewardship Principles of Alexander Campbell." Unpublished Master's thesis, Butler University, Indianapolis, 1940. 133 pp.

APPENDIX

BIOGRAPHY OF ALEXANDER CAMPBELL

Alexander Campbell, the oldest son of Thomas and Jane Corneigle Campbell, was born in the county of Antrim, Ireland, September 12, 1788.

His mother, who was of French Huguenot ancestry, had been brought up by a religious mother "with tender affection and in the nurture and admonition of the Lord from her early infancy, so that she had become noted for her sincere devotion to religious duties."[1]

His father, whose ancestors were originally from the West of Scotland, was a handsome man with soft gray eyes "whose whole expression of countenance was indicative of deep reflection and of kindly feeling."[2] He was a minister in the Secession Church.

During his youth, Alexander was more fond of sports--snowballing, fishing, swimming, and hunting birds, beasts and butterflies--than he was of books.[3] Consequently, his father put him to hard work in the fields where he soon became the "champion grain-sower of the countryside."[4]

---

1 Robert Richardson, Memoirs of Alexander Campbell (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott and Co., 1871), I, 20.

2 Ibid., p. 21.

3 Loc. cit.

4 Clarence R. Athearn, The Religious Education of Alexander Campbell (St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1928), p. 19.

Meantime, young Campbell's intellectual interests were developing with his physical growth. He later mastered English grammar and studied French, Latin, and Greek. He developed a love for books, and he memorized classic poetry and long passages from the Bible. Before many years he resolved to become the greatest scholar in the whole kingdom.[5]

After a few years of intense study, he became an assistant to his father in his academy in the parish. While receiving instruction in theological subjects, he completed the work necessary for a preliminary university course, reading in philosophy the works of John Locke.

Because of Thomas Campbell's failing health, it became necessary for the family to leave Ireland. Since a sea voyage had been recommended, Alexander advised his father to seek a new home in the United States.

Accordingly, Thomas Campbell sailed to America, leaving to Alexander the care of his large family and the management of the academy. With sprightliness and cheerfulness he assumed this responsibility in such a manner as to revive the courage of all.[6]

---

5 Athearn, loc. cit.

6 Ibid., p. 20.

After a year the new home in America was ready for the Campbells, but the whole family was stricken with smallpox. Fortunately, there were no casualties, despite the fact there were no vaccinations; and in six months they were ready again to set sail.

A few details of this momentous journey are worthy of note:

> the pageantry of religious services among the large number of Catholics on board; the quarreling and inefficiency of a drunken crew and self-willed captain; a beautiful day of sailing among the isles of the Hebrides between Ireland and Scotland; followed by a stormy night in which the ship loses [lost] her course and strikes [struck] among the rocks; excitement and terror of the passengers and crew; mast and sails cut away with axe and broadswords; firing of cannon in token of distress.[7]

As Alexander sat on the stump of the broken mast, he reflected upon the vanity of human life and resolved, if saved from this storm, to devote his life to preaching the gospel.[8]

In 1810, young Campbell, who had been educated at Glasgow, joined his father, Thomas Campbell, who was then a Presbyterian minister in Pennsylvania. They directed their efforts to the restoration of what they considered the main principles of apostolic Christianity, and to the promotion

---

7 Ibid., p. 21.

8 Ibid., p. 22.

of Christian union. "They soon became convinced that immersion is the only right method of baptism, and that infant baptism is unlawful."[9]

Alexander Campbell had been in a mental turmoil during many years of his life. He was conscientiously opposed to sanctioning a religious system of which he no longer approved. Yet he wished to comply with all his religious obligations. The question of semi-annual communion, as well as other matters of church organization, and other fields of religious thought varying from atheism to fanaticism, had a strong influence upon his life.[10]

Early in his life he had showed an interest in science, but he had always been careful never to allow its "extravagant claims"[11] to be confused with religious issues. In fact, this great interest in science had "increased rather than diminished"[12] his devotion to religion.

He had lived in a time of "many lingering superstitions, and much unwarranted opposition even to worthy scientific enterprises."[13] People opposed the steam locomotive, for example, because they could not find evidence

---

9 George Park Fisher, History of the Christian Church (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902), p. 565.

10 Athearn, op. cit., pp. 147-148.

11 Ibid., p. 49.

12 Ibid., p. 51.

13 Ibid., p. 45.

that God intended mankind to travel at the "high speed of thirty-seven miles an hour."[14] They also believed that God punished the wicked with disease, and, when vaccination for smallpox was introduced, "furious crowds mobbed the houses of physicians"[15] thinking that to try to prevent the spread of disease would be a way of assisting the devil.

Alexander Campbell was a Baptist from 1813 to 1830, but great controversy arose over the matters of close or open communion, use of the title "Reverend," the modern pastor, adoption of what resembled a creed, installation of organs in the churches, and organization of missionary and other societies. It was the last two points, particularly, that caused the disruption.[16] Campbell seemed to the Baptists to place too much importance to the New Testament at the disparagement of the old; and he insisted upon having weekly communion.[17]

He and his followers then worshiped under the name of the Disciples of Christ, after 1827. We are told that he was an ardent believer in The Second Coming of Christ and

---

14 Athearn, Loc. cit.

15 Loc. cit.

16 Elmer T. Clark, The Small Sects in America (Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1937), p. 262.

17 George Hedley, The Christian Heritage in America (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1946) p. 119.

actually predicted that it would be in the year 1866.[18] He favored emancipation, but he was not a rank abolitionist.[19] He had a horror of war and was "bitter in his condemnation of the weakness of church leaders in condoning it."[20]

Alexander agreed with his father in his desire for church unity, and he began preaching, refusing any salary,[21] as soon as he arrived in America. He was licensed as a preacher at the age of twenty-one. In order to succeed in his first trial sermon, he wrote it out and memorized it.

The arrangement and manner of delivery were simple. The entire sermon was almost wholly without gesticulation. But there was something in the "reverential bearing of the speaker, in the unaffected simplicity of his manner, in the appropriateness of his expressions, . . . that seemed to rivet the attention of all. . . "[22]

This success, no doubt, had much influence on his entire life as a minister; for he traveled in the West and

---

18 Frank Moore and Talcott Williams, editors, The New International Encyclopedia (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1930), IV, 398.

19 Athearn, op. cit., p. 66.

20 Ibid., p. 67.

21 Walter Yust, editor, Encyclopedia Britannica (Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., 1946), IV, 676-677.

22 Richardson, op. cit., I, 315.

Southwest and held meetings and debates as long as he had the strength to do so.

But never did his success hinder him from being humble. Though he had consciously wielded a vast influence over the minds of a large portion of the religious world,[23] he never wanted to be considered the *founder* of a religious denomination. So, when he was thus represented by a New Orleans paper, he wrote the following note[24] to the editor:

> I have always repudiated all *human heads* and *human names* for the people of the Lord, and shall feel very thankful if you will correct the erroneous impression which your article may have made in thus representing me as the founder of a religious denomination.
>
> With very great respect, I am yours,
>
> A. Campbell.

At the age of twenty-two Alexander Campbell, a rugged intellectual young preacher, married eighteen-year-old Margaret Brown, a tall, slender, graceful girl with a sweet "benignant countenance and most engaging manners."[25] Alexander then went to live in the Brown household where his talents and conversational powers won for him a hearty welcome.[26]

---

23 *Ibid.*, II, 441.

24 Richardson, *loc. cit.*

25 Benjamin Lyon Smith, *Alexander Campbell* (St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1930), p. 89.

26 *Loc. cit.*

After he had been married seventeen years, his wife died, leaving him with a family of young children. Nine months later he married Selina Bakewell, a close friend of Margaret Brown Campbell.

Despite the fact that Mr. Campbell had to be away from home much of the time, his children were brought up accustomed to "family worship, memorizing of hymns and Bible passages, and religious instruction."[27]

In 1823 he began a periodical called the Christian Baptist, which in 1829 was changed to the Millenial Harbinger, and "sixty volumes bear his name on their title pages."[28] The names of his books are listed in Smith's Alexander Campbell.[29]

During his active years he was interested not only in science and religion but also in politics:

> Seldom in the history of our country, except perhaps in the colonial period, has a theologian had such influence in national politics as Alexander Campbell. He was invited to address the National Congress at Washington, served as a member of the Constitutional Convention of Virginia, urged the Kentucky Constitutional Convention to abolish slavery, delivered the invocation at the first session of the Indiana Constitutional Convention, and addressed the state legislature.

---

27 Athearn, op. cit., p. 144.

28 Yust, op. cit., IV, 677.

29 Smith, op. cit., p. 2.

> Mr. Campbell's most conspicuous political service was rendered as a member of the Virginia Constitutional Convention, where he gained the admiration of such associates as Madison, Monroe, and Chief Justice Marshall.[30]

During Alexander Campbell's busy life he was never too engrossed in public affairs to offer sympathy and kindness to the most humble, to the unfortunate, and to small children. He always "had the largest and highest conceptions of the dignity and the destiny of humanity."[31]

Much of his life was spent pleading for the souls he valued so highly, as he preached and debated through many states of the union. Before his death on March 4, 1866, in Bethany, West Virginia, "the religious movement which he initiated had attained a membership of 300,000."[32]

Perhaps at the time of his death the greatest compliments that could be paid him as a speaker, or debater, were those of Bishop Purcell after the Campbell-Purcell debate on the Roman Catholic religion, January 13 to 21, 1837.

> Campbell was decidedly the fairest man in debate I ever saw, as fair as you can possibly conceive. He never fought for victory, like Dr. Johnson. He seemed to be always fighting for the truth, or what he believed to be the truth. In this he differed from other men. He never misrepresented his case nor that of his opponent; never tried to hide a weak point; never quibbled. He would have made a very

---

30 Athearn, op. cit., pp. 62-63.

31 Richardson, op. cit., II, 660.

32 Winfred E. Garrison, editor, Collier's Encyclopedia (New York. P. F. Collier and Son Corp., 1950), IV, 376.

> poor lawyer, in the ordinary understanding of the term lawyer. Like his great friend, Henry Clay, he excelled in the clear statement of the case at issue. No dodging with him. He came right out fairly and squarely. He was what used to be called, in good old times, "flat-footed." Rather than force a victory by underhand or ignoble means, he preferred to encounter defeat. But, whenever he fell, he fell like the Cavalier Bayard, with honor and a clear conscience.[33]

In conclusion, it can be said that, for three decades, Mr. Campbell held an extraordinary position of increasing eminence. He was loved and respected for his sincerity and fine character, and he was "deferred to by statesmen and jurists for his intellectual and oratorical powers."[34] Smith gives him an important place in the history of our country in the following paragraph:

> So when men of intellectual power, such as Mr. Campbell, debated the great verities of human life, the interest around was most intense. He spoke to hundreds and even thousands, and the published records had phenomenal sales. His debates established him as a first-rate thinker, for no one could have heard him, or can read his speeches now, without realizing he was following a master mind. The only debates in American history comparable in ability to Mr. Campbell's are the Lincoln-Douglas debates. Indeed, as these helped mold the political thought of the nation, so Mr. Campbell's helped mold the religious spirit.[35]

---

33 J. J. Haley, Debates That Made History (St. Louis: Christian Board of Publication, 1920), p. 14.

34 Smith, op. cit., p. 26.

35 Ibid., pp. 163, 164.

B. GOALS OF ALEXANDER CAMPBELL

Campbell gave the following qualifications "as necessary to attain excellence in the composing and pronouncing of sermons."[1] The reader may wish to compare Campbell's goals with his attainments.

1. The preacher must be a man of piety, and one who has the instruction and salvation of mankind sincerely at heart.

2. A man of modest and simple manners, and in his public performances and general behavior must conduct himself so as to make his people sensible that he has their temporal and eternal welfare more at heart than anything else.

3. He must be well instructed in morality and religion, and in the original tongues in which the Scriptures are written, for without them he can hardly be qualified to explain Scripture or to teach religion and morality.

4. He must be such a proficient in his own language, as to be able to express every doctrine and precept with the utmost simplicity and without anything in his diction either finical on the one hand or vulgar on the other.

5. A sermon should be composed with regularity and unity of design, so that all its parts may have a mutual and natural connection and it should not consist of many heads, neither should it be very long. [His sermons were often two hours long.][2]

6. A sermon ought to be pronounced with gravity, modesty and meekness, and so as to be distinctly heard by all the audience. Let the preacher, therefore, accustom himself to articulate slowly and deliver the words with a distinct voice, and without artifical attitudes or motions or any other affectation.[3]

---

1 Richardson, op. cit., I, 138.

2 Ibid., II, 110.

3 Loc. cit.