9-1973

A study of the speech philosophy of Alexander Campbell and the application of that philosophy

Rudy L. Morrow
Portland State University

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF Rudy L. Morrow for the Master of Science in Speech presented September, 1973.

Title: A Study of the Speech Philosophy of Alexander Campbell And the Application of That Philosophy.

APPROVED BY MEMBERS OF THE THESIS COMMITTEE:

[redacted]

Dr. Larry Steward, Chairman

[redacted]

Dr. Alfred Sugarman

[redacted]

Dr. Stephen Kosokoff

[redacted]

Dr. George Guy

A great religious Awakening was taking place in 1805 until the end of the Civil War. Religious debates became the order of the day, and were at least equal in importance to the political debates. Alexander Campbell was one of the leading debators of the period. He was born September 12, 1787, in Ireland, but moved to America in 1809, settling in western Virginia. In 1812, Alexander and his father, Thomas Campbell, launched what they called "The Restoration Movement", in which they were seeking for the unity of all Christians on the basis of the Bible.

Because Alexander Campbell's ideas were in conflict with many of the frontier denominations, he engaged in at least nine debates.

Through the influence of his father, his training at Glasgow University, and his personal study, Campbell had acquired both speech training and philosophy which fitted him for the role of a religious debator. Perhaps his fame in American religious history is due, in great measure, to his skill as a controversialist. His debates first brought him to public attention and were his most productive efforts in the Restoration Movement. They have an even wider significance, for they are outstanding examples of typical speaking situations which affected the lives of people on the American Frontier.

The purpose of this study is to look at the speech philosophy of Alexander Campbell and determine whether he practiced that philosophy. To determine the above question, two of Campbell's outstanding debates were explored: Campbell versus Robert Owen concerning skepticism, which took place on April 13-21, 1829; and Campbell versus Nathan L. Rice concerning Presbyterianism, which took place on November 15-29, 1843. The conclusions came from a comparison of his philosophy with the two debates.

Chapter one deals with Alexander Campbell the man. Chapter two gives further insight into Campbell as it deals with the people who knew Campbell. Chapter three is the presentation of his philosophy of speech and chapter four deals with the debate with Owen, and chapter five, the debate with N. L. Rice. Chapter six gives the conclusions and observations. The method of discovery was to take what Campbell had to say about three particular areas: Organization, argument and delivery, and compare this with what actually occurred in the debates to determine whether he actually practiced his own concepts.

The conclusions of this abstract will deal directly with the conclusions contained from this study. Campbell's overall philosophy of speech suggests that public speaking is not a display, but a practical means of accomplishing certain goals. The whole basis of Campbell's ideas is built around the concept of sincerity through naturalness. It is my opinion that he fulfilled this concept to a great degree.

His philosophy under organization indicated his concern over its importance. He works very hard in both debates to see that each argument and each piece of evidence is organized and carefully labelled.

Under argument Campbell is not very specific, but there are three areas of discussion: (1) the importance of fully supporting your points; (2) the importance of arguing from root meanings of words; and (3) the importance of audience analysis. Campbell fully supports his arguments, in fact, his

supports are so numerous as to violate the simplicity concept. He is not consistent in his definition of terms in the debates. He would use vocabulary very unfamiliar to his audience, which effected their comprehension.

His violation of audience analysis is apparent in his use of too much material for the audience to endure, let alone comprehend.

Campbell seemed to violate his philosophy on argument in definition of terms and the presentation of too many arguments for the immediate audience.

In Campbell's philosophy on delivery he is most concerned with effectiveness. He recognized conversational speaking as the most effective and felt that it should be extemporaneous. There are at least two areas of violation under this category: (1) he read several of his speeches in the Rice debate, moving away from the naturalness that he advocated; and (2) his eloquent pleas seemed to be unnatural at times.

Aside from the above mentioned violations, Mr. Campbell adhered exclusively to his philosophy. It is hoped that the religious person can understand the need Alexander Campbell showed to find the truth and express as best he could the truth he had found.

A STUDY OF
THE SPEECH PHILOSOPHY OF ALEXANDER CAMPBELL
AND THE APPLICATION OF THAT PHILOSOPHY

by

RUDY L. MORROW

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE
in
SPEECH

Portland State University
1973

TO THE OFFICE OF GRADUATE STUDIES:

The members of the Committee approve the thesis of

Rudy L. Morrow presented September, 1973.

[redacted]

Dr. Larry Steward, Chairman

[redacted]

Dr. Alfred Sugarman

[redacted]

Dr. Stephen Kosokoff

[redacted]

Dr. George Guy

APPROVED:

[redacted]

Dr. Robert W. Vogelsang, Head, Department of Speech

[redacted]

Dr. David T. Clark, Dean of Graduate Studies

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

INTRODUCTION

Alexander Campbell was a many sided man. He was the father of fourteen children. He managed a large business and made money. He was an author and editor. He has his name on the title pages of sixty volumes. He founded a college and was its president for a quarter of a century. He taught regularly all of those years.

He served the state that adopted him. He was a member of the Constitutional Convention of Virginia. He sat in council with ex-President Madison, with Chief Justice Marshall, with John Randolph of Roanoke and with many of the illustrious men of the old Commonwealth.

He was a defender of the faith as he held it. He had oral discussions lasting for days with John Purcell, a Roman Catholic Bishop; with Robert Owen, the Secularist; and with several other strong men of the time. He had written discussion with skeptics, Jews, Unitarians, Universalists and Baptists. These discussions covered nearly all questions relating to Christian doctrine. He preached in most of the states of the Union, in Canada, and in Great Britain and Ireland.[1]

[1]Archibald McLean, Alexander Campbell As A Preacher, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1955), pp. 7,8.

Intentions:

The purpose of this thesis is to discover the speech philosophy of Alexander Campbell, Restoration preacher in the 1800's in Kentucky, Tennessee and Ohio, and through a study of those who heard him and of the text of two of his outstanding debates, determine whether he applied the concepts in his speech philosophy to his own public speaking.

In determining what I wanted to discover about Campbell, it was brought to my attention that nothing had been done with Campbell in the area of debating. In talking with the chairman of the Biblical Studies Department at Columbia Christian College, I became convinced of the benefit of such a study. The chairman indicated that such a paper would aid students who are studying the history of the early church as well as benefit those studying the theory of preaching.[2]

Therefore, the question in this discussion will be: What was the philosophy of Alexander Campbell and did he practice that speech philosophy?

First, the philosophy that Campbell advocated will be discussed and put into a workable form. We will see how Campbell taught young men some definite ideas that he believed were necessary for a speaker to be successful. Then, two of his outstanding debates will be analyzed to see if and how the philosophy was applied.

[2]Dr. J. P. Sanders, Chairman, School of Biblical Studies, Columbia Christian College, Portland, Oregon, February, 1971.

The two debates to be explored are: Campbell versus Robert Owen concerning skepticism, which took place in Cincinnati, Ohio, April 13-21, 1829[3]; and Campbell versus Nathan L. Rice concerning Presbyterianism, which took place in Lexington, Kentucky, November 15, 1843.[4] Attention will be given not to the religious question, but to the rhetorical tools employed and the apparent results.

In Chapter one there will be a discussion of the times in which Campbell was active. The discussion will center around the religious activities of the time to determine the religious feeling prevalent when Campbell was doing his work. This chapter will also contain a biographical sketch of Campbell's life. Finally, the chapter will contain a character sketch of Campbell. This will provide some insight into the intentions of Campbell and their effect upon his life.

The discussion in Chapter two will be centered upon testimonies about Campbell from people he knew. The purpose of the chapter will be to help the reader become aware of appraisals of Campbell's effectiveness.

Chapter three will discuss Campbell's speech philosophy. The chapter will be written so that the analysis of the debates in Chapters four and five can be tied in clearly.

Chapters four and five will deal with the Owen and Rice debates respectively. Each contest will be placed in its immediate setting. The areas discussed will coincide with the material in Chapter three concerning his philosophy.

[3]Bill J. Humble, Campbell and Controversy, (Florida Christian College: Old Paths Book Club, 1952), p. 78.

[4]Ibid., p. 190.

The sixth chapter will be a discussion of the conclusions drawn from the research. The introduction continues now with the review of the literature.

Sources:

It is the purpose of this section to acquaint the reader with those materials that proved most beneficial in this study. Each source will be mentioned in the order in which it was especially helpful.

In recreating the times in which Campbell lived there were two sources which were especially helpful. The first was a dissertation written by Leo Ashby entitled, The Influence of Alexander Campbell Upon the Separation of Disciples and Baptists in Kentucky[5] and the second, a book by Bill J. Humble entitled, Campbell and Controversy.[6] This source deals directly with Campbell's debating, especially in the area of historical setting. Both of these were available at Columbia Christian College.

The most useful source in the discussion of Campbell's biography and character sketch was his biography by Robert Richardson, Memoirs of Alexander Campbell.[7] Richardson was a

[5]Leo Ashby, Influence of Alexander Campbell Upon the Separation of Disciples and Baptists in Kentucky, dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1948.

[6]Humble, op. cit., p. 78.

[7]Robert Richardson, Memoirs of Alexander Campbell, Two Volumes, (Cincinnati: Standard Publishing Co., 1897).

close friend and fellow instructor at Bethany College. He dealt with some aspects of Campbell's life in great detail.

A little book entitled Alexander Campbell as a Preacher[8] by Archibald McLean proved very helpful as a source for discussing his effectiveness. Mr. McLean was very thorough in gathering this type of material. Another useful source in this area was Alexander Campbell, Preacher of Reform and Reformer of Preaching by Alger Morton Fitch, Jr.[9] This source presented some of the more recent material on Campbell and his preaching.

The primary sources for the comparative study of the debates were the debates themselves. The editions of the Owen's debate used in this study were published by the McQuiddy Publishing Company in Nashville, Tennessee in 1946.[10] A copy of this debate was found in book form at Northwest Christian College in Eugene, Oregon.

A first edition of the Campbell-Rice debate was available at Northwest Christian College. The signatures of Mr. Campbell and Mr. Rice are on this document, attesting to its authenticity.[11]

[8]McLean, op. cit.

[9]Alger Morton Fitch, Alexander Campbell, Preacher of Reform and Reformer of Preaching, (Austin, Texas: Sweet Publishing Co., 1970).

[10]Alexander Campbell and Robert Owen, The Evidence of Christianity, A Debate, (Nashville: McQuiddy Printing Co., 1946).

[11]Rev. A. Campbell and N. L. Rice, On the Action, Subject, Design, and Administrator of Christian Baptism, A Debate, (Lexington: A. T. Skillman and Son, 1844).

Campbell's writings in his Christian papers--Christian Baptist[12] and Millenial Harbinger[13]--were most helpful in establishing his speech philosophy.

The other source most helpful in this section was a dissertation by Carroll Brooks Ellis entitled, The Controversial Speaking of Alexander Campbell.[14] This was most useful not only for this section, but was an invaluable source for the entire thesis. It suggested ideas for organization, methods of dealing with the debates, but most of all for insights into helpful sources. Where Ellis presented an overview of all of Campbell's major debates, I have compared just two of his debates with Campbell's actual philosophy.

There were many other secondary sources, but those mentioned on the preceding pages proved to be the most important in this study.

[12]Alexander Campbell, Christian Baptist, July, 1823-July, 1830, Seven volumes in one, revised by S. S. Burnet, no date, St. Louis, Missouri.

[13]Alexander Campbell, Millenial Harbinger, 1830-1850, Bethany, West Virginia.

[14]Carroll Brooks Ellis, The Controversial Speaking of Alexander Campbell, a dissertation: (Louisiana State University: Baton Rouge, Louisiana, 1949).

CHAPTER I

SKETCH OF CAMPBELL'S LIFE

The purpose of this chapter is to acquaint the reader with Alexander Campbell. Those categories to be discussed in this chapter are the times in which he lived; a biographical sketch of his life; and finally a discussion of the characteristics that contributed to his debating skills.

Times:

To better understand how Alexander Campbell applied and successfully used his speech philosophy, it is important to discuss the religious feeling at the time in which he was involved in his most important work. This discussion centers around the religious aspect of the times. Those aspects to be discussed in this chapter will be: The decline of religion in the period following the Revolutionary War, the upsurge of religious feeling, the Great Revival and its effects upon Campbell's work. Certain religious leaders who had a direct connection with the religious revival will be discussed.

Immediately following the Revolutionary War (1781-1800) there was a period of marked spiritual decline throughout the United States. This decline was characterized not only by passive indifference to spiritual influences but even by active antagonism toward religion. One church historian states that

there was probably never a time when there was as large a percentage of active hostility to religion as during the last two decades of the eighteenth century.[1] If this condition prevailed in the east, its baneful influence was doubly evident in the west. Kentucky was characterized by drinking, gambling, and brawling; the Kentucky boatman, commonly known as a "Kentuc," was more feared than the Indians, the most reckless, fearless law despising men.[2] When these men came off the boats and came to town, anything could happen and usually did.

One preacher wrote later of conditions as he had seen them in Bourbon County, Kentucky: "Apathy in religious societies had disappeared, but also the very form of it was waning fast away."[3]

A number of factors were responsible for this general and serious decline in religion. It is important to present these reasons so that one can see why the people may have gone to the complete extreme in the Great Revival and to better understand Campbell's attempt to counsel moderation. First, the decline was a natural reaction to the enthusiasm and emotionalism of the Great Awakening which had occurred a half century earlier. Second, there was the war itself and

[1]Winfred Ernest Garrison, Religion Follows the Frontier, (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1931), p. 53.

[2]John B. McMasters, A History of the People of the United States, 8 volumes, (New York: D. Appleton Company, 1914), p. 578.

Bill J. Humble, Campbell and Controversy, (Florida Christian College: Old Paths Book Club, 1952), p. 58.

the demoralizing uncertainty which follows any such conflict. Church buildings had been swallowed in the conflict as cannons boomed their destruction; preachers and members had often been lost to the war or to the migrations westward. Third, the period was one of deism and unbelief, adpoted from British and French philosophy. The young American nation, having found in French social philosophy a justification for its revolution, was strongly influenced by the contempt for religion found in that philosophy.[4] Thomas Paine, whose Age of Reason had ridiculed the principles of revealed religion, was highly popular, especially among the younger generation. As this religious decline was especially pronounced west of the Allegenies so the reaction against it and return to religion originated and was concentrated in Ohio, Tennessee, and Kentucky, the area in which Alexander Campbell centered his preaching and teaching work.

Beginning about 1797 and reaching its climax in 1810, a great religious awakening known as the Great Revival occurred in the Upper Ohio Valley. The Great Revival centered around the camp meetings with service being conducted night and day. There were many preachers participating and thousands in attendance. As the campfires burned at night and light from hundreds of torches danced eerily upon the dense forest surrounding the camp ground, several preachers might be heard

[4]Garrison, op. cit., p. 52.

addressing groups in various parts of the encampment; elsewhere clusters of people were singing, praying or screaming. The preaching of the Great Revival was of a highly emotional strain, calculated to lead the most hardened sinner to repentence. Accompanying this Great Revival were highly unusual physical exercises which assumed a variety of forms. Hundreds of people fell to the ground unconscious, lay unnoticed for hours, and arose to preach and pray.[5]

Many descriptions of these camp meetings have been preserved, but one of the most picturesque was written by Timothy Flint, a prominent pioneer preacher who devoted tne years (1815-1825) to western travels. Vividly picturing the encampment and the preaching, he wrote:

> The line of tents is pitched; and the religious city grows up in a few hours under the trees, beside the stream. Lamps are hung in lines among the branches; and the effect of their glare upon the surroundings is as of magic. The scenery of the most brilliant theater in the world is painted only for children, compared with this . . .
>
> There is no need for the studied trick of oratory to produce in such a place the deepest movements of the head. No wonder, as the speaker pauses to dash the gathering moisture from his own eyes, that his audience are dissolved in tears, or uttering the exclamation of penitence.[6]

To give some idea of the type of men who were involved in the Great Revival a discussion of two of the central figures

[5] Ibid., p. 60.

[6] Timothy Flint, Recollections of the Last Ten Years, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1932), p. 148f.

and their influence will be necessary. The first central figure of the Revival was James McGready of the Presbyterian Church. He is mentioned because of his direct relation to Barton Stone, who in turn was a co-worker with Alexander Campbell. McGready was licensed by the Redstone Presbytery August 13, 1878. Beginning his ministry in North Carolina, McGready was saddened by the exceedingly low ebb at which he found religion. Fired by evangelistic fervor, his preaching soon produced a revival of religion in Orange County. A description of McGready's preaching is presented in the following:

> Everything appeared by him forgotten but the salvation of souls. Such earnestness, such zeal, such powerful persuasion, enforced by the joys of heaven and miseries of hell, I never had witnessed before. My mind was chained by him closely in his rounds of heaven, earth, and hell with feelings indescribable. His concluding remarks were addressed to the sinner to flee the wrath to come without delay.[7]

This description is typical of that which was soon to become highly popular in the Great Revival and would be a contrast to the style of Alexander Campbell.

The second important figure in the Great Revival has a direct relation with Campbell and also switches the scene to the part of the country in which Campbell did his work. Barton W. Stone took the Great Revival to Can Ridge, Kentucky. In

[7]James R. Rogers, The Can Ridge Meeting House to Which is Appended The Autobiography of B. W. Stone. (Cincinnati: The Standard Publishing Co., 1910), p. 121.

1798, Stone was ordained as pastor of the Presbyterian churches in Can Ridge and Concord, Kentucky by the Transylvania Presbytery.[8] Distressed at the general apathy toward religion, and hearing of the revivals being conducted by James McGready in southern Kentucky, Stone visited the area early in the spring of 1801. The scenes which transpired before his eyes were new, strange, and baffling. On the edge of a prairie in Logan County, multitudes had come together and were worshipping incessantly, day and night. The physical exercises were present for many, and very many fell down as men slain in battle.[9] Some of Stone's acquaintances were among those struck down, and beside one, whom he had known to be a careless sinner, Stone sat, observing critically the momentary revivings as from death, the humble confessions of sins, the fervent prayer and the ultimate deliverance.[10] Such observations were sufficient to convince Stone that the revival was a work of God, a conviction which he retained throughout his life.[11]

Stone returned to his work in Bourbon County, and under the influence of his evangelistic preaching the emotionalism of the Great Revival began to be felt at Can Ridge and Concord.

[8]Charles Crosfield Ware, Barton Warren Stone, (St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1932), p. 78.

[9]Humble, op. cit., p. 62.

[10]Ibid.

[11]Rogers, op. cit., p. 156.

At one such service, Stone relates that scores had fallen unconscious to the ground, when he was approached by an intelligent deist of the neighborhood who questioned Stone's honesty and accused him of deceiving the people. Stone relates that he was not angered, but mildly spoke a few words to him; immediately the man fell down as a dead man and rose no more until he confessed the Saviour.[12]

Throughout the spring and summer of 1801 the religious tension of Bourbon County was mounting continuously, and the climax of the entire Great Revival was reached. Baptist, Methodist and Presbyterian preachers shared in the preaching and exhorting. Various estimates of the number in attendance have been given, but all are sufficiently high to indicate the vast multitude which participated in this religious enthusiasm. Stone reports that "it was judged, by military men on the ground, that there were between twenty and thirty thousand present".[13] Virtually all estimates exceed ten thousand.[14]

After the climax in the Can Ridge meeting, the Great Revival spread so rapidly that to trace its progress is difficult. Infecting other areas with its contagious enthusiasm, the Revival crossed into Ohio, carried there by Kentucky preachers and those who had attended the great Kentucky meetings of 1801. By 1802 revival movements had

[12]Ibid., p. 157.

[13]Rogers, op. cit., p. 157.

[14]Ware, op. cit., p. 110.

influenced religious life in virtually every part of the United States, and it was not until 1805 that the Great Revival showed signs of decline. Even after that date, revivals continued in some areas, though the scope of the movement had disappeared.[15]

The immediate results of the Great Revival included a general rise in the moral standards of many areas and an important increase in church membership. In many areas the camp meetings had stamped an indelible impression; religion was now recognized as an essential part of life. Though nearly all the camp meetings were Presbyterian in origin, all denominations enjoyed sizable increases in total membership.[16] Though the Great Revival had begun to decline by 1805, the revival spirit was kept alive in many localities. Timothy Flint reports that numerous revivals were being conducted in Kentucky and Tennessee during the 1820's and 1830's.[17]

The influence of the Great Revival was felt most strongly in the Upper Ohio Valley, the area in which Alexander Campbell did most of his public work. The religious enthusiasm cultivated by the camp meetings was entirely different from the popular interests aroused by Campbell and his techniques. This point will be verified in later writings. Yet the emotionalism was at least partially responsible for the intelligent interest in religion. A scholarly discussion

[15]Rogers, op. cit., p. 160.

[16]Humble, op. cit., p. 65.

[17]Timothy Flint, The History and Geography of the Mississippi Valley, (Cincinnati: E. H. Flint and L. R. Lincoln, Publishers, 1932). p. 146.

of vital religious issues would naturally arouse more popular interest within the community where the cultural background was strongly religious and controversial than in one whose religious tradition was one of cold intellectual formalism.[18]

This description of the religious activity around which Campbell began his work will give an idea of the feeling the people had for religion and how this feeling would affect the task of Campbell.

Biographical Sketch:

The purpose of this sketch is to acquaint the reader with the life of Alexander Campbell and some of the important events and forces that shaped his philosophy and life. The following areas will be discussed in this section: (1) the influence of Campbell's father's work; (2) influence of his home life; (3) the significance of the shipwreck in Scotland; (4) the influence of the professors in Glasgow University; (5) the reuniting in America with his father and his desire to study independently; (6) his work as a debator; (7) the influence of his writing and work as a college president.

This man who was destined to play such an important part in the religious life of Kentucky, as well as other areas, was born in Antrim County, Ireland, in 1793. His father, Thomas Campbell, was of Scottish descent and his

[18]Humble, op. cit., p. 66.

mother was of French Huguenot extraction.[19] Thomas Campbell was a minister who identified himself with the Seceders, a branch of the Presbyterian church. The Presbyterian church in Scotland and Ireland was very much divided at that time. Living in this situation, Thomas Campbell was brought into direct contact with that intolerance and narrowness that characterized religious groups of the time. He attempted to unite some of the various Presbyterian groups, eventually meeting with some success. While teaching school to supplement his pay as a minister, he frequently came in contact with a congregation of Independents at Rich Hill. These people taught that each local congregation was independent and that each individual had the privilege and right to interpret the Scriptures for himself.[20] The work of Thomas Campbell and his association with the independent preachers did much to shape the philosophy of Alexander Campbell.

The early home life of Alexander Campbell helped to shape his later philosophy. It was customary in the Campbell home for each person to memorize a passage of scripture each day and present it at the evening meal. On Sundays each child had to give an account of what he received from the lessons of the day and present it orally to the rest of

[19]Leo Ashby, Influence of Alexander Campbell Upon the Separation of Disciples and Baptists in Kentucky, Dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1948, p. 51.

[20]Alonzo W. Fortune, Origin and Development of the Disciples of Christ, (St. Louis, 1924), p. 23.

the family. He memorized passages in Greek, Roman, French, and English literature. In later years many marvelled at the knowledge which Campbell possessed.[21] Tolbert Fanning says of him:

> Hence, we never saw a man so perfectly familiar with the most important events recorded in the Sacred Oracles, particularly the Old Testament, and also in Greek, Roman, and English history. Singular as it may appear, Alexander Campbell could recite and fully appreciate more of the English poets, especially Milton, Shakespeare, Thompson, and Young, than any with whom we have the satisfaction of associating.[22]

In this home situation Alexander Campbell was able to recognize how hard his father labored, and how dedicated he was to the task that was his. He could see the concern that Thomas Campbell had for people and his attempts to help them. This experience might well have endowed Alexander with the need to work and help people. In fact, as a preacher Thomas Campbell had many obligations. He was teaching in the school he established at Rich Hill, he was preaching for the Presbyterians there, also, and he was involved in the work with the Independents. During this period, he tried to focus his own thinking on just what truth was and the best avenue to attain it. There were many burdens. Because of all this, he apparently developed some type of stomach trouble and the doctors encouraged him to get away and come to America. At first he

[21]Earl I. West, The Search for the Ancient Order, (Nashville: Gospel Advocate Co., 1949), p. 43.

[22]Tolbert Fanning, "Sketches in the Life of Alexander Campbell", No. I, Gospel Advocate, Vol. VIII, No. 20, May 15, 1866), p. 307.

refused to leave, but with the encouragment of his young son he came to America in 1807. Alexander was left in charge of the family and the school for a period of two years. All the records seemed to indicate that the seventeen year old boy conducted these affairs well.[23]

At last the family made plans to come to America and rejoin their father. At this point, another significant event came into the life of Campbell. In March, 1808, the family left Ireland, but they were delayed by a shipwreck off the coast of Scotland and were forced to spend part of a winter in that country. While in Scotland, Alexander took advantage of the opportunity to attend Glasgow University. This event is significant because it gave to Campbell the first and only opportunity to study in a university setting. His schooling was important, and the personalities that Campbell encountered there had much influence on his life.

While in Glasgow, Alexander became acquainted with Greville Ewing, pastor of an Independent church there, and also some leading religious reformers in the persons of Robert and James Haldane. These men maintained that there were wide discrepancies between the religious practices of the churches and that which they thought the Bible authorized.[24]

[23]Robert Richardson, Memoirs of Alexander Campbell, two volumes, (Cincinnati: Standard Publishing Co., 1897), p. 225.

[24]Ashby, op. cit., p. 55.

While at Glasgow, Campbell studied with Professor Young in Greek, Professor Jardin in Logic and Belles Lettres and Professor Ure in Experimental Philosophy. The latter two had taught Thomas Campbell twenty-five years before. At Glasgow, Campbell also came into contact with the common sense school under the influence of Thomas Reid.[25]

The independent spirit of the Haldanes and Ewing did much to mold the thinking of Campbell. At once, he began to examine for himself the claims of the Seceder church as a religious group. Slowly, he was led to doubt them. The crucial hour came at the semi-annual communion service, near the close of his stay in Glasgow. It was the custom to give all who were to partake of the Lord's Supper a metallic token to shutout the unworthies from partaking. As Campbell had come from Ireland without any letter or recommendation, it was necessary for him to take an examination. He passed and was given a token, but the next day his conscience hurt him so much that he put the token in the tray and refused to partake of the communion.[26] Campbell had now taken his stand. The University gave Campbell some idea of what life held for him. These ideas were to be realized when he and his father joined each other in America.

[25]West, op. cit., p. 51.

[26]Thomas Grafton, Life of Alexander Campbell, (St. Louis: Standard Board of Publications, 1897), p. 40.

In the fall of 1809, Thomas and Alexander Campbell were reunited in Pennsylvania. When they began to discuss the events of the past two years, they discovered that each had been going through a time of change. Thomas had been meeting with a group of Presbyterians, and he then broke away from them and had written a document called, "The Declaration and Address," which advocated the return to primitive Christianity.[27] Upon comparing notes they both found that each had become dissatisfied and wanted something better. It was at this time that Alexander decided to preach the "divine truth" and for that preaching he would never accept financial compensation. His father replied: "Upon these principles, my dear son, I fear you will have to wear many a ragged coat".[28]

So Campbell determined to study the Bible independently and to work tirelessly in an effort to know the truth. Meanwhile, Thomas Campbell had been preaching in the groves and homes of the people in Virginia. But he decided to build a meeting house near Buffalo Creek because there were many members there. A site was chosen on the farm of William Gilchrist, in the valley of the Brush Run, two miles above the junction with Buffalo Creek, which is now Bethany, West Virginia. It was here on September 16, 1810, that Alexander

[27]West, op. cit., p. 50.

[28]Richardson, I, op. cit., p. 275.

Campbell preached his first sermon.[29] This signified that Mr. Campbell was no longer a boy, but was now ready to assume his role in the work of the church. He continued to study and grow and use his influence in these early stages to spread the cause of the Restoration. In accordance with the desire of followers he opened a seminary in his home which he called the "Buffalo Seminary". This was in January of 1818.[30] He wanted the school to instruct young men in religion, but here he felt disappointment. Most students came from neighborhood farms and studied English and Language for professional purposes. There were very few students inclined toward religion. Campbell's disappointment caused his stay at the Seminary to be short lived.[31]

The disappointment with the Seminary did not dampen Campbell's spirits and he launched his work for the Restoration Movement in earnest. The remaining pages of this chapter will acquaint the reader with the areas of Campbell's outstanding contributions. Those areas incluing debating, writing, and work as a college president.

[29]West, op. cit., p. 58.

[30]Ibid.

[31]Ibid., p. 64.

In 1820 Campbell started a career as a debator, meeting John Walker, a Presbyterian minister, on the subject of baptism. This was followed by a second debate with W. L. MacCalla, another Presbyterian minister. This debate was also on baptism and was held in 1823, at Washington, Kentucky. In 1829, he participated in a debate in Cincinnati with Robert Owen, the debate to be considered later in this study. The subject of this discussion was on the "Evidences of Christianity". In Cincinnati in the year 1837, he had a fourth debate, this time with Archbishop John Purcell on "Romanism". In 1843, the Presbyterian Synod selected N. L. Rice to meet Campbell in a debate in Lexington, Kentucky, the second of the debates to be considered. The first of the five debates was held when Campbell was thirty-two and the last when he was fifty-five years old.[32] Through these debates, the fame of Campbell spread and his influence was felt all over that region. He traveled and preached in many communities, but his home base was still at Brush Run or Bethany.

Along with Campbell's preaching and debating there is another activity worthy of mention. This area of endeavor was in his writing and publishing. In 1822, he became acquainted with Walter Scott, a Restoration preacher. The two

[32]John A. Hudson, The Man and the Movement, A Study of the Life of Alexander Campbell, (Cincinnati, 1927), p. 71.

of them began to discuss the idea of a paper. They decided it would be helpful to the cause and so it was established and called the Christian Baptist. The paper remained in circulation for seven years. Campbell wrote harsh and often bitter denunciations of prevalent religious practices. He sought to expose the pride, worldliness and paganism in the churches. In spite of the extreme tone the Christian Baptist took, it exercised no small influence for good in the Restoration. His plea was for the return of New Testament Christianity.[33]

By 1829, Campbell began to be concerned lest the name Christian Baptist be applied as a party name to those advocating restoration. He wanted the movement to be Bible centered and not man centered. He determined at once to drop the paper and put this name out of existence. On January 4, 1830, Campbell became the editor of the Millennial Harbinger.[34] This paper was to be for the purpose of the destruction of sects. Both papers were effective tools for the spread of the doctrines that Campbell and his colleagues advocated.

Campbell was continually interested in the education of young men, especially those who wanted to preach; and in 1841, he added to his busy program that of founding and becoming president of a college. Bethany College opened its

[33]Richardson, op. cit., p. 50.

[34]Ibid., p. 51.

doors that fall. Campbell was president and professor in the college for twenty-five years. The college is still in operation today under the control of the Christian Church.[35]

Campbell was a college president, editor of a paper, preacher, lecturer and in short time President of a Missionary Society. Few men were capable of doing as much work as Campbell did during the prime of his life. He was constantly traveling, preaching and lecturing before clubs and societies.

This brief discussion of Campbell's live was not meant to be conclusive. It was to point out the major events in his life, which would have some direct relation to his speech philosophy and to his work as a preacher. This thesis now deals with the subject of the character of Campbell as conveyed by those who knew him.

Character Sketch:

> Alexander Campbell, someone said, was born to cut a figure in the religious world; and to a considerable extent, he has fulfilled his destiny. Since the year of grace, 1823, the good people west of the Allegheny Mountains have heard his warning voice against the corruption of the sects and the errors of the clergy. He seems to have imbibed the impression that he was chosen as a vessel of the Almighty, appointed to set in order the crazy concerns of Christendom which has been in mournful confusion since the age of the Apostles.[36]

[35] Ibid.

[36] John N. Waller, "Messrs. Campbell and Rice on Influence of the Holy Spirit," Western Baptist Review, (Frankfurt, Kentucky, Vol. I, September, 1845,) p. 23.

As John Waller has written, Alexander Campbell was certainly not an ordinary man. Few indeed were those who had more influence in the nineteenth century on religious thinking. His speaking changed many minds, and his teachings carried a great weight with a large number.[37]

This character sketh is intended to acquaint individuals with Campbell in the following categories: (1) his physical appearance; (2) his quest for truth and independent spirit; (3) his tireless application to the work ahead; (4) his benevolent and giving spirit; and finally (5) his aggressive nature. These are the outstanding characteristics of this man. A study of these will help to understand his speech philosophy and his application of that philosophy.

Physically, he was well endowed, being about six feet in height with no physical defects. The ring of his voice showed Scotch tendency, but his rapid manner of speaking was Irish.[38] He presented a rather rugged appearance, his body showing toughness and power. His eyes, which were small and set far back in his head, gave an appearance of sharpness and penetration. Because of his love of the outdoors, confining work had little attraction to him. His active business manner gave no impression of a minister.[39]

[37]Ashby, op. cit., p. 110.

[38]Moses E. Lard, Lard's Quarterly, Frankfurt, Kentucky, 1863-1868, Vol. I, p. 253.

[39]Ibid., pp. 258-270.

In order to understand Alexander Campbell, it is necessary to study him in the light of his quest for truth. He felt himself capable of attaining ultimate truth, and wanted more than anything else to do so. He himself wrote:

> Often have I said, and often have I written, that truth, truth eternal and divine, is now, and long has been with me the "pearl of great price." To her I will, with the blessing of God who searcheth the hearts knows I have not done it intentionally. With my whole heart I have sought the truth, and I now know that I have found it.[40]

On another occasion he wrote:

> Numbers with me count nothing. Let God be true and every man a liar. Let truth stand, though the heavens fall. When contending for the truth with thirty millions of Lutherans, I feel myself contending with but one man. In opposing seventy millions of Greek and Eastern Professors, I am in conflict with but one leader. In all the Methodists I see but John Wesley; in all the Calvinists, John Calvin; and in all the Episcopalians, one Canner. Names, numbers, circumstances weigh nothing in the scales of justice, truth and holiness.[41]

In Campbell's search for truth, he made the Bible the ultimate source of all his authority. He loved to study the Word, and it can be safely said that few men ever attained to the knowledge which he had of Biblical Doctrine. Campbell did read extensively from other men, but he thought independently, and took from other men what he conceived to be in

[40] Ibid., p. 54.

[41] Ibid., p. 55.

harmony with the truth as he interpreted it. Yet, he was always on the lookout for truth. He never hesitated to read the writings of others for the truth, and he would accept what truth he found.

As a debator, Campbell showed himself always interested in the cause of truth. He debated, not for the joy of polemics, but for the desire to know and dispense the truth.[42]

Another quality of his life contributed to his greatness, his tireless application of his energy to the work ahead. Alexander Campbell was a worker. Arising every morning at four o'clock, he worked steadily until ten at night. His health was excellent; his disposition cheerful. When not in his study, he was busy at some manual labor. Campbell was rarely idle. Tolbert Fanning wrote of him:

> He was a farmer of the highest order, an admirable mechanic, and loved dearly the shrubbery which he had planted with his own hands about his premises, and especially that upon which he could look from his own quiet little office, in which he did his best thinking. We never saw Alexander Campbell idle. This is the main key to his greatness.[43]

It will be interesting to see how this quest for truth and tireless work effected his ability as a speaker.

One important characteristic of Campbell which cannot be overlooked here was his benevolent, giving spirit. It seems

[42] Ibid., p. 56.

[43] Tolbert Fanning, "Sketches on the Life of Alexander Campbell--No. 2", Gospel Advocate, Vol. VIII, No. 21 (May 22, 1866), pp. 321-325.

that his life was one example of giving. He gave himself to the cause he believed was right; he gave himself to fulfilling the wishes of his father; in his home it is reported that he was a pleasant host and always ready to find something to approve.[44] Campbell's willingness to give are illustrated in the following examples. Through the estate given him by his father-in-law, John Brown, he gradually increased his resources. From about 300 acres, the estate developed into one of over 1,000 acres. Later a printing business was put up, a college built, a village developed on Campbell's land.[45] Although an economical man, he always gave support to any worthy enterprise and never failed to help the unfortunate and poor.[46] During his closing years, he donated to the American Missionary Society his interest in hymns he had published, and from which he derived a large portion of his income.[47]

Finally, there are the aggressive tendencies of Campbell, his quest for truth and his ability to work ahead. These characteristics brought a host of enemies. Campbell was blessed with many friends, but this desire to know the truth brought enemies and these men expressed themselves in different

[44]Selina Huntington Campbell, Home Life and Reminiscenses of Alexander Campbell, (St. Louis: John Burns, 1882), p. 315.

[45]Evan Wrather, "Alexander Campbell", The Christian Evangelist, September 1, 1938, p. 965.

[46]Ibid., p. 963.

[47]Richardson, I, op. cit., p. 659.

ways. Unfortunately, these enemies were very bitter and continued that way throughout their lives. The Baptists thought of Campbell as an agent of destruction, who, when their churches were opened to him throughout the country, took the opportunity to extend his own ideas.

The Presbyterians also felt that they had received a large share of hostility from the people led by Campbell. This, added to the fact that his father had come to America as a Presbyterian preacher, and that Alexander had been raised in that church, brought him much severe criticism from that source. He was accused of arrogance, ingratitude, abuse and slander.[48] In all of these attempts to slander Campbell, he was never once found guilty of any of the charges brought against him.[49]

In summation, Campbell truly seemed to be an extraordinary man. His powerful physical appeal and his demanding manner made him extraordinary; his willingness to work at all hours and against odds also illustrates his extraordinary qualities; his benevolent spirit was truly outstanding; and finally, his aggressiveness also brought the enemies that outstanding men will have.

The direction of this inquiry now turns to a discussion of men who were acquainted with Campbell and knew his ability. The chapter will present further insights into the character of Campbell as background for his speech philosophy.

[48]Ashby, op. cit., p. 51

[49]McLean, op. cit., p. 40.

CHAPTER II

CAMPBELL, PREACHER, AS SEEN BY HIS CONTEMPORARIES

> Alexander Campbell was a man of fair education and unbounded confidence in his resources and tenets. He was possessed of a powerful personality and was one of the ablest debators of his age. In the use of caricature and saracasm he has rarely been surpassed. Throughout the regions that he chose for the propagation of his views, the number of Baptist ministers who could in any way approach him in argumentative power or in ability to sway the masses of the people was very small.[1]

The description above came from the pen of the great Baptist historian A. H. Newman as a tribute to the speaking ability of Mr. Campbell. It is just an example of the many that have been paid to Alexander Campbell as a speaker. The purpose of this chapter is simply to relate some of the statements that have been made about him and his ability. As there are not enough examples to be able to draw any conclusions about how he followed his theory and most of the quotations do not give adequate examples for this task, the thrust of the chapter will be to relate material that illustrates his apparent effectiveness as seen by those around him. The order of the chapter will be as follows: (1) quotations from famous statesmen and school officials; (2) statements from friends and workers in the Restoration; (3) statements from those who were his enemies and finally, (4) summary of the

[1]Bill J. Humble, Campbell and Controversy, (Florida Christian College: Old Paths Book Club, 1952), p. 257.

chapter. Again, the purpose of the chapter is to give a testimony to the effectiveness of Campbell as background for the discussion of his debates.

President James Madison said: "It was my pleasure to hear him very often as a preacher of the Gospel, and I regard him as the ablest and most original expounder of the Scriptures I have ever heard."[2]

Robert Graham, one-time president of Kentucky University, and himself a most effective speaker, spoke thus of Mr. Campbell:

> I can hardly express my admiration of him in every walk and employment of life. In the social circle he was by far the finest talker I ever heard; in the lecture room the most instructive; and in the pulpit I am sure he had few equals, and no superiors according to my standards.[3]

Theodore S. Bell, then a young man and afterwards a physician in Louisville, Kentucky, heard Campbell preach a sermon on the first chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews. In that first sermon the speaker dwelt on the divine glory of the Son of God, a theme upon which he was said to be surpassingly eloquent. Dr. Bell said: "I have never heard anything that approached the power of that discourse, nor have I heard

[2]Archibald McLean, Alexander Campbell as a Preacher, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1955), p. 7.

[3]M. M. Davis, How the Disciples Began and Grew, (Cincinnati: Standard Publishing Co., 1915), p. 49.

it equalled since. It has been forty-five years since I heard that pulpit discourse, but it is as vivid in my memory, I think, as it was when I first heard it."[4]

General Robert E. Lee also admired Campbell. He wrote:

> 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 he had been delegated as the representative of his species to one of the superior worlds, would have suggested a grand theme of the human race. Such was President Campbell.[5]

Others who testified as to his effectiveness are: President Herman Humphrey of Amherst College, who looked upon him as the most perfectly self-possessed, the most perfectly at ease in the public of any preacher he had listened to; and Dr. Leonard Bacon, Yale Professor of Theology, who believed him to have but few, if any, equals among the religious leaders of his time.[6]

One Baptist preacher said what many others felt: "I thought I could preach, but since I have heard this man I

[4]McLean, op. cit., p. 15.

[5]Earl K. West, The Search for the Ancient Order, (Nashville: Gospel Advocate Co., 1949), p. 37.

[6]Alger Morton Fitch, Alexander Campbell, Preacher of Reform and Reformer of Preaching, (Austin: Sweet Publishing Co., 1970), p. 109.

do not seem, in my own estimate, to be larger than my little finger."[7] Jeremiah Vardeman declared that if all the Baptist preachers in Kentucky were put into one, they would not make an Alexander Campbell.[8] John Howard wrote from Illinois to the Christian Standard saying: "We regard him as decidedly the greatest man, take him every way, the world has produced since the days of the Apostles.[9]

George D. Prentice, one time editor of the Louisville Journal, said that Campbell was unquestionably one of the most extraordinary men of his time.[10]

Issac Errett, the founder and for many years the distinguished editor of the Christian Standard, spoke especially in reference to the delivery of Campbell:

> We have known him, in his prime, stand for two hours leaning on a cane, and talk in a true conversational style with scarce a gesture in the entire discourse. But to a fine personal appearance and dignity of manner, he added a clearness of statement, a force of reasoning, a purity and sometimes a pomp of diction, a wealth of learning, a splendor of imagination, and an earnestness often rising into impassioned utterance, which clothes his pulpit efforts with a high degree of oratorical excellence.[11]

[7]McLean, op. cit., p. 20.

[8]Fitch, op. cit., p. 109.

[9]Ibid.

[10]Davis, op. cit., p. 41.

[11]McLean, op. cit., p. 17.

The following is an account of an observation of the preaching of Campbell taken from A History of the Disciples on the Western Reserve:

> Nothing could be more transparent than his statement of his subject; nothing franker than his admission of its difficulties; nothing more direct than his enumeration of the means he must reach. With great intellectual resources and great acquisitions, athletic and gladator as he was, he was a logician by instinct and habit of mind and took pleasure in magnifying, to the utmost the difficulties of his positions, so that when the latter were finally maintained, the mind was satisfied with the results. His language was copious, his style nervous, and the characteristic of his mind was direct, manly, sustained vigor, and under its play he evolved a warmth which kindled to the fervor of sustained eloquence. There was no appeal to passion, no effort at pathos, no figures or rhetoric, but a warm kindling, heated glowing, manly argument, silencing the will, captivating the judgement, and satisfying the reason, and the cold, shrewd and thinking like it.[12]

Finally, Jeremiah S. Black, one time Chief Justice of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, gave the following testimony to the power and effectiveness of Campbell:

> The interest which he excited in a large audience can hardly be explained. The first sentence of his discourse drew the audience still as death, and every word was heard with rapt attention to the close. It did not appear to be eloquence; it was not the enticing words of a man's wisdom; the arts of the orator seemed to be inconsistent with the simplicity of character. It was logic, explanation and argument so clear that everybody followed without an effort, and all felt it was raising them to the level of a superior mind. Persuasion sat upon his lips. Prejudice melted away under the easy flow of his

[12]A. S. Hayden, A History of the Disciples on the Western Reserve, (Cincinnati: Chase, Hall Publisher, 1875), p. 378.

> elocution. The clinching fact was always in its proper place and the fine poetic illustration was ever at hand to shed its light on the theme. But all this does not account for the impressiveness of his speeches and no analysis of them can give any idea of their power.[13]

The direction of the chapter now turns to the host of friends that Campbell possessed and their impressions of him and his preaching. The quotations cover so much of his preaching that it is difficult to put it in any subject order.

The first testimony to be presented here comes from a fellow-worker in the Restoration Movement, Tolbert Fanning. He covers the complete scope of the material that will be presented in this section of the thesis:

> Alexander Campbell is about sixty years old; has been blessed by nature with a fine constitution; has led a most active life, and consequently enjoys remarkably good health for one of his age and his intellect is as vigorous as it was at twenty-five. In personal appearance, there is no man like him. His scholarship is admired by both friends and foes; and in logical powers, the world, in my humble opinion, has not his equal. As a declaimer, he is generally admired by the multitude; but men of the best order of mind are delighted with his addresses. He is most chaste, pointed and dignified, in all his public exhibitions; knows not how to take advantage of an opponent, and will not condescend to little tricks for the sake of applause. His arguments are always well arranged, and are generally full and satisfactory on every point he touches. It is scarcely probable any man has ever become truly distinguished who has not attained his pre-eminence for some one particular trait, and evidently Alexander

[13]McLean, op. cit., p. 40.

> Campbell owes his greatness to his powers of concentration, and his habit of presenting the greatest subjects in a few pointed and palpable propositions. His doctrine is that the universe is ruled by a few general laws, and to illustrate the most important truths, a few leading points only need to be discussed. For logic, Scriptural knowledge, genuine criticisms, dignity of manner, fairness, and Christian courtesy, it is barely probable Alexander Campbell has an equal living. . .[14]

Jeremiah Jeter said the following about Campbell's public speaking:

> Campbell's superiority as a public defender of his tenets may be explained partly in terms of the natural speaking abilities with which he was gifted. Campbell's mind was richly endowed for the public platform; he was able to think in terms of broad generalizations and comprehensive propositions, to reason with an amazing nimbleness and accuracy, to perceive readily the fundamentals of a proposition and to confine his arguments to these fundamentals, ignoring the irrevalent. As a public speaker, Campbell was highly regarded; his was an eloquence produced by a broad vocabulary, vast reading in all the best literature from the ancient classics to that of his own day, an apparent sincerity, and striking personality.[15]

Barton W. Stone, of whom we spoke in the first chapter and who was a co-worker of Campbell, stated the following concerning Campbell's effectiveness in the cause of the Restoration:

> I will not say there are no faults in Brother Campbell, but, that there are fewer, perhaps, in him, than any other man I know on the earth; and

[14]West, op. cit., p. 37.

[15]Humble, op. cit., p. 158.

> over these few my love would throw a veil and hide them from view forever. I am constrained and willingly constrained to acknowledge him the greatest promoter of this reformation of any living man. The Lord reward him.[16]

Bishop Hurst said that few men have impressed themselves more profoundly on the religious world than Alexander Campbell. His personality was of the most vigorous type, and for over a generation his name was a tower of strength over the whole United States. He was a man of purest character and the highest consecration. He leavened the whole country with his view. Few men have exerted a wider influence.[17]

W. K. Pendleton, Campbell's successor, as President of Bethany College, said that his ideas flowed on a perpetual stream--majestic for its stately volume, and grand for the width sweeping magnificence of its current. With a voice that thrilled with the magnetism of great thoughts, and a person imposing and majestic as his mind was vigorous and commanding no one could hear and see him, and fail to discover that he was in the presence of one on whom nature had set the seal of transcendant greatness.[18]

As a preacher, Campbell developed great power. In his delivery he had a decided Scotch brogue. He seldom moved about the pulpit and made few gestures. His voice rarely

[16]Barton W. Stone, Biography of Elder Barton W. Stone, (Cincinnati: J. A. and V. P. James, 1847), p. 76.

[17]McLean, op. cit., p. 46.

[18]Ibid., pp. 28, 29.

ever descended below a lofty conversational tone or rose to strain his vocal cords.[19]

A noted Baptist minister said to a friend at the close of one of Mr. Campbell's lengthy sermons that it was a little hard to ride thirty miles to hear a man preach thirty minutes. In this example the idea of being lost in what Campbell was saying is very evident. He said:

> It has been longer than that, look at your watch. On looking, he found that it had been two hours and a half. He said, "Two hours of my time are gone and I know not how, though wide awake all the time." This was no uncommon experience. The people were so engrossed with the great theme under consideration that they forgot all else.[20]

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 related that at times he was 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. At such times he spoke with a rapidity and fervor of utterance which literally defied coping and so enchained the mind and heart as to paralyze the hand that would otherwise have reported every sentence.[21]

[19]West, op. cit., p. 58.

[20]McLean, op. cit., p. 30.

[21]Richardson, I, op. cit., p. 40.

One of the most complete descriptions of Campbell comes from the pen of his biographer, Robert Richardson, who said:

> Nothing, indeed, was more striking than his singular ability to interest his hearers in the subject upon which he treated. With this his own mind was occupied, and being free from all thoughts of self, here was in his address an entire absence of egotism, and nothing in his delivery to divert his attention from the theme on which he discussed. For the first few moments, indeed, the hearer might contemplate his commanding form, his perfect self-possession and quiet dignity of manner or admire the clear and silvery tones of his thoughts, while that voice was heard, nothing could desolve his charm. Minutes become seconds, and hours were converted into minutes, so that the auditor became unconscious of the lapse of time, and his attention during the longest discourse was never weary. Without any gestures, either emphatic or descriptive, the speaker stood in the most natural and easy attitude, resting upon his innate powers of intellect and his complete mastery of the subject, impressing all with the sense of a superior mind. His enunciation was distinct, his diction chaste and simple, his sentences clear and forcible. The intonations of his clear and ringing voice were admireble adapted to the sentiment, while by his strong and bold emphasis upon important words he imparted to what he said a peculiar force and authority--his power was thus derived, not from graceful gestures or actions, not from flowery language or elaborate and glowing description, nor merely from logical argumentation, but from his singular faculty of stating and connecting facts--of producing more novel and striking combinations of related truths, and of evolving the grand fundamental principles of things.[22]

[22] Ibid., I, p. 315.

Many different people were impressed by different things in Campbell. What most impressed one admirer was Campbell's grand conception, striking illustrations and comprehensive scope. Another was awed by the freshness of his thought. Still another spoke of clarity, simplicity, or new insights. Most agreed with Aylet Rains who believed that Campbell had more Bible knowledge than any man living.[23]

The enemies of Campbell can also be quoted to illustrate his effectiveness. He apparently was not popular with all people and yet even his enemies seemed to respect him for his ability.

N. L. Rice, the last opponent of Campbell in a debate, later wrote an article against him under the title, "Alexander Campbell's Sacrifice and Reform". After accusing him of insincerity and stating that his religious movement was for monetary reasons, Rice said, "Mr. Campbell is a man of more than ordinary talents, and is possessed of considerable learning, and is a fine speaker and debator."[24]

Robert Davidson in History of the Presbyterian Church in the State of Kentucky, lashed out at Campbell for leaving the Presbyterian Church, yet he said, "He was a man of great natural gifts, a cool head . . . having a respectable share of learning;

[23]Fitch, op. cit., p. 108.

[24]Carroll Brook Ellis, The Controversial Speaking of Alexander Campbell, a dissertation, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, 1949, p. 3.

considerable knowledge of human nature, and a keen polemical mind.[25]

The following was recorded in a religious journal, Watchman of the Prairies, concerning Campbell:

> More distinguished for his oratory, wit, and talent than for his piety, he very soon acquired considerable celebrity as a public speaker. . . few persons have ever possessed more of the qualities of a religious demagogue than Alexander Campbell. Eloquent in speech, adroit in argument, witty, ambitious, unscrupulous, and fond of public notoriety, he succeeded, under the most favorable circumstances, in acquiring a popularity which has given him considerable influence over the minds of many.[26]

Finally, a Baptist historian, described Campbell as a man with a powerful intellect which largely predominated over his emotions; also, as being positive, unyielding, fearless and capable of wonderful endurance. While not overpolite, Campbell's style was characterized by a frank, open-heartedness in his speech, which was logical and had an artful sarcasm which seldom failed to influence his hearers.[27]

Summary:

We can draw only one conclusion from the material here and that is that Alexander Campbell did exercise a great deal of influence upon the area in which he lived.

[25]Robert Davidson, History of the Presbyterian Church in the State of Kentucky, (New York, 1847), p. 214.

[26]Fitch, op. cit., p. 108.

[27]Thomas Armitage, A History of the Baptist, (New York, 1889), p. 52.

The quotations from men of authority indicate some of the influence Campbell commanded. Through these quotations the chapter simply gives more background material on Campbell and indicates further why Campbell is worthy of study.

CHAPTER III

CAMPBELL'S PHILOSOPHY OF PUBLIC SPEAKING

The subject of this chapter will be the nature of Campbell's ideas concerning preaching and how he applied them to his actual performance. The ideas presented in this chapter will be the basis for further discovery in the following analyses. The order of the chapter will follow this pattern: Campbell's attitude toward studying public speaking; a discussion of the guiding principles of his philosophy; and a consideration of his beliefs about organization, argument and delivery. The essential elements of each of these will be discussed in order to contrast them later with the methods used in the debates.

It was Campbell's custom to spend a great deal of time with young men as they prepared to preach. Campbell once said:

> Young orators, in the pulpit and the bar, are more in need of instruction than children at school, or a student at college. For if they began wrong, and contact bad habits they seldom can cure them.[1]

In one of his lectures upon the subject of education, he pointed out three fields in which college should function: (1) physical education; (2) intellectual education; (3) religious

[1]Alexander Campbell, Christian Baptist, July, 1823 - July, 1830, Seven volumes in one, (St. Louis, Missouri, no date), p. 585.

and moral education or obligations. Under the heading of education, he said:

> After giving an analysis of the intellectual power--perception, memory, reflection, imagination, abstraction--proceed to the exercise and employment of them in the acquistion and communication of knowledge, including logic, rhetoric, oratory, taste, discussion and debate.[2]

These quotations indicate to some extent the interest that Campbell had in teaching and the importance he placed upon speech training. Campbell spent much time in study, and as many have testified, he was an able scholar. He was insistent in his own life upon the need to speak well. His earnest study of language and especially his Biblical study can be an excellent example to one who needs justification as to the value of study.

It should be pointed out before going any further, that Campbell does not follow any one philosophy as set forth by earlier rhetoricians, but combines several with the Biblical ideas playing the most important part.

Conclusions about Campbell's philosophy must be based on what he said. If he did not develop an idea fully, he probably had nothing further to say about it.[3]

The subject now turns to the all important aspect of Mr. Campbell's philosophy of speaking. The key to his philosophy

[2]Carroll Brooks Ellis, The Controversial Speaking of Alexander Campbell, a dissertation: (Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, 1949), p. 91.

[3]After considerable research, nothing further about his philosophy can be located by this writer.

in preaching and living was built around sincerity, which he thought could best be reached through naturalness. These two concepts are woven into the ideas that he illustrated. These two concepts cannot be limited to his delivery only, for they are represented in his organization and use of argument and, in fact, his whole life. Therefore, they must be related to his entire philosophy of speaking and then related individually to organization, argument and, finally, delivery. Concerning simplicity and naturalness he said:

> The preacher must be a man of piety, and one who has the instruction and salvation of mankind sincerely at heart. He must be a man of modest and simple manners, and in his public performance and general behavior must conduct himself so as to make people sense that he has their temporal and eternal welfare more at heart than anything else.[4]

To Campbell it was not a question as to whether sincerity came before naturalness. It was his opinion that they stood side by side. If a person was natural, there would be nothing artificial in his manner as he related in the following:

> But he who for some great, or good, or interesting object, loses himself in the subject; forgets almost his own identity, and sees or feels nothing but that from which he speaks. His object is in his own head and before his own eyes continually. From it he derives his inspiration, his zeal, his eloquence. When a speaker has an object to gain, which his understanding, his conscience, his heart approve--then, and only then can he truly be eloquent.[5]

[4]Robert Richardson, Memoirs of Alexander Campbell, (Cincinnati: Standard Publishing Co., 1897), p. 138.

[5]Ibid., p. 604.

In these two examples is found the key to Campbell's philosophy. It was Campbell's contention that the preacher should be as sincere as he possibly can and that this could only be accomplished through natural feeling and expression. It was his idea, also, that naturalness could not come through trying to copy someone else. The preacher must be himself and the message must come from him.

Campbell explained his reason for reaching this conclusion through examples from the Scriptures. This idea is illustrated in the following conversation with Raccoon John Smith, one of the other Restoration preachers:

> He pointed to Smith the Apostolic manner: "Suppose that one of them (Apostles) should have plied his arms in gesticulations, stamped his feet in vehemence, and declared his testimony . . . in a loud stentorian voice?" Rather, Campbell said, "there was composure of manner, natural emphasis and solemn deliberations.[6]

Campbell continued this line of thought in illustrating the manner of the New Testament preachers. Although these are related to delivery, they should be presented here because of the connection they have with the overall philosophy. In the New Testament examples of preaching where men "spake that many believed", the manner did not seem that of declamation. There was no pomp nor pageantry of language--no fine lights of fancy--no embellishments of the rhetorical character.[7] There was no

[6]John A. Williams, Life of Elder John Smith, (Cincinnati: Standard Publishing Co., 1870), p. 133.

[7]Alger Morton Fitch, Alexander Campbell, Preacher of Reform and Reformer of Preaching, (Austin: Sweet Publishing Co., 1970), p. 71.

effort to soften the heart with melting tones and gentle cadences or impassioned mannerism.[8] Personally, Campbell thought that Godly sincerity, impressiveness, earnestness and benevolent ardor were essential elements of the manner of Christ's Truth, and it was that Truth that the preacher should be trying to present.[9]

With the ideas of sincerity and naturalness in mind, we now turn to the specific topics of organization, argument and delivery.

Organization:

Campbell was aware of the importance of planning the material and then following that plan. It was his conviction that the arguments and evidence should be arranged so that the audience would have a chance to make up their own minds about the material. It was his philosophy that each argument he planned to present should be laid out and numbered, so that the audience would not become lost. Campbell related the following about organization:

> 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.[10]

Campbell seemed to say to put your plan out so that it is natural and the transitions from one point to the other is

[8] Ibid.

[9] Ellis, op. cit., p. 96.

[10] Richardson, I, op. cit., p. 138.

natural and then proceed to discuss each of these in relation to the other.

Argument:

In discussing Campbell's philosophy of argument, one must take into consideration that Campbell was never very explicit as to just what constituted an argument. For purposes of analysis, it can be generally asserted that an argument is the statement of a definite contention supported by various kinds of evidence to prove the validity of the contention. Campbell did relate three concepts that are relative to this discussion. They are: (1) that your argument should be complete and fully supported; (2) your argument should be illustrated by the use of the root meanings of words; and finally, (3) the audience should be considered in the selection of material to be presented. As these three concepts cover his use of argument and evidence, the method shall be explored with these concepts in mind.

During the Great Revival which had preceded the preaching career of Mr. Campbell, it had become popular to pick a particular text or even a word and spend the entire amount of time on that text, completely ignoring the context of the passage. Campbell had much to say about this sort of "textual preaching". In an article headed, "Text and Textuary Divines," he fully explains what he meant by the term "text":

> I would rather derive the term directly from the Greek verb "tixto", beget or bring forth, which texes or textus might ingeniously formed, and this might be translated as egg, or something pregnant with life, which by laws of sermonizing become a full grown sermon.[11]

He is indicating that one should take the meaning of words from the original text and try to discover the complete meaning rather than something partial. This applies to his statement that he was in favor of presenting material completely and intelligently for the audience. Particularly in the Christian Baptist, Campbell made war in humorous fashion against what he called the "Textuaries":

> A certain textuary did take from his text the words of a wicked servant who told the Lord, "You are an Austere man." This was the text. The preacher could not spell very well, and he made it, "You are an Oyster man." But the misfortune was that he used his whole doctrine on the word oyster, in his exordium, he told the audience that his object was to show how fitly the Saviour was compared to an oyster man or oyster catcher. Accordingly, his method was: (1) to show the coincidence or resemblance between his Saviour and an oyster man; (2) to point out how suitably oysters represent sinners; (3) to demonstrate how beautifully the tongs which the oyster man uses to take up oysters represented ministers of the Gospel; (4) to prove that the man's boat was a fit emblem of the Gospel and a Gospel church, into which the oysters, or sinners, are put when caught or converted. His fifth head I have forgotten, but perhaps it was to show how the cooking and eating

[11]Christian Baptist, op. cit., p. 145.

> of oysters represented the management and discipline of those sinners caught be the ministers of the Gospel. He concluded with a few practical hints according to custom.[12]

Campbell felt that this type of preaching limited the subject and the preacher. He saw the need to discuss the entire passage and not just a portion. It was Campbell's opinion that this type of preaching put too much emphasis upon the man and not the Bible. Also, a preacher was more apt to make the mistake that the one described above did make. With this in mind, it was Campbell's practice to preach upon such topics as: "The Suffering Christ," "The Law," "Jesus as the Son of God," and "Salvation."[13]

The second concept under argument and evidence had to do with the use of proper language and most importantly the use of the ancient language. In using this concept Campbell saw a need to go to the root of a word and relate its meaning from the very beginning. He illustrated his idea in the following:

> The preacher must be well instructed in the morality and religion, and in the original tongues in which the Scriptures are written, for without them he can hardly be qualified to explain Scriptures or to teach religion and morality.[14]

[12] Ibid., p. 203.

[13] Archibald McLean, Alexander Campbell as a Preacher, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1955), p. 25.

[14] Richardson, I, op. cit., p. 138.

Campbell further talked about the importance of the meaning of words in the Rice debate when he said:

> The meaning of a word is ascertained by the usage of those writers and speakers, whose knowledge and acquirements have made them masters of their own language. From this class of vouchers, we derive most of our knowledge of Holy writ.[15]

Campbell was much impressed with the validity of the ancient language and the importance a word played.

The third concept under argument had to do with the ability to apply the lessons to a particular audience. Campbell seemed to think this was important in forming the arguments to be used and then in the applying of supporting material. Under this heading he advised young men to:

> First of all, ascertain the stature of the mind or the amount of information which his audience may possess as the foundation on which his talk would be built.[16]

This example seems to be indicative of the type of instruction that is found in his philosophy. Campbell stressed the importance of the preacher working within the framework of basic principles to present arguments and evidence on the knowledge level of the audience. He continues to speak on this idea in the following:

[15]Alexander Campbell and Robert Owen, The Evidence of Christianity, a debate, (Nashville: McQuiddy Publishing Co., 1946), p. 58.

[16]Christian Baptist, op. cit., p. 213.

> The preacher should follow the examples of the Apostles as they would contemplate the men before them as believers or as unbelievers--as practicing the precepts of the Saviour--and then immediately propose some point of reference to which they opened the Scriptures and applied.[17]

This concept seems to follow the general theme of Campbell's philosophy, that is the importance of speaking so that the audience will have total understanding.

These three concepts will be the basis for conclusions reached concerning Campbell's use of argument and evidence.

Delivery:

The final category to be discussed under the general heading of naturalness is the delivery that Campbell advocated. This refers primarily to the physical method of delivery. Much of what has been said about sincerity and naturalness applies directly to this concept as well as the concepts of organization and argument, but there is additional information that only deals with delivery.

Campbell advocated what might be called today a conventional style of delivery. He looked at preaching as a dialogue, rather than a monologue. As mentioned earlier, Campbell felt that this type of delivery was a superior mode of speaking. Concerning this, Campbell reasoned:

[17]Alexander Campbell, Millenial Harbinger, 1830-1850, Bethany, West Virginia, p. 140.

> Our words react upon themselves according to their importance and hence, we are sometimes wrought up to a pathos, fervor, and ecstacy indeed, by the mysterious sound of our own voices upon ourselves, as that of others, to which he never could have ascended without it. Hence the superior eloquence of extemporaneous speaking over that of those who read or recite what they have cooly or deliberately thought at some time and in some other places.[18]

Campbell reasoned that you could not read a manuscript in conversation to your friends in the parlor. Why, then, not talk face to face, eye to eye and heart to heart with the audience?[19]

Campbell gave additional support for this type of preaching in the following:

> Let the preacher, therefore, accustom himself to articulate slowly and deliver the words with a distinct voice, and without artificial attitudes or motions or other affectations.[20]

In this example Campbell shows further dependence upon the natural speaking style, being always careful to impress upon the preacher the importance of talking slow enough for the audience to understand.

Finally, under delivery, Campbell further illustrated naturalness in his opposition to the idea of trying to model yourself completely after others and speaks of this in the following:

[18]Fitch, op. cit., p. 73.

[19]Ibid., p. 75.

[20]Richardson, op. cit., p. 138.

> I do think that nature, when followed, is a better teacher of eloquence than Longinus or all the Grecian and Roman models. Mimics never can excel except in being mimics. There is more true gracefulness and dignity in a speech pronounced in the natural tone of your voice, and in the natural key, than in all the studied mimicry of mere actors.[21]

Campbell was against anything artificial and it seems that this last quotation sums up his feeling in an effective manner.

Summary:

These are the main concepts of Mr. Campbell's philosophy as he saw and taught them. In summation, Campbell emphasized the importance of naturalness in speaking and all that he said concerning organization, argument and delivery are built around that philosophy. Campbell was much in favor of an organized manner of speaking, with much logical evidence of a valid nature. He was also against artificiality in preaching. These concepts will now be applied to the debates and conclusions will be drawn as to Campbell's ability to follow them.

[21]Christian Baptist, op. cit., p. 585.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE CAMPBELL-OWEN DEBATE

Few events in the long public career of Alexander Campbell brought him the universal public acclaim and popularity which he attained in 1829 through his defense of Christianity against the assaults of Robert Owen. The skeptical Owen had gained an international reputation as a socialistic reformer, philanthropist, and opponent of Christianity; and when he established a "city of mental independence" at New Harmony, Indiana, he contributed materially to the growth of general skepticism throughout the United States. In undertaking to uphold the divine origin of Christianity against the attacks of Owen, Alexander Campbell became immediately, though temporarily, the champion of all American churches. At the conclusion of the discussion, American Christianity, both Protestant and Catholic, owed its erstwhile critic a debt of gratitude.[1]

The debate between Campbell and Owen, conducted in Cincinnati, Ohio, April 13-21, 1829, is the first of Campbell's major debates; however, it did not find him a complete novice in the field of religious polemics. Earlier he had represented the Baptist Church in two discussions with Presbyterian ministers, John Walker in 1820, and W. L. Macalla in 1823. These

[1]Bill J. Humble, Campbell and Controversy, (Florida Christian College: Old Paths Book Club, 1952), p. 78.

discussions are not so important as Mr. Campbell's three major debates in which he met skepticism, Catholicism and Presbyterianism; and though they merit consideration, they may be studied more logically as a background for the other major debates in which he was involved.[2]

Our purpose in this chapter will be to discuss the events and background involved in this debate and then to investigate the debate in further attempting to discover just how Alexander Campbell practiced his speech philosophy. Looking into these debates will give us a first-hand view of some of the only original material of Campbell that is available. The order of the chapter will be as follows: a discussion of the background and setting of the debate, a discussion of Campbell's opponent; and an analysis of the debate itself. The following areas will be covered: organization, arguments and delivery. Each of these areas will be discussed in the form of a summary with some examples to illustrate the points. The chapter will conclude with some general observations comparing Campbell's speaking with his philosophy.

The editions of the Owen debate used in this study were published by the McQuiddy Publishing Company in Nashville,

[2]Lee Ashby, Influence of Alexander Campbell Upon the Separation of Disciples and Baptists in Kentucky, Dissertation, (Lexington: University of Kentucky, 1948), p. 60.

Tennessee, in 1946.[3] The debate was checked with an original by Dr. Carroll Ellis and found to be identical in text.[4]

Background for the Debate:

As was stated earlier, Alexander Campbell used the Christian Baptist, his small newspaper, to present his views of Christianity and also to fight those ideas that he felt were in error. Campbell exercised complete control over the paper and wrote the majority of the articles. Because he was so vitriolic in print, he received many replies. He established the policy of allowing any person to contribute to the paper, but he exercised the right to respond to any article published. Thus, Campbell entered into a controversy with the religious groups on the frontier.[5] It was in this way, while attempting to deliver Christianity from its avowed friends, that he almost inadvertantly came into contact with its professed enemies--the skeptics.

Upon opening the pages of his paper to others, Campbell received numerous articles from skeptics. Because of this, he entered into many controversies with them. These controversies

[3]Alexander Campbell and Robert Owen, The Evidence of Christianity, a debate, (Nashville: McQuiddy Publishing Co., 1946), Referred to hereafter as the Campbell-Owen debate.

[4]Carroll Brooks Ellis, The Controversial Speaking of Alexander Campbell, a dissertation: Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1949), p. 12.

[5]Ellis, op. cit., p. 106.

were climaxed by five essays entitled, Robert Owen and the Social System and Deism and the Social System.[6]

Campbell had neither a major objection to the mere cooperative arrangements of Owen's system, nor to Owen personally. In fact, he said:

> Mr. Owen has attracted much attention to this country as well as in Britain from the singularity of his views, and the benevolent nature of his efforts for the amelioration of society. He has afforded evidence of mental independence never perhaps surpassed before. His talents, education, fortune, and extraordinary zeal in the prosecution of his favorite object, entitle him to a liberal share of public respect.[7]

Yet, Campbell did not hesitate to condemn Owen's attitude toward religion.[8]

An unnamed citizen of Canton, Ohio, wrote Campbell requesting that he accept a challenge issued by Dr. Underhill, the leader of a Communal Society at Kendal, Ohio. Campbell refused to accept the invitation, but replied that he would debate with Owen:

> As to this Doctor Underhill, he is too obscure to merit any attention from me on the atheism or deism of his philosophy. If I lived in the neighborhood with him, and should he throw himself in my way, I might find it my duty to either kill him, or break a lance over his steep cap. But to go out of my way to meet such a gentleman would be rather

[6]Christian Baptist, pp. 327, 343, 357, 364, 373. (Complete source in the introduction).

[7]Ibid., p. 327.

[8]Ibid., p. 328.

> incompatible with my views of propriety. If his great master, Mr. Robert Owen, will engage to debate the whole system of his moral and religious philosophy with me, if he will pledge himself to prove any position affirmative of his atheistical sentiments as they lie scattered over the pages of the New Harmony Gazette--if he will engage to do this cooly and dispassionately in a regular and systematic debate, to be moderated by a competent tribunal, I will engage to take the negative and disprove all his affirmative positions in a public debate to be holden any place equi-distant from him and me.[9]

At approximately the time of Campbell's refusal to meet Dr. Underhill, Robert Owen delivered a series of lectures in New Orleans on his social system. In his talks he made frequent assaults on religion. Owen accused the clergy of misrepresenting his views and issued a challenge to discuss publicly or privately their differences.[10] None of the New Orleans' clergy saw fit to respond to Owen's challenge, but upon learning of it, Campbell immediately addressed a letter to Owen proposing a debate.[11] Through further correspondence, the debate was agreed to and a committee was set to work to find a suitable place for the contest.

In this debate, Campbell had for an opponent a man of international prominence. Owen's fame, however, was not due to his ability as a debator, nor did it rest upon his skill as

[9] Ibid., p. 208.

[10] Ellis, op. cit., p. 109.

[11] Christian Baptist, p. 433. Campbell gave the entire challenge and said, "It seems this challenge was published several times in the New Orleans papers."

a public speaker. His eagerness for oral debate was probably stimulated by the spirit of the American Frontier.[12] Yet, one of his biographers says of him:

> He was far too intent on stating his own case, at inordinate length, to pay any attention to his opponent. Owen regarded a debate simply as affording a platform from which he could repeat his unvarying version of the truth. He was most persuasive as a lecturer when he had the platform to himself, but he was always wasted in debate.[13]

Robert Owen was born May 14, 1771, in Newton, Montgomeryshire, a remote little town of Central Wales. Largely self-educated,[14] he left home at the age of nine and made a fortune in textile manufacturing. Both his wealth and fame came to him while he lived near Glasgow, Scotland, where he was part owner as well as manager of New Lanark Mills for twenty-eight years. Perhaps he was one of the first at the beginning of the Industrial Revolution to be more concerned with men than machines. He was a leader in the fight for factory reform, and gradually transformed the New Lanark Mills into the most successful establishment of the day in human as well as in commercial results.[15]

[12]Ellis, op. cit., p. 111.

[13]G. D. H. Cole, Robert Owen, (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1925), p. 225.

[14]Robert Owen, The Life of Robert Owen, (New York: G. Bell and Sons, Ltd., 1920), p. 4.

[15]Ibid., p. 6.

Owen, reared in a Christian atmosphere, turned away from all religions because of his disgust over sectarian differences. After his success with the Lanark Mills, he formulated a scheme for a Utopian Society. Because he felt that religion was the only obstacle to the establishment of his new society, he attacked all religions with vehemence.[16]

In 1825, he attempted to make a practical application of some of his theories in the United States. From the Rappites he purchased Harmony, an estate of some 30,000 acres in Posey County, Indiana, on the banks of the Wabash River. From 1825 to 1829, he spent most of his time in America directing New Harmony, as he renamed it. Even though the experiment was not the success which he had anticipated, he continued to predict a new social order. After 1829, he returned to England, where he became a strong political figure among the working classes in the trade unions and co-operatives movements.[17]

Setting of the Debate:

Arrangements were made to conduct the debate in Cincinnati, Ohio and the many preparations were begun. Isaac C. Burnett was elected temporary chairman and Richard Fosdick was appointed temporary secretary of the citizens who were making the arrangements. It had been hoped that a Presbyterian church, the

[16]J. J. Haley, Debates That Made History, (St. Louis: Christian Board of Publication, 1920), p. 75.

[17]Ibid., p. 6.

largest in Cincinnati, might be obtained for the debate, but its minister, Dr. Wilson, refused his permission. Mrs. Francis Trollope, who attended the debate, wrote in her book, Domestic Manners of the Americans:

> . . . Whatever confidence the learning and piety of Mr. Campbell might have inspired in his friends or in the Cincinnati Christians in general, it was not, as it appeared, sufficient to induce Mr. Wilson, the Presbyterian minister of the largest church in town, to permit the display of them within its walls. This refusal was greatly reprobated, and much regretted, as the curiosity to hear the discussion was very general and no other edifice offered so much accomodation.[18]

Mr. Campbell remarked that Dr. Wilson with his customary liberality had refused the citizens of Cincinnati the use of a building which they had helped erect.[19] Cincinnati Methodists readily granted the use of their largest building with a seating capacity of about 1,200.[20]

When Campbell and Owen arrived in Cincinnati, all of the preparations had been made except the selection of the moderators. Campbell appointed Issac G. Burnett, Samuel W. Davis, and Major Daniel Gano. Owen selected Timothy Flint, Colonel Francis Carr and Henry Starr. These six in turn chose the Reverend Oliver Spencer. Burnett was elected to serve as chairman of the debate, that is, to preside over the meeting.[21]

[18]Francis Trollope, Domestic Manners of the Americans, (London: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1832), p. 125.

[19]Christian Baptist, op. cit., p. 552.

[20]Humble, op. cit., p. 93.

[21]Ellis, op. cit., p. 116.

Nothing was said in the preliminary proceedings concerning the duties of the moderators. It is apparent, however, that they did not aid the debators, but served as a committee to see that both the speaker and the audience maintained the proper order. On several occasions they interrupted Owen, telling him he was off the subject. Campbell appealed to them twice to give an opinion on Owen's management of his arguments and finally asked permission to conduct his part of the case as he saw fit. The moderators always acted with extreme caution, couching their decisions in "over-polite language."[22]

Campbell had accepted the propositions included in Owen's challenge. In his letter to the New Orleans clergy, Owen had not stated a formal debate proposition, but merely gave points which he was willing to defend. Nevertheless, the following four topics became the proposition for the debates:

1. That all the religions of the world have been formed on ignorance of mankind.
2. That they have been, and are, the real sources of vice, disunion, and misery of every description.
3. That they are now the only real bar to the formation of a society of virtue, intelligence, sincerity and benevolence.
4. That they can no longer be maintained except through the ignorance of the mass of people, and the tyranny of the few over the mass.[23]

[22] Ibid., p. 117.

[23] Christian Baptist, op. cit., p. 433.

Throughout the debate, Owen was to be the affirmative and Campbell was to occupy the negative position. It was arranged that each disputant should speak alternately half an hour or less, but could speak longer with the consent of the moderators. Each day there were to be morning and afternoon sessions, which were to occupy approximately two hours each. The discussion began on Monday, April 13, and continued through April 21, 1829.[24]

Owen opened the discussion and his appearance and attitude have been described by Timothy Flint, a prominent western minister whom Owen had chosen as a moderator:

> Every one has seen the face or the print of the benevolent social cosmopolite, the Welsh philosopher, whose strange taste it is to wander over the world, bestowing vast sums in charity, and to obtain in return, an ample harvest of vilification and abuse. He was dressed in Quaker plainness; wearing his customary, undaunted, self-possessed, good natured face, surmounted, as most people know, with an intellectual rudder of almost portentous amplitude, that might well have been deemed an acquiation in a pilgrimage to the promontory of noses. From each side of this prominent index of mental power, beamed such an incessant efflux of cheerfulness, as might well shame, in comparison, the sour and tristful visage of many an heir of hope of immorality.[25]

Owen devoted his opening address largely to the background of the debate, adding that he had discovered certain principles of human nature which would abolish religion, marriage and unnecessary private property when understood and applied.[26]

[24]Owen, Robert Owen's opening speech, p. v.

[25]Humble, op. cit., p. 94.

[26]Ibid.

The appearance of Campbell as he opened his portion of the debate is likewise described by Flint:

> The chivalrous champion of the covenant is a citizen of Bethany, near Wheeling, in Virginia; a gentleman, we should think between thirty and forty, with a long face, a rather small head, of a sparkling, bright, and cheerful countenance, and finely arched forehead; in the earnest vigor of youth, and with the very first sprinkling of white on his crown. He wore an aspect, as of one who had words both ready and inexhaustible, and as possessed of the excellent grace of perserverance . . .[27]

Campbell's first address, the only one which he prepared prior to the debate and read from manuscript, was an eloquent plea for the Christian religion. Asserting that there was sufficient evidence to convince any rational being of the divine origin of purity, he eulogized the Christian virtues of love, mercy, humility, and purity, and contrasted the indescribable joy produced by the promises of the Bible with the gloom of an eternal death, the only future of the unbeliever.[28]

There is ample evidence to show that the audience and the debators were very kind to one another. Flint said the following concerning the size and behavior of the crowd:

> . . . During the eight days that the discussion lasted, the church was uniformly crowded, seldom admitting all the spectators. We all felt that

[27] Humble, op. cit., p. 95.

[28] Ibid.

> our city richly deserved the compliment which both the disputants gave it. There was the most perfect order and entire decorousness of observance during the whole debate. Although the far greater proportion was professed Christians, and no small part of the stricter class, they received with invincible forbearance, the frank and sarcastic remarks of Mr. Owen in ridicule of the most sacred articles of Christian belief.[29]

After the discussion concluded, Owen published a book which contained his opening and closing speeches, and a chapter called "General Observations Relative to the Discussion." In this he commented as follows:

> It was the first public discussion that the world has ever permitted with any degree of fairness, to take place between the orthodox faith of any country and a well known open and decided opponent. The credit of this first submission to truth and common sense is due to the United States in general, and to the population of the city of Cincinnati in particular. No audience could conduct themselves with more order, decorum and fairness than was exhibited on this occasion.[30]

Thus, we have the background of the Campbell-Owen debate. This background will lead into the analysis of the debate. The extensive analysis in this paper will be from Campbell's point of view, with some reference to Owen from time to time. This section will include Campbell's method of organization, argument and delivery within the context of the debate and then the contrast between those ideas and the philosophy Campbell advocated.

[29]Ellis, op. cit., p. 120.

[30]Owen, op. cit., p. 147.

Analysis of the Debate:

In beginning the analysis of the debate, it must be pointed out that Owen did not state the propositions of the debate and did not present supportive arguments. Instead, he spent most of his time reading a manuscript as to the nature of his new social system and on his opposition to religion.

In his introductory speech, Campbell marked out the general idea which he thought the controversy should take, but he added, "It devolves upon my opponent to lead the way, and upon me to follow."[31] Apparently Campbell desired Owen to state the main issues and wished to play the part of the negative by presenting contentions in refutation.[32] Campbell also pressed Owen as to the necessity of excluding irrelevant matter. He said, "If the truth is to be elicited, for the love of truth let us close the door against the admission of all extraneous and irrelevant matter."[33] Campbell also insisted upon a definition of terms, stating, "There can be no development of logical truth without the nicest precision and co-intelligence in the use of terms."[34] Furthermore, he insisted that there must be a logical relationship between

[31]Ellis, op. cit., p. 123

[32]Campbell-Owen Debate, op. cit., p. 12.

[33]Ibid., p. 25.

[34]Ibid.

Owen's propositions. Campbell protested Owen's procedure, "His manner is certainly loose and declamatory; and he does not exhibit any bearing or connection existing between his allegata and the affirmative propositions which he intends to prove by them, he necessarily imposes upon himself as well as the audience."[35]

In spite of Campbell's insistence, and the occasional interruption of the moderators, Owen continued to ignore his opponent's charge to clarify the issues. All of Owen's arguments were centered around what he called "twelve fundamental laws," which he sometimes referred to as "Divine Facts" or "True Principles." Whatever he called them, he clung to them tenaciously. They were as follows:

1. That man, at his birth, is ignorant of everything relative to his own organization, and that he has not been permitted to create the slightest part of his natural propensities, faculties or qualities, physical or mental.

2. That no two infants, at birth, have yet been known to possess precisely the same organization, while the physical, mental and moral differences between all infants are formed without their knowledge or will.

3. That each individual is placed, at birth, without his knowledge or consent, within circumstances, which, acting upon his peculiar organization, impress the general character of those circumstances upon the infant, child and man. Yet, that the influence of those circumstances is, to a degree, modified by the peculiar natural organization of each individual.

[35] Ibid., p. 24.

4. That no infant has the power of deciding at what period of time or in what part of the world he shall come into existence; of whom he shall be born, in what distinct religion he shall be trained to believe, or by what other circumstances he shall be surrounded from birth to death.

5. That each individual is so created, that when young, he may be made to receive impressions, to produce either true ideas or false notions, and beneficial or injurious habits, and to retain them with great tenacity.

6. That each individual is so created that he must believe according to the strongest impressions that are made upon his feelings and other faculties, which his belief, in no case, depends upon his will.

7. That each individual is so created that he must like that which is pleasant to him, or that which produces agreeable sensations on his individual organization, and he must dislike that which creates in him unpleasant and disagreeable sensations; while he cannot discover, previous to experience, what those sensations should be.

8. That each individual is so created that the sensations made upon his organization, although pleasant and delightful at their commencement and for some duration, generally become, when continued beyond a certain period, without change, disagreeable and painful; while on the contrary, when too rapid a change of sensations is made on his organization, it dissipates, weakens, and otherwise injures his physical, intellectual and moral powers of enjoyment.

9. That the highest health, the greatest progressive improvements, and the most permanent happiness of each individual depend, in a great degree, upon the proper cultivation of all his physical, intellectual and moral faculties and parts of his nature being duly called into action, at their proper period, and temperately exercised according to the strength and capacity of the individual.

10. That the individual is made to possess and to acquire the worst character, when his organization at birth has been compounded of the most inferior propensities, faculties and qualities of our common nature, and when so organized, he has been placed, from birth to death, amid the most vicious or worst circumstances.

11. That the individual is made to possess and to acquire a medium character, when his original organization has been created superior, and when the circumstances which surround him from birth to death produce continued vicious or unfavorable impressions. Or when his organization has been formed of inferior materials and the circumstances in which he has been placed from birth to death are of a character to product superior impressions only. Or when there has been some mixture of good and bad qualities in the original organization, and when it has also been placed, through life, in various circumstances of good and evil. This last compound has been hitherto the common lot of mankind.

12. That the individual is made the most superior of his species when his original organization has been compounded of the best proportions of the best ingredients of which human nature is formed and when the circumstances, or laws, institutions and customs in which he is placed, are all in unison with his nature.[36]

Owen's primary concern was not to attack religion directly but rather to prove that his "Twelve Fundamental Principles" were true. His proof consisted mainly of repetition with a few logical arguments of support. Toward the end of the discussion, when Owen was considering the laws again, Campbell

[36] Ibid., p. 22f.

arose and said, "I would beg leave to suggest that these laws should not be commented on more than eleven times in all."[37] Owen did, however, go over them once more, making twelve in all.[38]

After Campbell became convinced that Owen would not define the issues of the propositions as he saw them, nor discuss the propositions themselves, he made a counter proposal. He maintained that the "Twelve Laws" should be excluded because they were not related to the questions under consideration. He said:

> I have been pleased with the perusal of my friend's twelve fundamental laws of human nature . . . I have very little objection to any of them, save that which undertakes to settle the amount of influence they will exercise over our belief . . .[39]

Campbell criticized the laws because they failed to take into account the spiritual side of man, but he was willing to accept all with the exception of the sixth as true. Nevertheless, he sought to exclude them because they were not related to whether religion was true or false.[40]

With this background material in mind, we now turn to a comparison of different characteristics of his public speaking as found in the debate and in Campbell's philosophy.

[37] Ibid., p. 477.

[38] Ibid., p. 127.

[39] Ibid., p. 46.

[40] Ibid., p. 40.

The method of presentation will include the following: a short analysis of Campbell's philosophy and then an analysis of that philosophy as found in the debates. The areas of organization, argumentation and evidence are closely related, therefore, some interchange of examples to illustrate the point may be found.

Organization:

In Campbell's speech philosophy concerning organization, he wanted to be sure that the audience could follow easily and clearly the point he was trying to present. It was his custom to label each argument and piece of evidence. It is the purpose of this section to simply give his method for organization and any extraordinary characteristics. The propositions mentioned here will be further illustrated in the discussion of his use of argument.

When Owen would not debate the proposition that had been chosen, Campbell chose, with the consent of the moderators, to discard the original proposition, and the question of the debate became: Resolved: That the Jewish and Christian religions are inspired of God. Campbell then divided the proposition into five main questions:

I. Is it possible for men to invent religion?

II. Are the facts upon which the Christian religion is founded true?

III. Is the Bible the Word of God?

IV. Are the facts upon which the Jewish religion is founded true?

V. Has Christianity been beneficial to mankind?[41]

To all these questions Campbell answered, "Yes," and Owen refused to take a stand. Campbell proceeded to support his new proposition while Owen clung to his prepared manuscript, rarely referring to anything which Campbell said. It will be noticed that the aforementioned five points (I-V) are arranged in a topical plan of organization, that is, each question or topic seems to arise naturally from the subject matter.

Campbell would then apply this topical pattern in the answering of the posed questions in the proposition. It should be remembered that according to the rules, each speaker was to occupy two thirty minute periods in the morning and the same in the afternoon. After Owen finished reading his manuscript during his twenty-second appearance, he generally granted Campbell the privilege of speaking as long as he wished without interruption. There is no reason to believe that Campbell anticipated such a move, but he was so familiar with the material under consideration that he spoke for twelve hours, beginning Friday afternoon at three o'clock and continuing until Monday morning.[42] Before Campbell began his

[41] Ibid., p. 55.

[42] Ibid., p. 60.

discussion, he mapped out generally what he was trying to do in the debate and this philosophy helps to put his ideas on organization into the scheme of his organization. He said:

> As I have been given the arena to myself, I will now submit to you the course which I intended to pursue and that course that will lead to a natural conclusion and, as circumstances will permit, to a logical termination.[43]

In the internal scheme of Campbell's organization one can see the topical idea built around the chronological, which would help to reach the natural and logical termination. One can see readily Campbell's reliance upon the chronological form of organization in each bit of evidence, for each point is treated in the historical sequence in which it occurred. If then, we outlined a single point and its supporting evidence, it would take on the following form:

I. Are the facts upon which the Jewish religion is founded true?

   A. The facts relied upon were sensible facts.
      1. He related the story of the Israelites' journey from the land of Egypt to the land of Canaan.
         a. The crossing of the Red Sea was told.
         b. The manna from Heaven was related.
         c. The group being led by a cloud by day and fire by night was discussed.

   B. They were facts of remarkable notoriety.
      1. The importance of Pharaoh's court was related to the events of the Old Testament.

   C. There are now existing monuments in perpetual commemoration of these facts.

[43] Ibid., p. 87.

1. The whole Jewish nation exists today.
2. The Passover and circumcision still exist.

D. These commemoration attestations have continued from the very beginning of the period in which the events occurred up to the present time.
   1. He relates the history of the Passover and its importance today.
   2. He quotes famous historians from the past to the present concerning Jewish history.[44]

Campbell presents the question he has in mind and then divides the question into four topical areas (A, B, C, D), and then supports each topical area with historical data, presented in a chronological sequence.

It is my purpose to look now at the organization of Campbell in terms of the introduction, the body and the conclusion.

In his introductory remarks he usually oriented his audience in respect to the discussion. He justified his appearance on such occasions by stating that the Bible authorized and encouraged public controversy. He said he was not working to convince Owen of error. Campbell stated:

> I know, indeed, that there is no circumstance in which any person can be placed more unfavorable to his conviction, than that which puts him in a public assembly upon the proof of his convictions.[45]

[44]A full discussion of each of these contentions are found on pages 78-81 of this chapter.

[45]Campbell-Owen Debate, op. cit., p. 85.

The organization of the body of the speeches consisted of a few general strictures upon the data, which were in response to something Owen had said in a preceding speech. As a rule, he did not attempt to refute Owen's remarks, but showed why they were not related to the subject. A constructive argument to support his contention was next. He stated the argument, discussed it in detail, and summarized before going to the next point.

Campbell's arguments were well organized and clearly presented. At times, however, he failed to relate a particular argument to his main contention which in turn was not always tied to his proposition. This might have come about because Campbell tried to present too much evidence in defense of the propositions.

Finally, Campbell's usual procedure for concluding a speech was in the form of a summary. He would usually review each of his arguments and what he had tried to accomplish. The summary was usually brief enough to cover the material and yet conclusive in trying to prove the point in question.

One other point worthy of notice in his organization was his use of transitional sentences. After a point had been established, Campbell summarized, and before going into the next topic, he used a transitional sentence such as, "But although we give the testimony of Celsure first, it is not because there is not more ancient witness," or, "But to

approach the position to be proved more closely."[46] This attention to transitional statements undoubtedly made his presentation easier to follow; an essential attribute in two twelve hour speeches.

In organization, Campbell took pains to make himself clear. When Owen failed to do what Campbell had expected, Campbell was able to meet the emergency by presenting an organized case in favor of Christianity. Campbell's organization would be labeled first as topical and then presented in the form of a chronology. He relied heavily upon the use of summary and effective transitions. It is hoped that this basic material can be better understood in the illustration of it in the use of argument.

Argument:

In discussing Campbell's philosophy of argument, one must take into consideration that Campbell was not very explicit as to just what he conceived an argument to be or what constituted good evidence. But there are three concepts found in his philosophy that help to evaluate his argumentation in this debate. They are: (1) the importance of fully supported materials; (2) the importance of the use of the meanings of words; and (3) the importance of fully considering the audience in the type of material presented. The

[46] Ibid., p. 287.

discoveries about Campbell's argumentation must come from these three concepts.

It is not my purpose to present every argument and piece of evidence in the debate, but to just present a sampling of Campbell's techniques in light of the above mentioned concepts and then draw some conclusions about his adoption of his philosophy.

As mentioned earlier, an argument is the stating of a definite contention and offering various kinds of evidence to prove the validity of the contention. Campbell's method of argument and evidence seemed to be pretty much the same in most all instances. His technique was to state several contentions and several criteria or tests to demonstrate the truth of the passage. He then supplied evidence that the statement met all four criteria and are therefore true. The criteria then are issues upon which the proposition will stand or fall, if the judge accepts the criteria. Not all the arguments followed this exact format, but one can be assured as you read his argumentation that Campbell was very interested in the amount of material and building his material around the particular audience.

To test the validity of his argumentation, each contention must be recorded and then evidence shown to see if Campbell went further than the contention indicated. If he did, then he violated his philosophy.

As stated earlier, Campbell had broken the debate down into five basic propositions and now each of these was covered in the debates. Three of Campbell's arguments on two of the propositions will be discussed at length to see if he followed his theory on the use of argument.

Some facets of his argumentation we demonstrated in his support of the idea that the facts of the Jewish religion are true. In proof of the correctness of the foregoing assertion, Campbell first listed four criteria by which one could judge the truth of ancient occurrences, such as the one mentioned above. These were:

1. The facts relied upon were sensible facts;
2. They were facts of remarkable notoriety;
3. There now exists standing monuments in perpetual commemoration of these facts;
4. These commemoration attestations have continued from the very period in which the events happened up to the present time.[47]

Campbell then proceeded to illustrate the use of these criteria in the following. He briefly told the story of the Israelites' journey from Egypt to the land of Canaan, especially mentioning that they walked through the Red Sea, saw visible manifestation of the Deity at Mount Sinai, were fed by manna in the wilderness for forty years, and were led by a pillar of cloud by day and of fire by night in their travel. These were the

[47] Ibid., p. 184.

facts which he was seeking to establish in this argument. Rather than trying to give the lengthy quotations Campbell used to prove each, I will try to illustrate what Campbell tried to do with each of the criteria.

Campbell felt that as his audience believed the Bible, simply quoting from it would be sufficient. To prove the entire point, Campbell used the example of the six hundred thousand people crossing over the Red Sea at the command of Moses' rod. After reviewing these ideas he concluded that these facts were sensible to those who believed the account of the Bible. From the setting of the debate there is evidence that there were many of these present. Campbell then pointed out that many people knew about these things and could testify to their occurrence. The following illustrates the point:

> Every man who has heard of these facts knows that they were in the face of the most enlightened realm of antiquity, many of them in the very court of Pharaoh, which was crowded with the greatest statesmen and scholars that then existed. The people to be delivered were themselves six hundred thousand in number, each of them individually and deeply interested; so that all the recollections connected with their state of vassalage; all their national feelings of hostility toward their oppressors; in short, every sort of feelings which belongs to man, was called into exercise to the very highest degree of excitement; and all these concurring to impress their minds indelibly with the marvelous and stupendous character of the past. Therefore, there is no matter of fact on record more notorious than these.[48]

[48] Ibid., p. 184.

Campbell furthered the argument with his third question, by asking whether there are any commemorative institutions now existing in attestations of these facts? Campbell answers that the whole Jewish nation exists today. He then gave testimony of the many nations that have existed and passed on, leaving no trace behind them. Then he asked: "Do not their Passover and circumcision still exist?" Campbell took the evidence, through testimony, both through the words of the people and by their example, to show that there is ample proof to show that the religions of the Jewish people did exist and still do.[49]

The fourth step in determining this argument was to point out observances that have been kept very strictly since the time of Egypt. Campbell illustrates the idea with the following:

> Moses tells them, on the very night preceding their departure from the land of Egypt, to take a lamb, to be called the Paschal Lamb, and to dress it in a peculiar manner. This festival was to be observed on that night, and under circumstances calculated, on every return of its anniversary, to excite the recollections and the feelings of the Jewish nation. He tells them that they must, on every anniversary of this festival, eat the Passover with a strict observance of all rites and circumstances; that they must eat with their loins girded, and with such other adjuncts as should remind them of the sorrows of their captivity in Egypt. This feast was instituted on that memorable night and has continued unchanged down to the present period.[50]

[49] Ibid., p. 185

[50] Ibid.

It should be noted that the material in the following examples goes further than Campbell indicated that he would go in this argument. He adds to his contentions a test of reason, which is not part of his overall plan for argument. The fault is not in the material itself, but in the fact that Campbell did not properly prepare the audience.

After Campbell had covered these four criteria, he then applied what he considered a test of reason. He asks them if any nation under Heaven could be induced to celebrate a solemn annual festival in commemoration of a false fact--a fact which never did occur. Campbell brought the idea down to their way of thinking. You can see from his continued use of the Bible that Campbell truly believed that his audience would take the Bible as authority. He said:

> Could all the Magi, sorcerers and wonder-mongers of eastern antiquity, if they were now alive, compel the North American nations to observe the first day of January in commemoration of their Declaration of Independence when the whole nation knew that its anniversary was the fourth day of July? To suppose such an absurdity as this--to admit for a moment the possibility of such a national extravagance--is to suppose men to be very differently constituted nowadays from what all former experience has even demonstrated them to be.[51]

Campbell then summed up the argument by showing that the events did not occur in some dark corner of the world but they occurred in mighty Egypt. This point is clearly illustrated in the following:

[51] Ibid., p. 186.

> If these mighty miracles of Moses had been performed in a dark corner of the earth, in the presence of only a few wandering tribes, or of rude unlettered nations, without records, some skeptical scruple might arise in our mind . . . these facts transpired in an age when the human faculties were highly cultivated. Moses himself was brought up in all the learning of the Egyptians. Who is not acquainted with the scientific reputation of ancient Egypt? Who has not heard of her proficiency in the arts, particularly in the art of embalming, of which we are ignorant?[52]

This example of his argument illustrates the argumentation from testimony as well as his point of organization. Campbell tried to divide the questions into topics or criteria then applied them in a chronological order, leading the audience from the past to the present. This argument shows Campbell's general plan for his argumentation and the use of and type of evidence that he presents.

Another illustration of Campbell's techniques of argument came under the proposition, "Is the Bible the Word of God." This example shows Campbell's use of testimony from sources other than the Bible. Campbell's first argument was to quote from ancient writers who mentioned certain passages in the New Testament and had acknowledged the book and author. He affirmed that Barnabas, Clement, Hermas, Ignatius, Polycarp, and Papias, all men who knew the Apostles, had made extensive quotations from the New Testament in their writings.[53] Campbell did not give statements from all of them but the following excerpt illustrates his choice:

[52] Ibid., p. 187.

[53] Ibid., p. 287.

> In the letter written by Clement from Rome to Corinth . . . the Sermon on the Mount is directly quoted and other passages of the testimony of Matthew and Luke. But it would be tedious to be minute in furnishing examples of each sort of quotation here; more than forty clear allusions to the books of the New Testament are to be found in the single fragment of Polycarp.[54]

In the second part of this argument, Campbell tried to prove that the enemies of Christianity affirmed the facts of the Bible. Campbell said that even though they attempted to philosophize away the events of Christianity, they neither denied them nor the Scriptures. Again, his technique was to read extracts from their writings, give brief comments on their life, and then relate their statements to passages in the Bible. The following is an example of Campbell's method:

> Hierocles, the philosopher, was a prefect at Alexandria in the year 303 A. D. He composed two books in order to confute the Christian Religion . . . the proof of Christianity, from the miracles of Jesus, he tried to invalidate, not by denying the facts themselves, but by showing that one Appollonius had performed equal, if not greater miracles, which were recorded, which were recorded, he says, not by ignorant men like Peter and Paul, but by Maximuim of Aegis and Damis, a philosopher.[55]

Other examples could be cited, but they would, for the most part, be repetitious.

[54] Ibid., p. 288.

[55] Ibid., p. 300.

Both of the methods used in this argument are closely related, the only difference being the class of testimony used. In each of these his material was effectively presented. He tended to read shorter passages than he did from the ancient historians and to give a condensation of the point under consideration; furthermore, after presenting the material, Campbell, in his summary, related these arguments to his contention. Here are some excerpts:

> These testimonies are as worthy of the attention of the Christian public, as of the skeptics; for, while they prove that neither infidel Jews, nor Pagans, nor Apostates from the Christian faith, in all their malice, and with all the opportunities which they had, even attempted to contradict, they also give some striking attestations to the purity, excellency, and the value of Christianity, as received and practiced by the primitive Christians. But the conclusions from these premises bearing upon the position before us now, I hope, established in every mind in this assembly which has led us so far into antiquity, is this--that the Christian Scriptures, and the facts which they record, were admitted by the enemies of Christianity, as we now contend for them.[56]

Campbell tried to establish two facts from the preceding evidence:

1. All Christian communities, from A. D. 33 to 101, whether previously Jews or Pagans, or both, to whom these writings were addressed, did receive and retain these writings, as the works of the persons whose names they bear.

[56] Ibid., p. 303.

> 2. That all the opponents of Christianity whose works have come down to us--or whose arguments have been preserved in the writings of their opponents--did admit the gospel histories to have been written by their reputed authors; did admit the facts recorded and never dared to question either the authorship of the inspired books, the time or place of their publication, or the verity of the facts stated by the eye and ear witnesses of the word.[57]

One can be impressed in this last set of points and supports with Campbell's concern for supportive material other than the Bible. The Bible was his primary source, but his desire to present complete evidence compelled him to use more extensive supports.

A final example in illustration of Campbell's argumentation is found under the proposition, "Are the facts upon which the Christian religion is founded true?" His contention was that Christ arose from the dead. He considered this the most important point in the discussion because he said, "I beg the indulgence of this assembly here. I will to be diffuse on this one point. I desire for the sake of every saint and sinner here--or who may read this discussion . . . this fact proved and all is proved."[58] Therefore, he went into more detail upon this contention than upon any of the others.

The first evidence presented came from the Apostles of the New Testament of the Bible. He affirmed that they saw Christ

[57] Ibid., p. 304.

[58] Ibid., p. 313.

after his Resurrection and sealed their testimony with their death. He admitted that people have been martyrs for their opinion, and said this did not prove their opinion to be true . . . But he asserted, "The martyr to an opinion in dying says, 'I sincerely think.' But the martyr to a fact in dying says, 'I most assuredly saw or heard.' " It was for publishing facts, sensible facts, and not for propagating opinions, that all the original martyrs suffered and died. Campbell advocated that martyrdom, therefore, proves the sincerity of the martyr, who dies for an opinion, but it proves the truth of the fact, when a person dies in attestation of a sensible fact.[59]

Campbell then made the statement that people would accuse him of quoting only from the Apostles and friends of Jesus. To this, Campbell gives the following reply:

> Now suppose Tacitus had said that Jesus Christ arose from the dead, and that he believed it; would he not have been enrolled among the Christians? And so of all others, Jews and Pagans. The instant they believe the fact, they would have ceased to be Jews and Pagans--they would have been embodied in the ranks of Christians. So that a little common sense, or a little reflection, would have taught such a skeptic in Christianity, that in asking for such evidence, he only asked for an impossibility--yes, an impossibility as great as to place two substances in the same spot in the same instant.[60]

[59] Ibid., p. 320.

[60] Ibid., p. 321.

It was his contention that the witnesses of the Scriptures were far more favorable than the witnesses who knew Christ arose from the dead and yet they continued in their present state. So, he quoted further from the Scriptures. He pointed to the three thousand souls who were converted on Pentecost and is recorded in the Book of Acts, the second chapter. He discussed the failure of Christ's enemies to produce the body and to the lack of motive for anyone attempting to remove the body.

Campbell continued in his discussion of the bravery of the Apostles. Their willingness to stand and defend the truth in the courts of the day, and completely defy the authorities, as recorded in Saint John, Chapter Four. Campbell concluded that these men would not illustrate this courage if they had been told that the death and resurrection of the Christ was a falsehood. They knew that he had risen and was living and it was their duty to spread this word.[61] Campbell talks about their courage in the following:

> After this, we see Peter and John standing up in the temple, and proclaiming this truth in open defiance of the whole Sanhedrin. Here we see that the influence of the belief of this fact of the Resurrection made cowards brave. We see the timid Peter standing boldly with his associates, men of no address, and with no arm of flesh to support them; yet they fearlessly proclaim the fact. They are put into prison; when released they go back to the temple and repeat the proclamation and travel from place to

[61] Ibid., p. 324.

> place in order to disseminate it far and wide; until, at last, the opposite party began to perceive that if they did not put forth all their power, the existing order of things would be subverted by this sedition. To put a stop to further spread of it, the disciples were martyrized.[62]

He further tried to prove the point by using four criteria that had been mentioned earlier in the chapter, which stated that the fact had to be sensible, witnessed by many, and had to be commemorated by some institution to the present day. Campbell asserted that many people did, in fact, see Jesus after the Resurrection and could attest to it happening, and it was a sensible fact for men to risk their lives for this truth. He then spoke of an observance of the first day of the week and the commemoration of the Death and Resurrection of Christ to prove that it still exists today.[63]

The argument was concluded with testimony from ancient historians who did not directly say Christ came from the dead, but they did advocate that he lived and was a good man and did many good deeds.

> Suetonius, another eminent Roman historian, was born about the year 70. He says, in his history of the life of the Emperor Claudius, who reigned from the year 41-54, that he banished the Jews from Rome, who were continually making disturbances, Christus being their leader. The first Christians being of the Jewish nation, were for a while confounded with the rest of the people and shared in the hardships that were imposed upon them. This account, however,

[62] Ibid., p. 325.

[63] Ibid.

> attests what is said in the Acts of the Apostles (xviii, 2) that Claudius had commanded all Jews to depart from Rome when Aquilla and Priscilla, two Jewish Christians, were compelled to leave it. In the life of Nero, whose reign began in 54 and ended in 68, Suetonius says, "The Christians too were punished with death; a sort of people addicted to a new and mischievous superstition.[64]

In mentioning testimony from historians, Mr. Campbell was not trying to get the writers to say that Christ had arisen, for he had already proven that it was impossible to do that, but instead he was interested in getting the writers to admit that Jesus did live and there was a group of people following him and in fact, were being persecuted and even killed for believing him and following him. Thus, when he did finish this contention, the audience must have thought he was justified in saying, "There is no other historical fact of equal antiquity that can be supported by one thousandth part of the testimony that this is."[65]

In summation of Campbell's use of argument in this debate, one can see that Campbell tried to give enough evidence to prove his points. His arguments were not new, but were the standard arguments in defense of Christianity. It should also be revealed that Campbell did quote a great deal from the Bible and also from sources that the fundamentalists in the audience would believe.

[64] Ibid., p. 339.

[65] Ibid., p. 327.

Delivery:

The final section of Campbell's speech philosophy dealt with earlier was entitled Delivery and it entailed one area of consideration, centered around the way that the speaker presented the message.

Mr. Campbell advocated the conversational mode as the most effective type of delivery, and that it be extemporaneous if possible. He viewed this as being the closest to naturalness. With this in mind, the discussion turns to his delivery in the debate.

From the reports about the debate, Campbell was very conversational and, for the most part, extemporaneous. It is very hard to imagine him doing this with the great abundance of evidence he presented. At one point he might be considered to have violated his speech philosophy by using "purple patches of eloquence." In this particular incident, he used language that might have been unfamiliar to the audience. This emotional outburst seems to violate the concept of conversational speaking, although it may have been somewhat effective. Campbell said:

> Angels read men, and by men will read angels to learn the deity. In the rational delights and entertainments of heaven you and they will read each other. Gabriel will tell you what were his emotions when he saw the sun open his eyes and smile upon the newborn earth; what he thought

> when he shut Noah in the ark, and opened the windows of heaven and the fountains of the deep; yes, Raphael will tell you with what astonishment he saw Eve put forth her hand to the tree of knowledge of good and evil. Gabriel will relate his joy when he saw the rainbow of peace span the vault of heaven in token of no more deluge. He will give you to know what were his emotions when sent to salute the mother of the Lord; and all the multitudes will rehearse the song they sung and the night they visited the shepherds of Bethlehem.[66]

There are many cases such as the above where Campbell spoke with more fervor than he normally did and in a very emotional way. A typical example of the delivery of Campbell was related by Timothy Flint, who was Owen's moderator:

> Mr. Campbell possesses a fine voice, a little inclining to the nasal; and first rate attributes and endowments for a lawyer in the interior; perfect self possession, quickness of apprehension, and readiness of retort, all disciplined to effect by long controversial training . . . his proofs of Christianity were of the common character, and arranged in the common way. Very often, during the debate, he manifested these resources which belong only to an endowed and disciplined mind.[67]

The above quote is more than a description of his delivery, but does indicate some of his mannerisms.

The examples of his speaking seem to indicate his use of the conversational style with a few examples of emotion packed language. In the discussion of the next debate, his style of delivery will become more prevalent in contrast with this one, but the above material will stand as sufficient for the present.

[66] Ibid., p. 375.

[67] Humble, op. cit., p. 113.

Summary:

The purpose of this chapter was to present the background and setting for this event and then to explore the debate in terms of organization, argument and delivery to comprehend whether Campbell followed the philosophy that he advocated. The first observation is a general one and that is that Campbell did follow for the most part his philosophy. He was interested, it seemed, in doing whatever he could to present the truth as effectively as possible. But, being human, he may have erred somewhat. Here now is a summary of the material of each section with conclusions drawn as to how he followed the philosophy.

The background and setting of this debate helped to make Campbell successful. As we stated, Campbell was made the real champion of all church going people against skepticism. For a time division of religion was closed and many people joined hands to back Campbell.

There seems to be a great deal of evidence for the fact that Campbell was very much prepared and had analyzed and organized the arguments that he wanted to present. In his organization, Campbell took pains to make himself clear. When Owen failed to do what Campbell had expected, Campbell was able to meet the emergency by presenting an organized case in favor of Christianity. He organized his main points topically and employed a chronological pattern for the development

of each. He relied heavily upon the use of summary and effective transitions. In his discussion of philosophy, Campbell had said that all things should be done in order and he seems to have fulfilled that expectation here.

In Campbell's theory concerning argument, he stressed argumentation from testimony or authority, and from definition of words. In summation of his use of argument, one can see that Campbell's arguments were supported usually with testimony from ancient history and contemporary history. His arguments were not new, but were the standard arguments used in defense of Christianity. He was armed with a great amount of evidence, and he probably presented too much of this evidence. Also, much of the evidence may have been too technical for the audience. In this sense he violated his philosophy. In his use of argument he worked hard to combat the idea that the textuary presented. Campbell made it a point to be complete in his discussion. It is my opinion, keeping the above in mind, that he did not use good judgement in the length and amount of evidence in each argument. The passages of evidence could have been much more effective if they had been shorter. He would, at times, read long drawn out passages to illustrate a point and it would seem that the audience would get lost in the maze of material. It is difficult to concentrate when reading the material. This was a violation of his philosophy for simplicity and clearness.

The primary source of material Campbell used was taken from the Bible and the method of presentation was testimony. Campbell seemed to make every effort to use material other than the Bible, although his starting point was always the Bible. Campbell's handling of the Bible as testimony is interesting. He rarely made a direct quotation from the Bible to prove an argument. Campbell did make mention of a number of events recorded in the Bible and sought to prove them to be true. At no time did he maintain that a certain statement was true just because it was recorded in the Bible.

Campbell stated the importance of using arguments that the audience would understand. It seems that Campbell tried to adhere to this concept by quoting much from the Bible and Biblical writers. He also used writers that the audience would know. This all seemed to be in the context of his philosophy.

The final area of discussion in this summary is Campbell's delivery. From my reading the debate and from what observations I could find, and they were few, Campbell was interested in presenting the logical evidence and did, for the most part, follow his conversational style of preaching. There was some emotion packed language. The speaking style of Campbell will become more prevalent in his debate with N. L. Rice, which will be discussed in the next chapter.

Campbell generally adhered to his philosophy in organization and argument, although he presented too many arguments and too much evidence. His style of delivery was, for the most part, conversational.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF THE CAMPBELL-RICE DEBATE

The years that followed the Owen debate brought change in the Restoration Movement, transforming a small group of energetic reformers within the Baptist fold into an independent religious body which was militant, aggressive and growing. Those two decades witnessed the phenomenal growth of Campbell's personal prestige among the Baptist churches, the widening breach which finally separated him and even entire associations from their communion. By the 1840's, many areas in the Ohio Valley had seen the Christians overtake and eclipse the Presbyterians, Methodists and Baptists in their race for the greatest membership; and in Kentucky especially, the Presbyterians had been hard hit by the Restoration Movement.[1]

Consequently, Kentucky Presbyterians had learned to regard the Restoration Movement as more than a troublesome innovation; it was rapidly becoming a disastrous revolution which threatened to obliterate the last strongholds of Presbyterians faith in the state.

The only real way that the Presbyterians could get back on top again would be a large scale meeting that would attract

[1]Bill J. Humble, Campbell and Controversy, (Florida Christian College: Old Paths Book Club, 1952), p. 185.

a great deal of attention and be able to refute many of the ideas of the Restorers. The campaign most likely to accomplish this lasting result would be a highly successful debate of major importance in which the doctrines defended by Alexander Campbell would suffer stunning defeat. To meet lesser figures in the Restoration Movement would not accomplish this goal, for this course had been tried and failed. The only possible hope was that the guiding genius of the movement, Alexander Campbell himself, should be induced to visit Kentucky for a religious debate of historic importance. These Presbyterians administered a crushing defeat to the acknowledged leader of the new faith and after a long and tedious negotiation such a historic debate was arranged.[2]

The chapter will contain a discussion of the background of the debate (especially the events leading to the debate); followed by a discussion of the setting and especially the excitement that was present; and the debate will be discussed with the emphasis being placed on a comparison of Campbell's principles.

Background of the Debate:

The Presbyterians took the initiative in opening the negotiations which ultimately led to the Campbell-Rice debate. In August, 1842, Campbell was spending a few days in Richmond,

[2]Ibid., p. 186.

Kentucky, when he was approached by a Presbyterian minister, John H. Brown, who suggested to Campbell a friendly discussion between his brethren and the Presbyterians of the main points at issue between the two groups, including baptism and the work of the Holy Spirit. At first, Campbell was somewhat reluctant to give his consent, believing that the Christians of Kentucky were fully capable of maintaining their convictions without his assistance. Brown was quite insistent that, should a conference be held, Campbell attend, explaining that his presence would contribute much to the authority and prestige of such a meeting. Campbell then replied that if the Presbyterian denomination would select prominent persons of acknowledged literary and ecclesiastic eminence, he would attend the conference in spite of his heavy responsibilities elsewhere. The reformer further proposed that should such a conference meet and fail to attain agreement, he would enter a public discussion with one outstanding Presbyterian which would be published and regarded as a consummation of the controversy between Christians and Presbyterians.[3]

After Campbell had returned to Bethany, he received a letter from Brown assuring him that at the coming meeting of the Synod of Kentucky a committee would be selected to arrange details for such a conference. When the Synod convened at

[3]The Millennial Harbinger, Bethany, West Virginia, 1830-1850, p. 199f.

Maysville, Kentucky, October 13, 1842, they designated a committee consisting of John C. Young, R. J. Breckinridge, N. L. Rice, J. F. Price, and J. H. Brown, with Rice and Brown to have authority to negotiate the final arrangements. Subsequently, the Presbyterian's moderator in the Macalla debate, J. K. Bruch, was substituted for Breckinridge. Campbell soon selected his committee: James Shannon, Dr. J. Fishback, A. Rains, and John Smith.[4] The correspondence between Campbell and Brown was quite extended and it was not until August, 1843, that final details of the meeting had been arranged.[5] By this time it had been decided that instead of a conference in which several would speak on either side of the question, the meeting would be a personal debate between Campbell and the Presbyterian champion, N. L. Rice. Campbell had hoped that his opponent would be President John C. Young of Centre College, located at Danville, Kentucky, for whose literary and theological attainments Campbell had the highest respect, and whose presence would insure the debate's being conducted on a high gentlemanly plain; but much to the regret of all, President Young's failing health prevented his participating in the debate.[6] The Presbyterians then requested another

[4]Robert Richardson, Memoirs of Alexander Campbell, Vol. II, (Cincinnati: Standard Publishing Co., 1897), p. 501.

[5]A debate between Rev. A. Campbell and N. L. Rice, On the Action, Subject, Design, and Administrator of Christian Baptist, (Lexington: A. T. Skillman and Son, 1844), p. 11. (Referred to hereafter as the Campbell-Rice Debate).

[6]Richardson, op. cit., p. 501.

of their distinguished ministers, J. R. Breckinridge, to represent their faith, and though he too had Campbell's highest respect, he declined, "No sire, I will never be Alexander Campbell's opponent," was his reply. "A man who has done what he has to defend Christianity against infidelity, to defend Protestantism against the delusions and usurpations of Catholicism, I will never oppose in public debate. I esteem him too highly." At this refusal the Presbyterians selected N. L. Rice to champion their cause.[7]

It must be noted that Campbell was not pleased with the selection of Rice as his opponent. In previous discussions with preachers adhering to the Restoration Movement, Rice had often displayed a spirit of prejudiced hostility, and Campbell considered such an attitude wholly inimical to any discussion which was dedicated to a search for truth. Campbell stated the following concerning Rice:

> Mr. Rice, from all accounts of him, will enter the debate in order to succeed at all hazards. He will endeavor to carry every point, whether he answers my arguments or not, but then all the arrangements have been made--no change can be effected.[8]

Campbell would have preferred a man of President Young's reputation and personality, because he feared that a discussion with Rice might produce more bitterness than truth.[9]

[7]Humble, op. cit., p. 188.

[8]William R. Rogers, Recollections of Men of Faith, (St. Louis, 1869), p. 19.

[9]Humble, op. cit., p. 189.

When the correspondence between Brown and Campbell came to its close, it had been decided that the great debate would begin in Lexington, Kentucky, November 15, 1843. Lexington was an ideal site for the discussion, for central Kentucky had become one of the strongholds of Christian strength. Main Street Church, where the sessions of the debate were conducted, was one of the leading congregations of the Restoration Movement. Presbyterianism, too, was strong in the Blue Grass area; their leading western educational institution, Centre College, was located in Danville. Nowhere in the entire Ohio Valley could such an atmosphere of aristocratic culture and learning have been found for one of the greatest religious debates in the annals of American Christianity.[10]

In Nathan L. Rice, Campbell was to meet a very worthy opponent and one more versed in the area of debating than any he had faced in the past. Robert Richardson, who attended the debate, later wrote:

> It cannot be justly denied that throughout the discussion Mr. Rice manifested acuteness and ingenuity in bringing forward whatever could yield the slightest support to his cause, or that his efforts produced occasionally a marked impression on the audience. Having a musical voice and a pleasant countenance, with brilliant black eyes and hair, a confident and positive manner, an antagonistic style of gesticulation, he was well fitted to command attention.[11]

[10] Ibid., p. 190.

[11] Richardson, op. cit., p. 510.

Rice, a native of Kentucky, was younger than Campbell, having been born in Garrard County, December 19, 1807. The son of poor parents, Rice became a member of the Presbyterian church at the age of eighteen; and a year later (1826) he entered Centre College at Danville, Kentucky, where he remained for two years. Licensed to preach by the Transylvania Presbytery on October 4, 1828, he continued his education at Princeton Theological Seminary and was ordained in 1833.

In 1840, Rice moved to Paris, Kentucky and it was while he was preaching there that he met two prominent leaders of the Restoration Movement in public debate, Tolbert Fanning in 1842 and Alexander Campbell a year later. Rice continued to preach and debate after his encounter and was a thorn in the side of the Restoration Movement for some years.[12]

There was some disagreement on the propositions, but after some writing back and forth, the following propositions were taken up for the debate:

1. The immersion in water of a proper subject, into the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, is the one and only Apostolic or Christian Baptism.
2. The infant of a believing parent is a Scriptural subject of Baptism.
3. Christian Baptism is for the remission of sins.

[12]Carroll Brooks Ellis, The Controversial Speaking of Alexander Campbell, a dissertation: Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, 1949), p. 250.

4. Baptism is to be administered only by a Bishop or ordained Presbyter.

5. In conversion and sanctification, the Spirit of God operates only through the Word of Truth.

6. Human creeds, as bonds of union and communion, are necessarily heretical and schismatical.[13]

Campbell was the affirmative speaker on the first, third, fifth and sixth questions; and Rice was the affirmative on the second and fourth questions.

Henry Clay, the famed statesman, was chosen as chairman or moderator of the debate and many felt that it was because of his neutral feeling toward religion. He was a personal friend of Mr. Campbell and many felt that he accepted the chairmanship as a favor to Campbell. A writer for The Protestant Churchman, an Episcopal paper, said the following concerning Clay:

> The Honorable Henry Clay is understood to have been scrupulously careful after the debate, as well as during its progress, to abstain from all individual comparisons; whilst, at the same time, it is said that he expressed himself in terms of almost extravagant admiration of the mental powers, and occasional burst of eloquence, on the part of the Rev. Mr. Campbell[14]

The above quotation gives some idea of how Mr. Clay performed as a moderator.[15]

[13]Campbell-Rice Debate, op. cit., p. 47.

[14]Millenial Harbinger, op. cit., p. 326.

[15]Ellis, op. cit., p. 258.

Six general rules were agreed upon to govern both contestants, and they are as follows:

1. The terms in which the question in debate is expressed, and the point at issue, should be clearly defined, that there could be no misunderstanding respecting them.

2. The parties should mutually consider each other as standing on a footing of equality, in respect to the subject in debate. Each should regard the other as possessing equal talents, knowledge and a desire for truth with himself and it is possible, therefore, that he may be in the wrong, and his adversary in the right.

3. All expressions which are unmeaning, or without effect in regard to the subject in debate, should be strictly avoided.

4. Personal reflections on an adversary should, in no instance, be indulged.

5. The consequences of any doctrine are not to be charged on him who maintains it, unless he expressly avows them.

6. As truth, and not victory, is the professed object of controversy, whatever proofs may be advanced, on either side, should be examined with fairness and candor; and any attempt to answer an adversary by arts of sophistry or to lessen the force of his reasoning by wit, cavilling or ridicule, is a violation of the rules of honorable controversy.[16]

Setting for the Debate:

The contest began on November 15, and continued for sixteen days, closing December 1. The sessions were from ten until two

[16]Campbell-Rice Debate, op. cit., pp. 47, 48.

o'clock each day, except for two night sessions of two hours, making a total of seventy-two hours of actual debating. Two stenographers took down the entire discussion, which was published in 1844, with a certificate from Campbell and Rice to the effect that it was a "full exhibition of the facts, documents, and arguments used by us on the several questions debated." The published volume contained nine hundred and twelve pages of small print--more than half a million words.[17]

Great interest was manifested in Lexington before the debate began, much of which was of a partisan nature. Campbell's friends were foretelling a great victory. Some predicted that Rice would not even make a second speech.[18] The Cincinnati Gazette had a special reporter on the scene who sent back the following report of the interest stimulated by the event:

> This being the day appointed for a commencement of the long contemplated discussion between A. Campbell and Rev. N. L. Rice, the various avenues leading to Lexington have, for the last 48 hours, exhibited ample evidence of the widespread interest felt in this cause.
>
> Steamboats, stages, railroad cars, and vehicles of every variety were crowded with zealous partisans, lovers of excitement, lovers of debate and lovers of conflict, whether of body or of mind--all rushing to the scene, eager to secure good lodging and good places to see and be seen.[19]

[17]Ellis, op. cit., p. 258.

[18]John Waller, Western Baptist Review, September, 1845, p. 26.

[19]Ellis, op. cit., p. 259.

Campbell estimated that there were some hundred and fifty preachers present from various denominations . . . from New York to Louisiana, and from Philadelphia to Little Rock.[20]

On the first day of the debate there were two thousand people in the newly constructed Christian church. There were two thousand people in nearly all of the sessions to attest to the magnitude of the event. Not only were there large crowds present at each meeting, but the audience was apparently deeply interested. Each speaker was complimentary of the good conduct and interest of the audience. The correspondent of the Cincinnati Gazette stated:

> It is truly marvelous to see how multitudes of intelligent men and women can be thus enlisted, and kept for hours, days and weeks, enchained in breathless anxiety, as if their eternal welfare were in the scale . . . yes, and witnessed with copious streams of tears, of alternate grief and joy, from the eyes of many a worthy sire and matron, whose hopes of future happiness are connected with one or the other mode of belief.[21]

Campbell and Rice were very different in their presentation of attacks and the following sources indicate some of the differences and will give a good introduction to the analysis of Campbell's major ideas in the debate. A correspondent for the Protestant Churchman included the following comparison in his report of the Lexington debate:

[20]Millenial Harbinger, January, 1844, p. 1.

[21]Ellis, op. cit., p. 261.

> As I heard it described figuratively in a very animated manner, Mr. Campbell was like a heavy Dutch built man-of-war, carrying many guns, and of a very large calibre; whilst Mr. Rice resembled a daring and active Yankee privateer, who contrived by the liveliness of his movements and the ease with which he could take up his position for a raking fire, to leave his more cumbrous adversary in a very crippled condition at the close of the fight.[22]

His Lexington opponent, N. L. Rice, proved to be the most difficult opponent Campbell had ever encountered in public discussion.

Discussion of the Debate:

So the stage is set for one of the most interesting events in the life of Alexander Campbell. This event will give further insight into his style of preaching as compared to the philosophy that he advocated. This debate will be contrasted with the preceding debate to see if he executed anything differently. The method of presentation will be similar to the work in the preceding chapter. In the remainder of this chapter, we will examine the following areas: organization, argument and delivery. After each area is explored and analyzed, conclusions will be drawn, especially in comparison to his philosophy, but in some cases in comparison with the preceding chapter. It should be noted here that a copy of the original debate was available and it had been validated by Campbell and Rice.[23]

[22]Millenial Harbinger, op. cit., p. 326.

[23]A copy of the original debate was located at Northwest Christian College in Eugene, Oregon.

Organization:

At the beginning of the debate, Campbell recognized the importance of organization. He said:

> It is all important, sir, as you well know, to make a few points, to concentrate the mind upon them and to fortify them well with documentary proof. A multiplicity of matters confusedly thrown together, is neither so edifying nor so convincing as a few well selected and digested arguments properly arranged and fully elaborated. Without a distinctive method of arrangement, we might argue for years and prove nothing satisfactorily.[24]

The discussion of Campbell's organization in this debate will be divided into a discussion of his introductions and conclusions. Then to help to see his organization, there will be presented a complete outline of one of his point-support units, which will be the same unit discussed later in detail in the section under argument.

Campbell's introductions were always clearly separated from the body of the speech, and as a rule he provided sufficient transitional material for the audience to understand that a change had been made.

Campbell presented his arguments in an organized form which was easy to follow. He labeled his points by saying, "My first argument is," or "This for method's sake is my third argument."[25]

[24]Campbell-Rice Debate, op. cit., p. 286p.

[25]Ibid., p. 58.

After Campbell introduced a point, if he had a large amount of evidence to present, he numbered his authorities. For example, in the first proposition, on the action of baptism, his first argument was based on the proper meaning of the root "baptizo", from which the word baptism is derived. After stating his argument, he said, "My witnesses are so numerous that I must call them forth in classes, and hear them in detail. I shall first summon the Greek Lexicographers."[26]

Campbell's conclusions were usually just as definite as his introduction. They consisted of a summary of all his arguments. Here is an example to illustrate his use of the summary in talking about baptism:

> This is my last address on this proposition, and having to touch upon numerous topics, I must, therefore, touch upon them lightly. Most of the important matters have been repeatedly adverted to and gone to record; therefore, little need be said upon them. Whatever replies have been made to my regular argument, if I have not adverted to them, it is because I have not noted them down, or supposed them worthy of any special attention.
>
> The following items have been repeatedly adverted to or hinted at during the investigation of this question.[27]

He then briefly discussed the fifteen arguments that he had presented during the discussion, presenting just a short paragraph to illustrate and remind the audience what had been said. He was much more effective in this debate in this respect because his summaries were much more brief.

[26] Ibid., p. 59.

[27] Ibid.

Now, to help one see a complete example of Campbell's organization, I wish to outline one of his arguments. The argument will be taken from the first proposition:

> The immersion in water of a proper subject into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, is the one and only Apostolic or Christian Baptism.

Mr. Campbell chose to follow the course of the definition of the term baptism. This was his main objective and his supportive material came from many sources. The following is an example of the use of that pattern:

I. Definition of Baptism

   A. He discussed the importance of the word.

   B. He discussed the term from the concepts of the Old and New Testaments of the Bible.

   C. He then quoted fourteen language experts from the past to the present.

   D. He then quoted some classical writers and discussed their authority.

   E. He then concluded by comparing the ideas of the Scriptures with the writers he had quoted.[28]

As one follows this argument, the one really significant idea that stands out is Campbell's dependence upon a variety of sources of evidence. In this particular debate, the one

[28]This complete argument can be found on pages 111-117.

pattern that seems apparent is his desire to explore the question at hand from sources that are ancient to sources in the present and then to compare each.

It is apparent that Campbell spent much time in the preparation of the organization of the debate. His introductions and conclusions served the purpose, his arguments and evidence were labeled in an orderly manner, and he attempted to stay in that framework. As the discussion continues, it will be possible to see, through a complete example of argument and evidence, his method of organization.

Argument:

In discussing Campbell's philosophy of argument, one must again take into consideration that Campbell was not very explicit as to just what an argument really is. So, in order to make clear what is meant by the term, the following definition is repeated. An argument is the statement of a definite contention and the presentation of evidence in support of that contention. Campbell did relate three concepts that are relative to this discussion. They are: (1) the importance of arguments being complete and fully supported; (2) that arguments should be supported with evidence from the language in which it was written; and finally, (3) that the audience should be considered in the selection of material to be presented. In the Owen debate, Campbell was much concerned with audience

analysis and fully supported his materials, but in this debate he turned his attention to the importance of definition of terms and, at times, seemed to ignore the other concepts. With this background in mind, the discussion of the debate will begin.

The discussion of the first proposition began on Wednesday, November 15, and continued until Saturday, November 18. A session was held each day from ten o'clock until two and on Saturday evening an additional meeting was scheduled from six until eight o'clock. Twenty-two hours were devoted to this proposition, which in the published form occupies two hundred and twenty-three pages of small print. The major portion of this debate is built around the topic of baptism. Of the some nine hundred pages, over six hundred are taken up in discussion of this. Four of the six propositions come directly under the term baptism. Therefore, it is the purpose of this section to illustrate Campbell's use of argument from definition, with two arguments under the topic of baptism. The first will be under the question of immersion versus sprinkling or pouring as a mode of baptism. The use of argument from definition is the real point of concern, and the word under consideration is baptism. This question was not a new one nor unimportant one to the people of that day. Many early writers had written extensively on the subject. The point of difference between Campbell and Rice was one of long standing. Campbell affirmed

that immersion was the only mode of baptism authorized, while Rice contended that sprinkling or pouring was as acceptable as immersion. Therefore, the point of clash was upon the word only in the proposition. To support his position, Campbell attempted to define the word baptism.

Campbell began his discussion of the proposition by immediately talking about the specific meaning of the word, and he stated:

> Baptizo, confessedly a derivative from bapto, derives its specific meaning, as well as its radical and immutable form, from the ancient word. According to the usage of all languages, ancient and modern, derivative words legally inherit the specific, though not necessarily the figurative, meaning of their natural progenitors; and never can so far alienate from themselves that peculiar significance as to indicate an action specifically different from that intimated in the parent stock.[29]

He then applied this idea to the Greek Bapto and affirmed that through its more than 2,000 modifications it retains the specific idea of dipping or immersion, and never that of sprinkling. In an effort to make this idea clear to his entire audience, Campbell used the following illustration:

> A great majority of our citizens are better read in forests, fields and gardens than in the schools of philology or ancient languages. Agriculturists, horticulturists, botanists will fully comprehend me when I say, in all the dominions of vegetable nature, untouched by human art, as the root so is the stem, and so are the branches. If the root be

[29]Campbell-Rice Debate, op. cit., p. 55.

> oak, the stem cannot be ash, nor the branches cedar. What would you think, Mr. President, of the sanity or veracity of the backwoodsman who would affirm that he found a state of nature, a tree whose root was oak, whose stem was cherry, whose boughs were pear, and whose leaves were chestnut? If these grammarians and philologists have been happy in their analogies drawn from the root and branches of trees, to illustrate the derivation of words, how singularly fantastic and genius that creates a philological tree, whose root is bapto, whose stem is cheo, whose branches are rantizo, and whose fruit is Katharizo: Of, it not too ludicrous and preposterous for English ears, whose root is dip, whose trunk is pour, whose branches are sprinkle, and whose fruit is purification!
>
> My first argument, then, is founded on the root bapto, whose proper signification, all learned men say, is dip, and whose main derivative is baptizo--which, by all the laws of Philology and all the laws of nature, never can, never did, and never will signify to pour or to sprinkle.[30]

To further support this contention, Campbell affirmed that no translator, either ancient or modern, had ever rendered any derivative of bapto, to sprinkle. Throughout all Biblical translations, it has always been rendered by some word meaning to dip or immerse. It is significant to note that Campbell did define the Greek words which he had used in his illustration, which he did not do elsewhere in this debate or in the preceding debate. But one can see the importance he placed on definition in the discussion of his organization.

After presenting the proposition and defining the terms partially, for this entire argument is concerned with the

[30]Ibid., p. 57F.

definition of terms, he proceeded to present testimony from language experts and historical writers, both ancient and modern.

Campbell furthered the discussion by talking about material with which the audience was familiar. His first source of evidence came from the Old Testament of the Bible. This passage is taken from the writing of Moses in Leviticus the fourteenth chapter. Again, Campbell did not quote the story directly from the Scripture, but his method is illustrated in the following:

> In the law of Moses we have an ordinance for cleansing a leper; and I presume that my friend will admit that the cleansing of a leper from his disease was indicative of the cleansing of a sinner from his sins. It is remarkable that, in a single sentence of this chapter, the three words which are sometimes called baptism, are brought together in solemn contrast. They are found in the law for purifying the unclean, and cleansing the leper. Blood was to be sprinkled, oil was to be poured, hysop was to be dipped, and then after these ceremonies, the unclean was to bathe.[31]

After introducing the illustration in the above, Campbell proceeded to relate in detail the events of this and the contrast of the words:

> In giving a detailed account of these ceremonies, the inspired writer has presented these words in contrast thus: "And the priest shall take some of the log of oil, and pour it into the palm of his own left hand, and shall dip

[31] Ibid., p. 76.

> his right finger in the oil that is in his left hand, and shall sprinkle of the oil with the finger seven times before the Lord." In cleansing from the leprosy, the way is prepared first sprinkling with blood seven times, then the priest was to dip his finger in the olive oil and sprinkle that olive oil seven times before the Lord. First, blood was sprinkled upon the unclean, then oil was poured upon his head and afterwards he was commanded to wash his clothes, shave his hair, and bathe himself in water, that he might be clean.
>
> This is from the oldest record in the world. We have no writings more ancient than the five books of Moses. These have fixed an everlasting contrast between the words sprinkle, pour and dip--so that each must forever indicate a distance action, fixed among the legal ceremonies of a typical people. Since the time when the leper was cleansed by having blood sprinkled upon him, oil poured upon him, and his flesh bathed in water--from that time till now, these words have been used as distinct in meaning, and as immutable as the law of Moses.[32]

Campbell thought that he had made the distinction between the words clear. When Campbell had completed his study of the Scriptures in support of this argument, he turned to testimony, but still concerned with the usage and definition of the word baptizo. Campbell now made extensive use of language authorities. He quoted fourteen different lexicographers. The following is an example of how all were used:

> Scheusner, a name revered by orthodox theologians, and of enviable fame, says (Glasgow ed. 1824): Ist. Proprie, imergo ac intingo, in aquam imergo. Properly it signifies, I immerse, I dip, I immerse in water. 2nd, It signifies, I wash or cleanse by

[32] Ibid., p. 77.

> water--(quia haud rare aliquid immergi ac intigi in aquam solet ut lauetur)--because for the most part, a thing must be dipped or plunged into water, that it may be washed. Thus he gives the reason why baptizo figuratively means "to wash"--because it is frequently the effect of immersion.[33]

Campbell presented several more of these quotations in the manner as the above and attempted to relate the meaning of the word to show that it was the only form of baptism because of the practice of the early church and the meaning of the word.

When he had finished with the language experts, his next source of proof was classical writers. Campbell justified the introduction of classical writers as authority on the meaning of baptism by saying:

> The meaning of a word is ascertained by the usage of those writers and speakers, whose knowledge and acquirements have made them masters of their own languages. From this class of vouchers we derive most of our knowledge of Holy Writ, and of all the remains of Grecian literature and science. We indeed try the dictionaries by the classics, the extant authors of the language.[34]

Campbell then proceeded to read from twenty-three classical writers who used the word baptizo or some of its derivatives. The following is a typical example of such proof:

> Aristotle, de color, c. 4, says: By reason of heat and moisture, the colors enter into the pores of things dipped into them (tou baptimenou). De

[33] Ibid., p. 58.

[34] Ibid., p. 58.

> anima, iii, c. 12, if a man dips (bapsei) anything into wax, it is moved so far as it is dipped.[35]

In this example Campbell just wanted the audience to see the form of the word for baptism and relate that form to immersion or, in this case, dipping. He is less interested in the idea of the heat or the wax, but only in a presentation of a classical writer using the same term that is related in the Scriptures.

Campbell's ability to think and reason in comprehensive generalizations is graphically illustrated by the nature of the supports to which he appealed in this proposition. Instead of appealing to each passage of Scripture or each lexicographer as an argument to prove that immersion alone constitutes baptism, he appealed to great classes of evidence, often listing many authorities under each classification, as has been illustrated in the above material. He followed this same method under each proposition.

He concluded this proposition with a summary of all the contentions he made on the proposition and most especially emphasizing the importance of the definition of baptism. The other arguments under this proposition were all built around the argument from definition and the above material illustrates his use of this method.

The second example of Campbell's use of argument in this debate comes from the proposition that Christian baptism is

[35] Ibid., p. 58.

necessary for forgiveness of past sins. Campbell prefaced his remarks by talking about realization of this belief. Campbell said that he had believed this for twenty years and had written numerous articles in support of his conviction, but he had never before defended his belief as a formal debate proposition. Upon extensive study he had arrived at the true design and purpose of baptism. The result of the intensive study was:

> . . .Upon the simple testimony of the book itself, I came to a conclusion, proved by the Bible, which now appears from a thousand sources, to have been the catholic and truly ancient primitive faith of the whole church. It was in this commonwealth that his doctrine was first publicly promulgated in modern times; and, sir, it has now spread over this continent, and with singular success, is now returning to Europe, and the land of our fathers. My faith in it, sir, rests, however, neither upon the traditions of the church, nor upon any merely inferential reasonings of my own, nor those of any other man; but upon the explicit and often repeated declarations and explanations of the prophets and the apostles.[36]

Campbell's contents and supports centered around the many passages of Scriptures which are still used regularly by gospel preachers in discussing this question. It is my purpose to relate each of these Scriptures because Scripture was so important in this particular discussion and in the entire debate.

[36] Ibid., p. 472.

Campbell's first testimony from Scripture came from the passage of the Acts of the Apostles, Chapter two, verse thirty-eight. After studying the passage with emphasis on the expression "for the remission of sins," Campbell illustrated the meaning of Peter's statement with a parallel illustration:

> A rheumatic invalid asked a physician how he might be healed, and the doctor replied, "Go to the Virginia White Sulphur Springs, drink of the water and bathe in them, for the removal of your pains, and you shall enjoy a renovated constitution." Such a patient would rationally conclude that two things were necessary to his healing, drinking of the water and bathing in it. The physician gave no promise that the instruction would work.
>
> "Some of our ardent opponents, indeed, in the blindness of their zeal, have said that it ought to be read, because your sins are remitted." Campbell continued, "But, in the case before us, would not the people laugh the doctor to scorn who would say to the aforesaid invalid, "go to the White Sulphur Springs and drink the water, and bathe in it, because your pains are remitted?"[37]

Campbell contended that the Apostles immersed men on profession of penitence, or while confessing their sins, that they might reform. Hence, he baptized men in order to, or for the sake of reformation.

Campbell then spoke about the Great Commission which is found in Saint Matthew, Chapter 28, verses 19 and 20. The Great Commission commanded the Apostles to baptize the taught "into the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit."

[37] Ibid., p. 35.

Campbell reasoned, "Into always denotes change of position; a transition from one state to another. It makes boundaries."[38]

Campbell took another testimony, which was really a support of the main proposition from the letter that the Apostle Paul wrote to the church at Colassae, the second chapter, verses 12 through 15. Paul says: "We put off the body of the sins of the flesh," now here is the most beautiful allusion to circumcision imaginable. Here were those who still wanted after circumcision, Campbell reasoned. "To them the Apostle says, 'ye are complete in Christ;' you are not to be circumcised, which only takes off a mere atom of flesh; but the spiritual circumcision, which we have in being crucified with Christ, in being buried with him in baptism, cuts off without a knife, with a hand, the whole body of the sins of the flesh."[39] With this, Campbell was trying to destroy the idea that circumcision was the only thing necessary for cleansing of sins, and that baptism took care of the problem. Campbell further spoke:

> Baptism, my fellow-citizens, is no mere rite, no unmeaning ceremony, I assure you. It is a most intellectual, spiritual and sublime transition out of a sinful and condemned state, into a spiritual and holy state. It is a change of relation, not as respects the flesh, but the spirit. It is an introduction into the mystical body of Christ, by which he necessarily obtains the remission of his sins.

[38] Ibid., p. 443.

[39] Ibid., p. 440.

> No one can understand or enjoy the sublime and awful import of a burial with Christ; or a baptism into death, who does not feel that he is passing through a most solemn initiation into a new family; high and holy relations to the Father, as his Father and his God--to the Son, as his Lord and his Messiah--to the Holy Spirit, as his Sanctifier and Comforter. He puts off his old relations to the world, the flesh and Satan. Consequently, that moment he is adopted into the Family of God, and is personally invested with all the rights of a Citizen of the Kingdom of Heaven.[40]

The above helped to sum up somewhat the material he had been presenting from Scripture to support the idea that baptism is absolutely necessary. There have been just a few Scriptures alluded to here, but one can see how much he depended upon the Scripture in this proposition to prove his points. He had to take for granted the knowledge and faith the audience had in the authority of the Bible before he used these proofs, which shows his dependence upon effective audience analysis.

The question was concluded with a plea for the catholicity of his views. Arguing that he was far more catholic than the Presbyterians, he stated:

> Suppose now, one great convention of the Christian world had met to fix upon some basis of union and communion, and that they had agreed upon one single point--That whatever views were most generally believed, and first those that were universally believed, should be accepted and incorporated, instead of those believed by a minority.
>
> Baptism comes before the convention: the question is first upon the action; a part vote for sprinkling as valid baptism, a part vote for pouring, but all agree that immersion is right baptism. It is, therefore, put down as catholic, and the other two as sectarian.

[40]Ibid., p. 442.

> Finally, the design of baptism is canvassed. Some say it is a door into the church; others, a recognition that one is a member of the church; a third, that it is for the sake of christening, or giving a name. In none of these is there any approach to catholicity. But when it's being for a "pledge of remission of sins, and of our ingrafting into Christ," is offered, the whole world, Greek, Roman and all, unite in that view of it. This, then, is catholic, and the others sectarian.[41]

Campbell then concluded by asking, "Are we not, then most catholic on this subject? Why not, then, sacrifice that which is so sectarian and unite in one Lord, one faith and one immersion."[42]

Campbell gets them to agree on certain points and then draws the conclusion that we agree then it should be a simple and sensible thing to change to that which we all believe.

In summary, Campbell's use of argument in this debate, one can testify that Campbell depended a great deal upon argument from definition. His arguments again were not new. His use of argument from definition, as well as the examples of the second propositions in this debate, indicate his great dependence upon the use of Scripture as support.

Delivery:

The final area of discussion is, again, the delivery of Campbell. His idea on style or delivery is again that of naturalness; that style should be as conversational and

[41] Ibid., p. 560.

[42] Ibid.

extemporaneous as possible. In two instances, however, Campbell's practice was not consistent with his theory. The first is the style of delivery that Campbell used including his reaction to this audience and the technical language that was used.

Campbell seemed to be interested in two audiences--the immediate audience and the audience that would read the published book. Campbell seemed more possessed with speaking to two audiences in this debate than any of the others. It seems that Campbell was not as effective as he could have been because he did not center on the immediate audience. He was so concerned about getting his material into the book in a correct form that he read his first four affirmative speeches from manuscript.[43] Rice did not wait until after the debate to criticize Campbell for reading:

> It is truly marvelous that one of the greatest debators of the age . . .one who had, for the last thirty years, been engaged in this species of controversy, should find it necessary to read his arguments. Is it true, that he had defense of immersion prepared, "cut and dried," before the discussion commenced to be read to the audience? Cannot my friend sustain his cause by any other means? I never heard of but one man reading a speech in Congress; and I believe everybody laughed at him.[44]

[43] Ibid., p. 187.

[44] Ibid., p. 188.

Campbell defended himself by saying:

> My reading, it seems, is a great annoyance to my friend. The more concentrated arguments, exhibited in that form, require a more special attention than, as yet, he had bestowed on anything I have advanced . . . I have no preference for reading . . .the one great reason for my presenting these arguments in this form is, that they abound in criticism and matters somewhat minute, requiring great accuracy, which no stenographer in Christendom could rationally be expected to report.[45]

Some of the technical arguments just would not succeed with the immediate audience. On some points he introduced as many as twenty-five different authorities. This would make excellent source material, but would be difficult for the immediate audience to grasp.

On the other hand, if Campbell felt that a statement was not clear, he would go back and give a detailed explanation. For example, he said:

> I am told, however, I am not fully understood. The oft repeated and important distinction of generic and specific terms. I shall, therefore, once and for all more fully deliver myself on this essential difference.[46]

Mr. Campbell attempted to make the material interesting and vivid by the use of figures of speech and picturesque language. For example, he referred to the Arian creed as "the vagaries of those moon struck theologians." Of the

[45] Ibid., p. 194.

[46] Ibid., p. 99.

operation of the Holy Spirit on infants, he said: "these infant regenerators are lame in both limbs, in the right limb of faith, and in the left limb of philosophy of mind. They move on crutches, and broken crutches, too."[47]

Closely associated with this technique was his use of "purple patches," highly emotional and imaginative language in extended descriptions of God, Christ, Liberty, Truth and the Bible.[48] The extent to which Campbell used these can be seen by the following passage on truth:

> Truth, my friends, Holy Truth, stands upon the Rock of Ages. It lifts its head above the clouds--above the stars. It communes with God. It holds sweet converse with the hierarchies around the throne of the Eternal King; with those elders, sons of light, and with the spirits of the mighty dead. It is the bright effluence of the bright essence of the uncreated mind. God spoke, and Truth was born. Its days are the years of God. Embodied in the Word of God, it came down from Heaven and became incarnate. It is, therefore, immortal and cannot be killed. It will survive all its foes, and stand erect when every idol falls. No one knows its gigantic strength. It has been cast down, but never destroyed. For ages past, it has been gathering strength and preparing for a mightier conflict yet, than time records. It needs no fleshly wisdom, not worldly policy, to give it power to gain its victory. It is, itself, redeeming, soul redeeming, and disenthralling. It has passed through fire, and flood and tempest, and is as fresh, as fair, as beautiful, and as puissant as ever. I feel myself peculiarly happy in being permitted, in being honored, to stand up for it, when most insulted and disparaged by its professed friends. He that

[47] Ibid., p. 614.

[48] Ellis, p. 318.

> defends it feels strength of mountains, as though girded with the everlasting hills. It gives him more than moral strength and enlarges his benevolence wide as humanity itself.[49]

One can note Campbell's attempt to present the majesty of the Word of God and Truth. Nevertheless, it would seem to disagree with his idea that the speaker should keep the material as simple as possible. Yet, such passages usually came at the end of Campbell's speeches, and they were always in harmony with the point presented.

Finally, on occasions, Campbell utilized most of the methods of audience analysis except humor. There are only four times recorded in the debate that Campbell made the audience laugh. Rice, on the other hand, had them laughing in most of his speeches, usually at Campbell's expense. Campbell rebuked Rice for causing laughter over matters "involving the world's destiny," and never employed humor himself.[50]

In summation, Mr. Campbell seemed to come alive more with more picturesque language than he did in the other debate, and yet his reading so much of the material also seemed to take away from the impact of the discussion. In his explanation of the reading, Campbell tried to explain that he was only trying to present the material as accurately as he could, hence the reading. It is the opinion of this writer that since the material is not any more difficult here than before, the need

[49]Campbell-Rice Debate, op. cit., p. 892.

[50]Ellis, op. cit., p. 320.

for having the material completely written out was not necessary. Campbell also violated his philosophy of naturalness in trying to be natural for both audiences--the immediate audience and the reading audience. It would be impossible for the audience to follow even half of the seventy-five arguments that were presented with an abundance of evidence. For the sake of the immediate audience, Campbell should have thought about the reading audience at a later time.

Campbell's vocabulary and his use of foreign language also stood out in this debate. It would seem that the average person would have trouble understanding not only the technical language, but some of the so-called picturesque language.

Summary:

The performance, in comparison to the confrontation with Owen, can truly be called a debate. There was foundation between the two contestants and a set of principles laid out. The two men crossed each other many times during the debate and this helped to keep the audience on the edge of their seats as witnesses of the debate seem to indicate. Rice's picking at the personality and character of Campbell caused some concern. He responded in the same manner and in reality violated the principles of kindness and sincere search for the truth which he advocated.

There is not much indication that the setting and background of the debate had any particular advantage for either of the debators. Both men made comments about the great religious feeling in that part of the country. Campbell was upset from the very beginning about the possibility of meeting a man that he did not feel was sincerely interested in finding the truth, and this was very evident throughout the debate.

Campbell's pattern of organization again follows the topical-chronological idea. It might be observed that he presented a more effective plan in the Owen debate. The introductions and conclusions seemed to play a more prominent role in the Rice debate, or at least they were more thought out. At any rate, it is apparent that Campbell had given great consideration to his organization and seemed to try to follow his pattern.

One can be impressed with Campbell's knowledge of the original language and his ability to take a passage apart. He did this especially well in his discussion of the word Baptizo and his application of it to his arguments.

The use of the Bible in argument was more prevalent in this debate in relation to the Owen debate. Campbell and Rice had reached an agreement on the Bible as the supreme authority, and in contrast, there was no such understanding in the Owen debate. Campbell applied passages in the Old Testament as well as in the New. He would introduce each passage,

apply the context, and make the application to the point and then close with what others said about it.

Finally, in the development of his arguments, Campbell stressed the importance of the subject, frequently gave a brief historical background, defined the terms, and narrowed the arguments. In his attempt to give the reading audience more material, he probably presented too many arguments. The immediate audience must have suffered.

Just as in the Owen debate, Campbell probably presented too much material for a listening audience to comprehend. This came from his second purpose of presenting detailed material for a book. Campbell used the Bible and Bible related sources in most of his evidence. In referring to the Scripture, he would give an introduction to each verse and describe it in context and then give a brief explanation. In the use of his evidence he was also concerned with the need to refer to church fathers and leaders of other churches. He attempted to enhance his own credibility by the presentation of evidence from those who did not believe as he did, but would make observations that would serve to prove his point. Among these church fathers were Martin Luther, John Calvin, John Wesley, and Archbishop Richard Whately.

It is generally agreed that Campbell used too much evidence to prove each point. Campbell was so engulfed in the importance of proving a point and attempting to present it in a way that would sway the most stubborn skeptic, he

may not have realized the point at which he should stop. Yet, it is possible that the real reason was the fact that he wanted to publish the material for use of other Christians in defense of the principles that he presented. The following is a testimony to the effectiveness of the printed debate. The Rev. J. H. Brown, the man who held the long correspondence with Mr. Campbell arranging the propositions to be discussed, purchased for two thousand dollars the copyright of the printed debate, and made an effort to circulate it. As to the outcome of the strenuousity of Presbyterians to give the work an adequate circulation, a contemporary, familiar with the facts, testifies:

> It was soon found, however, that the effect of the printed discussion upon the public mind was quite different from what the party expected, and they were mortified to perceive that it was making many converts to Mr. Campbell's view but not to Presbyterianism. Upon this, Mr. Brown gladly disposed of his copyright, for a small sum, to a member of the Christian Church at Jacksonville, Illinois, C. D. Roberts, who immediately printed a large edition of the book, which has been since patronized and circulated by the Reformers. Results have shown that whatever personal distinction or notoriety the debate may have given Mr. Rice, it certainly added nothing to Presbyterianism, which in Kentucky continued still to decline while that of the Restoration steadily prospered.[52]

It is very possible that Mr. Campbell achieved the success he had hoped to achieve by offering so much evidence. It is still this writer's contention that the public audience suffered because of it.

[52]Ellis, op. cit., p. 230.

Campbell was again guilty of using too much technical and foreign language in the debate. His discussions of many words and their roots proved to have the opposite effect on many people in the immediate audience. They lost Campbell in his technical discussions of the words, and while they were lost their minds must have wandered in many directions.

Campbell's insistence upon reading so much of the material violated his philosophy of naturalness and simplicity. His justification of the reading, because of his desire to publish the debate was also not adequate, for it hindered the understanding of the immediate audience.

In summation, briefly: (1) Campbell's organization was effective as it was in the Owen debate. He had prepared his material; (2) The use of argument was very effective, with the exception of presenting too many arguments, a matter of poor judgment. This was apparent in both debates; (3) Campbell's style of delivery seemed to violate his principles of effective speech. His continued insistence upon speaking in technical language was a hinderance to the audience. He was much better in explaining terms in the Rice debate than the debate with Owen.

The Rice debate is without a doubt one of the greatest accomplishments for Mr. Campbell. It does illustrate to me his application of the philosophy that he advocated. Although

there are some marks of controversy, especially in language and amount of evidence, it is fairly evident that Mr. Campbell was, in fact, only interested in the cause of truth and was trying his best to speak for that truth in an effective manner.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS AND OBSERVATIONS

The introduction to this thesis promised to reveal Alexander Campbell's philosophy of speech and the degree to which he followed that philosophy in two of his outstanding debates. This final chapter will, therefore, present the conclusions derived from the analysis in previous chapters. The following form will be used in presenting these conclusions: First, a summary of the concepts in Campbell's philosophy; and second, a summary of the extent to which he followed those concepts in practice. These concepts will be discussed in terms of argument, organization and delivery. These conclusions will be followed by some general observations.

Conclusions:

In Campbell's rules for "composing and pronouncing sermons," taken with the principles which he sought to emphasize and practice, an approximate picture of the man's philosophy of speech is given. He was disdainful of anything artificial or mechanical. His emphasis was upon the character and sincerity of the speaker's speech content, clear organization, simplicity, and dignity of language, with direct

unaffected delivery. Public speaking to him was not a display, but a practical means of accomplishing certain goals. The whole basis of Campbell's ideas on preaching was built around the concept of sincerity through naturalness.[1]

Organization:

Campbell was aware of the importance of organization. It was his conviction that arguments and evidence should be arranged so that the audience would have a chance to make up their minds about the material.[2] Campbell expressed a desire for unity of design, with each point connecting naturally, with each item labeled so that the complete understanding could be reached.[3]

In both debates Campbell exhibited a desire for complete organization. In the Owen debate, he presented the plan he intended to follow and the criteria that he planned to use.[4] The basic type of organization used in the Owen debate was most often a topical-chronological pattern. For example, he divided the arguments into topics and then spoke on each. The discussion of each topic would begin with a look at Scripture, then proceed to language experts in each time period. He used testimonies from both ancient authorities and from contemporary

[1] cf., p. 44.

[2] cf., p. 47.

[3] cf., p. 73-76.

[4] cf., p. 75.

men of faith.[5] This particular pattern was not stated outright in Campbell's philosophy, but it does fulfill Campbell's desire for each point following in a natural manner and does give some guidelines for the audience to follow. It should be pointed out that in at least one of the two debates, he presented more than his initial contentions.

In the Rice debate, Campbell showed a great concern for proper organization in the introductory remarks. He was concerned with the background material and the setting of the stage for the debate. He took great care in the definition of terms in the Rice encounter, making sure that the audience understood what he was talking about.[6] Campbell could have been more complete in his definition of terms in the Owen debate, but other than that, his introductory remarks were clear.

Campbell made an extensive use of transitional statements in both debates that probably enhanced the audienc's understanding. He seemed very interested in seeing that the audience was able to follow him from one point to the next. So, he paid particular attention to conclusions and transitions.[7]

The basic conclusions drawn from these comparisons are that Campbell seemed most interested in labeling his material,

[5] Ibid.

[6] cf., pp. 113, 114.

[7] cf., p. 76.

and setting the criteria forth, in both debates, so that the audience could follow easily. The chronological-topical pattern seemed to help accomplish this purpose. The only contradiction seemed to be his lack of clear definition of terms, especially in the Owen debate, and to a certain extent in the Rice debate.

Argument:

Concerning Campbell's use of argument, he was most interested in seeing that the logic was presented in a complete, orderly manner. Campbell was particularly against what he called textual preachers. This type of preaching took the ideas out of context or relied primarily on one phrase for the text of an entire lesson.[8]

Campbell stressed two other points in his use of argument and they were concerned with the use of root meanings of words. He felt that it was important to go to the original language to illustrate a point.[9] The other concept was adhering to what the audience could understand. Campbell felt that it was important to talk on the level of the audience to help complete understanding.[10] There was at least one inconsistency between philosophy and practice in the complete definition of terms. Campbell always started an argument by defining terms, but in the course of the discussion he would use terms that the

[8] cf., pp. 46-47.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Ibid.

audience could not possibly understand. On the other hand, he quoted a great deal from the Bible because he knew that it would be familiar material for the audience.[11]

Another inconsistency was in the amount of material presented in the debates. There are seventy-five questions or arguments in the Rice-Campbell debate and the immediate audience could not possibly follow all of the arguments. This abundance of arguments was a violation of his philosophy of naturalness and simplicity. This violation probably came about because Campbell knew that both debates were going to be published and he wanted to make sure that all of his material would be in the writing of the text. This concern made it very difficult for the immediate audience.

Campbell followed his philosophy in the use of argument for the most part. Campbell was concerned with complete support and seemed to strive for this. There seems to be only two major conflicts with his philosophy: In the definition of terms and the presentation of too many arguments for the immediate audience.

Delivery:

In Campbell's philosophy of delivery he was most concerned with effectiveness. He recognized conversational speaking as the most effective and felt that it should be extemporaneous.

[11]cf., pp. 78-82.

Campbell based this concept on the idea that as one would talk face to face with a friend in the parlour, he should exercise the same idea in speaking to an audience.[12]

There seem to be two areas in which Campbell violated this philosophy. First, he read several of his speeches in the Rice debate, moving away from the naturalness that he advocated. He did this to such an extent that his opponent raised a question about it.[13]

The other area involved was in his sudden use of eloquent pleas. These eloquent pleas were not consistent with the natural, conversational manner that he advocated.[14] Although this concept was contradictory to his philosophy, it appears to this writer that more of this type of delivery would have made some of the many arguments and abundant evidence come alive.

Observations:

Aside from the above mentioned conclusions, the author would like to present some observations in the closing pages of this work.

From the research of the preceding pages, Campbell seemed to follow his theory most effectively in terms of organization, argument and evidence.

[12]cf., pp. 53-54.

[13]cf., p. 117.

[14]cf., pp. 117-118.

Another observation worthy of mention is in the application of Scriptures. The overwhelming amount of evidence came from secular sources. What were the reasons for this? First, it was Campbell's technique to select a few representative passages of Scripture upon the question involved and analyze them thoroughly, rather than briefly introduce an array of Biblical quotations. This reasoning came about because of his desire not to be like the textuaries, who were content to take a word or passage out of context and use that for proof. When Campbell used Scripture as a support, he made sure that everyone understood the context, background and definition of terms. Therefore, it was his opinion that a few well organized Scriptures would be more effective than a great deal of Biblical references. Second, the Bible was not suitable evidence for many of the propositions discussed. Even with this in mind, in my estimation, Campbell can be criticized for not bringing the Bible more effectively into his arguments. The guiding principle of the Restoration Movement was: "Speaking where the Bible speaks, and being silent where it is silent."[15] It is somewhat inconsistent that Campbell did not make the Bible his most frequent source of evidence even though it was his primary source.

When the study began, the writer thought he had in mind what he would find out in the study of Alexander Campbell. I

[15]Earl I. West, The Search for the Ancient Order, Vol. I, (Nashville: The Gospel Advocate Co., 1949), p. 58.

knew that he was a popular figure, and that he was especially well known in conservative churches. I had read that his delivery was not dynamic and that he was a very brilliant scholar. Yet, in my study I was surprised to find that a man with so much ability and with a background as strong as his could make some of the mistakes that I have described in this thesis. It proves to me what an in-depth study can do in really finding out about a particular subject or person. It is hoped that this thesis has at least partially answered the question posed. It is hoped that the religious person can understand the need Alexander Campbell showed to find the truth and express as best he could the truth he had found. Those who read this should recognize what can happen in communication when one gets caught up in the message. Campbell was so compelled with the urgency of his message that he showed some weakness in his presentation of the truths he found. His error in providing too many arguments and too much evidence can be explained in this desire to share the truth he had found. The concept of too many unexplained definitions is very hard to understand. He was a brilliant man and just failed to bring much of his material down to the level of the audience. He should have been more concerned with the needs of the immediate audience. This, along with the desire to share the truth, are the two basic reasons why there were these shortcomings in Campbell's application of his philosophy.

SOURCES CONSULTED

Books:

Armitage, Thomas, A History of the Baptist, New York, 1889.

Ashby, Leo, Influence of Alexander Campbell Upon the Separation of Disciples and Baptists in Kentucky, Dissertation, University of Kentucky, Lexington, 1948.

Campbell, Alexander and Owen, Robert, The Evidence of Christianity, a debate, Nashville: McQuiddy Publishing Co., 1946.

Campbell, Rev. A., and Rice, N. L., On the Action, Subject, Design and Administrator of Christian Baptism, a debate, Lexington: A. T. Skillman and Son, 1844.

Campbell, Selima Huntington, Home Life and Reminiscenses of Alexander Campbell, St. Louis: John Burns, 1882.

Cole, G. D. H., Robert Owen, Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1925.

Davidson, Robert, History of the Presbyterian Church in the State of Kentucky, New York: 1847.

Davis, M. M., How the Disciples Began and Grew, Cincinnati: The Standard Publishing Co., 1915.

Ellis, Carroll Brooks, The Controversial Speaking of Alexander Campbell, a dissertation: Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, 1949.

Fitch, Alger Morton, Alexander Campbell, Preacher of Reform and Reformer of Preaching, Austin, Texas: Sweet Publishing Co., 1970.

Flint, Timothy, Recollections of the Last Ten Years, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1932.

Flint, Timothy, The History and Geography of the Mississippi Valley, Cincinnati: E. H. Flint and L. R. Lincoln, Publishers, 1832.

Fortune, Alonzo W., Origin and Development of the Disciples of Christ, St. Louis, 1924.

Books: (Cont.)

Garrison, Winfred E., Religion Follows the Frontier, New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1931.

Grafton, Thomas, Life of Alexander Campbell, St. Louis: Christian Board of Publication, 1897.

Haley, J. J., Debates that Made History, St. Louis: Christian Board of Publication, 1920.

Hayden, A. S., A History of the Disciples on the Western Reserve, Cincinnati: Chase, Hall Publishers, 1875.

Hudson, John A., The Man and the Movement, A Study in the Life of Alexander Campbell, Cincinnati, 1927.

Humble, Bill J., Campbell and Controversy, Florida Christian College: Old Paths Book Club, 1952.

Mattox, F. W., The Eternal Kingdom, Delight, Arkansas: Gospel Light Publishing Co., 1961.

McLean, Archibald, Alexander Campbell as a Preacher, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1955.

McMaster, John B., A History of the People of the United States, 8 volumes, New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1914.

Moore, William Thomas, A Comprehensive History of the Disciples of Christ, New York: Fleming R. Revell Company, 1909.

Owen, Robert, The Life of Robert Owen, New York: G. Bell and Sons, Ltd., 1920.

Renwick, A. M., The Story of the Church, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdman's Publishing Co., 1958.

Richardson, Robert, Memoirs of Alexander Campbell, Cincinnati: Standard Publishing Co., 1897.

Rogers, James R., The Can Ridge Meeting House To Which Is Appended The Autobiography of B. W. Stone, Cincinnati: The Standard Publishing Co., 1910.

Rogers, William R., Recollections of Men of Faith, St. Louis, 1869.

Books: (Cont.)

Stone, Barton W., Biography of Elder Barton Warren Stone, Cincinnati: J. A. and U. P. James, 1847.

Thonssen, Lester, and Baird, A. Craig, Speech Criticism, New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1948.

Trollope, Frances, Domestic Manners of the Americans, New York: Dodd Mead and Co., 1927.

Ware, Charles Crosfield, Barton Warren Stone, St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1932.

West, Earl I., The Search for the Ancient Order, 2 volumes, Nashville: The Gospel Advocate Co., 1949.

Williams, John A., Life of Elder John Smith, Cincinnati: Standard Publishing Co., 1870.

Periodicals:

Christian Baptist, Edited by Alexander Campbell, July, 1823 to July, 1830, Seven volumes in one, revised by S. S. Burnet, no date, St. Louis, Missouri.

Fanning, Tolbert, Sketches in the Life of Alexander Campbell, Gospel Advocate, May 15, 1866, Nashville, Tennessee.

Lard, Moses E., Lard's Quarterly, 2 Volumes, 1863 to 1868, Frankfurt, Kentucky.

Millenial Harbinger, Edited by Alexander Campbell, 1830 to 1850, Bethany, West Virginia.

Ohio History, Volume 79, Winter 1970, Number 1, The Ohio Historical Society, Columbus, Ohio.

Sweet, William S., "Campbell's Position in Church History," Christian Evangelist, September 8, 1938, St. Louis, Missouri.

Waller, John M., "Messrs. Campbell and Rice on the Influence of the Holy Spirit," Western Baptist Reivew, September, 1845, Frankfurt, Kentucky.

Wrather, Eva Jean, "Alexander Campbell," The Christian Evangelist, September 8, 1938, St. Louis, Missouri.