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Harvard University has for many years enjoyed an aura of tradition and leadership in the world of education. It was almost a truism that in the "academic" past of the United States, the Harvard scholar represented the epitome of American education.

Harvard has been first in many of the developments and innovations in education. Among these many firsts, the Boylston Chair of Rhetoric and Oratory has enjoyed a position of eminence. It was the first of its kind in the United States. It is not for this reason alone, however, that the Boylston Chair has significance. It has provided an opportunity for teaching which has had significance as a force in the area of speech education on a nationwide basis. Further, as a result of the efforts of Boylston professors contributions have been made to American society in general. To understand the effects of America's first Chair of rhetoric it is necessary to look to the teachings of the men who have occupied the Chair:

John Quincy Adams 1806-1809  
Joseph McKean 1809-1818  
Edward Tyrrel Channing 1819-1851
Francis J. Child 1851-1876
Adams Sherman Hill 1876-1904
Le Baron Russell Briggs 1904-1925
Charles Townsend Copeland 1925-1928
Robert S. Hillyer 1937-1944
Theodore Spencer 1946-1949
Archibald MacLeish 1949-

This study is an attempt to tell the story of the work of these great teachers, whose common bond was their title - Boylston Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose and scope. The purpose of this study is to trace the development of the philosophy of rhetoric in the Boylston Chair of Rhetoric and Oratory at Harvard University from 1804 to 1958. Specific emphasis is given to the effects of the teachings of the occupants of the Boylston Chair on the development of speech education in the United States.

This purpose has been implemented by a detailed examination and an analysis of the rhetorics of John Quincy Adams, the first holder of the Boylston Chair, Joseph McKean, Edward Tyrrel Channing and Adams Sherman Hill. Careful investigation was made into the interests of other holders of the Boylston Chair - Francis J. Child, Le Baron Russell Briggs, Charles Townsend Copeland, Robert S. Hillyer, Theodore Spencer and the present incumbent, Archibald MacLeish.

The critical analyses of the four philosophies of rhetoric of Adams, McKean, Channing and Hill as they applied to speech education, have been outlined in chronological fashion and have been prefaced by a general history of the foundation and development of the Boylston
Chair. One chapter has been devoted to those Boylston professors who did not produce in organized form a "rhetoric" and, finally, a chapter was added for the purpose of comparing the philosophies of rhetoric held by the men whose work was central to this study.

An attempt has been made to take into account the influences originating from administrative bodies at Harvard University. Records of the College Overseers and of those administrators who had a direct connection with the Boylston Chair of Rhetoric and Oratory at Harvard have been included. Influences from outside Harvard University were examined in an attempt to gauge the extent to which these influences or pressures affected the teachings of the occupants of the Boylston Chair.

Finally, an effort was made to determine the effects of the teachings of those who occupied the Boylston Chair on speech education in the United States.

Importance of study. During the past sixty years the academic discipline of speech has become recognized throughout the United States. The importance of speech in the curriculum is indicated by the fact that as late as 1900 there were no speech departments in colleges and universities in the United States, while in
1958 there were over 600.

The recent and relatively unique volume A History of Speech Education in the United States, edited by Karl Wallace in 1954, is not simply a representation of the sixty years during which training in speech has been a part of the educational curriculum, but of the whole of American educational history. The roots of speech education extend widely into the bedrock of American educational tradition. Training in speech has been inherent in American democracy. Extracurricular activities and public college exercises in declamation and forensics played an active part in the lives of students in the earliest days of the United States. During colonial days, public commonplace, orations and disputations were prominent in education.

This volume by Wallace was one of the first of


3George V. Bohman, "Rhetorical Practice in Colonial
its kind. In his preface, Wallace commented on the limitations and achievements involved in the work which his book represented.

Readers, however, should not regard the chronological progression as an attempt to write definitive history. Before a "final" history of speech education can be prepared, we need the work of many future scholars who will furnish the facts as to who taught what, and where, and how. We believe, nevertheless, that the studies included here supply significant information and afford interpretations which must be reckoned with by future historians of the subject. They organise much that has already been done; they offer much that is new.

This study of the Boylston Chair of Rhetoric and Oratory was designed to supplement broader histories, such as Wallace's volume. Further, the study was considered to be, in part, an answer to the "need of the work of many future scholars." Since this endowed Chair was one of the very first attempts to make speech training an organised curricular activity in the American educational process, it is strange that

---


there is still a need for intensive study. Its im-
portance and its neglect are strangely incongruous.

Since the days of the Chair's origin (1771-1806) the men who occupied the office of Boylston Lecturer have, directly and indirectly, influenced the course of speech education in the United States. To examine the philosophies of the men who held the Boylston Chair was to review practically all of the philosophies of speech education as they have appeared and reappeared in more recent days. Until 1900, the trend of education in this Chair was a "picture in miniature" of speech education in the United States as it developed on a broader national scale. More recent developments however were not typical.

Classical rhetoric in the Boylston Chair was repre-
resented in the persons of John Quincy Adams and Joseph McKeen. The "communications" approach to speech train-
ing was outlined by Edward Tyrrel Channing. Francis J. Child was one of the first to introduce philology into the American curriculum. Adams Sherman Hill represented the grammarian's approach to rhetoric. Le Baron Russell Briggs followed in Hill's footsteps by approaching rhetoric as the principles behind English written com-
position. Charles Townsend Copeland, known especially
for his *Reader* took the point of view of those who today are interested in oral interpretation. More recent occupants of the chair, Robert S. Hillyer, Theodore Spencer and Archibald MacLeish, have approached their duties as Boylston Lecturer from the standpoint of poetics, emphasizing poetry and drama. The variety represented here is striking and, at the same time, inviting to the student of speech education.

To the teacher of speech, the analysis and the comparison of these various philosophies were basic to an understanding of the development of American rhetorical theory. To the individual who was interested in education in general, this study should be of importance because the speakers and writers who graduated from Harvard University and were affected by the Boylston Chair have been in many cases prominent in the history of the United States. In some cases the students who were influenced by this Chair have decidedly influenced the thinking and actions of Americans to this day.

Thomassen and Baird in *Speech Criticism* indicated...
that Theodore Parker was greatly influenced by John Quincy Adams' *Lectures on Rhetoric and Oratory.* Theodora Parker's influence in turn was extensive. In Mildred Berry's work on Lincoln, Parker was reputed to be the man from whose work Lincoln was inspired to make his most immortal statement. For when Lincoln read Parker's lecture entitled *Effect of Slavery on the American People* he underlined these words, "democracy is direct self-government, over all the people, for all the people, by all the people."

It seems worthwhile to indicate further the influence of the Boylston Chair on American thought and life in general. The host of great men whom the Chair affected is highly impressive. Ralph Waldo Emerson won the Boylston Prize for Oratory as an undergraduate of Harvard. In his journals Emerson made note of the impact of rhetoric and oratory at Harvard upon his life and works. Wendell Phillips distinguished


10Theodore T. Stenberg, "Emerson and Oral Discourse,"
himself in declamation under the guidance of Edward T. Channing and John Barbour. Barbour’s training in speech, said Phillips, was the "best ever offered any student." 11 Charles Eliot’s one bright spot in an otherwise dull education was public speaking and declamation. 12 Charles Summer was enrolled in Rhetoric and Oratory at Harvard. 13 In addition to those already cited, Henry Thoreau, Richard Henry Dana II, John Lothrop Motley, Francis Parkman and Oliver Wendell Holmes were all students affected by the lectures and teaching of the Boylston Professors of Rhetoric and Oratory. 14


Alan Seeger, Stuart P. Sherman, Conrad Aiken, Robert Benchley, E. E. Cummings, George Boas, Kenneth I. Brown, Bernard De Voto, John Dos Passos, Robert Hillyer, Kenneth MacGowan, Heywood Broun, T. S. Eliot, Brooks Atkinson, Walter Lippmann, Robert Sherwood and Van Wyck Brooks were among the hundreds to have been affected by Boylston Professors.15 Earnest Brandenburg and Waldo Braden have told of an interesting comment made in an interview with Mrs. Franklin Delano Roosevelt. She said, "Roosevelt [F.D.R.] became one of 'Copey's' [Charles Townsend Copeland, the seventh Boylston Professor] many friends and often spoke in later years of the enthusiasm with which he and his classmates gathered to hear this stimulating teacher read from the Bible and from eminent English and American authors."16


It is difficult to disagree with Everett Lee Hunt, when, in reviewing the *Copeland Reader*, he referred to the Boylston Chair in these terms, "The men who have occupied this chair, the books they have written, and the educational influence they have wielded have made it easily the most distinguished chair of rhetoric and oratory in America."\(^{17}\) This statement concerning the wide-ranging influence of the Boylston Chair is representative of similar statements in other works. References to the Boylston Chair and the men who occupied it are considered under the heading of *Related studies*.

**Related studies.** Little concentrated effort has yet been made to analyze critically the development of speech education as it has taken place in the Boylston Chair of Rhetoric and Oratory at Harvard University. Some references to the family of Boylston, prominent in colonial days and after the Revolution, are to be found in American histories. Harry Carman and Harold Syrett, for example, referred to the Boylston family "in the same breath" with the Pickmans of Massachusetts and the DeLanceys of New York.\(^{18}\)


In addition to occasional references to the Boylston family of New England in general histories, there are specific references to the Boylston Chair of Rhetoric and Oratory in a wide variety of sources. In *The Flowering of the New England Mind* by Van Wyck Brooks there are many specific references to the Boylston Chair as a force in the making of the "Golden Age" of American Literature. It is mentioned from time to time in various histories written about Harvard University. A section in S. E. Morison's *Development of Harvard* and several references in Josiah Quincy's *History of Harvard University* are examples in point.

Brief references to the Boylston Chair have been made in several speech texts of recent years. These references are generally made in connection with the Lectures of John Quincy Adams. Adams was quoted in Gilman, Aly and Reid's *The Fundamentals of Speaking*.

---


McBurney and Wrase's *The Art of Good Speech*, 23 Brigan-
ance's *Speech Composition*, 24 and Bryant and Wallace's
*Oral Communication*. 25

Some individuals who have occupied the Boylston
Chair have been studied in detail. Horace Rahskopf
wrote his doctoral dissertation on *John Quincy Adams:*
Speaker and Rhetorician. This dissertation was put
into article form in 1946, and published in the *Quar-
terly Journal of Speech*. 26 Lousene Rousseau, in a
1916 edition of the *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 27
published an article on John Quincy Adams, comparing
his work with Cicero's. She concluded that John Quincy
Adams copied from the works of Cicero and, consequently,

23 James H. McBurney and Ernest J. Wrase, *The Art of

24 William Norwood Briganee, *Speech Composition*
(New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1953),
p. 23 and pp. 318-319.

25 Donald C. Bryant and Karl Wallace, *Oral Communi-
cation* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc.,

26 Horace Rahskopf, "John Quincy Adams: Speaker
and Rhetorician," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 32:
435-441, December, 1946.

27 Lousene Rousseau, "The Rhetorical Principles of
Cicero and Adams," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech,*
could be justifiably dubbed a "copier."

Dorothy Anderson wrote a doctoral dissertation on the teachings of Edward Tyrrel Channing and subsequently wrote two articles for the Quarterly Journal of Speech in 1947\(^\text{28}\) and 1949\(^\text{29}\) on Edward Tyrrel Channing's philosophy of rhetoric and his methods as a teacher.

Other comments on the Boylston Chair or those men who occupied it have been singular and somewhat hurried in nature. Warren Guthrie in his article, The Development of Rhetorical Theory in America, which was published in four parts in Speech Monographs in 1946, 1947, 1948, and 1949, touched on the Boylston Chair from an oblique rather than a direct angle.\(^\text{30}\) Scattered comments concerning the Boylston Chair were found in the books A History of Speech Education in the United States\(^\text{31}\)


and A History and Criticism of American Public Address. Donald Goodfellow's article in the New England Quarterly deserves also to be mentioned because it represents the only purely historical study of John Quincy Adams' connection with the Boylston Chair. Essential information concerning the origin of the Chair was given emphasis in this article. Ronald Reid of the University of Washington, St. Louis, Missouri, has also given a great deal of thought in connection with his research on Edward Everett to a part of the period with which this study deals.

There is good reason why scholars have been more interested in dealing with specific individuals who have occupied the Boylston Chair than with the Chair's general development as an institution. The policy governing philosophy and methods used in teaching rhetoric in the Boylston Chair has been characterized by a lack of consistency. This lack of consistency seems to be a result of the fact that despite the in-


tentions of the founder of the Chair and the rules laid down by the Harvard Overseers, the men who occupied the Chair in essence determined policy themselves. Therefore, it has been desirable to study the origin and the development of the Chair in terms of the men who were responsible for and administered the duties of the office.

**Method and organization.** In developing a practical method of implementing the purpose of this study it was necessary to set up a form to be used in dealing with the works of those individuals who occupied the Boylston Chair of Rhetoric. The models for form were provided by Lester L. Hale in his article on Dr. James Rush and Claude L. Shaver in his article on Steele MacKaye. Hale and Shaver approached their respective subjects from the standpoint of, first, the man; second, the rhetoric; and finally, the effects of the rhetoric on speech education. In the case of his subject, Dr. James Rush, Hale specifically advised that, "In examining or utilizing Dr. James Rush's contribution to speech education, not only must the most familiar product of his investigation ... be scrutinized,

---

but its frame of reference should be appreciated. 37

The rhetorics of those who occupied the Boylston Chair were approached in the same fashion.

In analysing the major rhetorics of Boylston Lecturers, certain basic questions and their answers have been emphasised. These questions concerned the definition, the scope and function of rhetoric, special emphases, modes of communication stressed and unique contributions. After each individual Boylston Lecturer has been considered, an over-all comparison of all of their rhetorics is added for purposes of isolating their differences and determining their relative influences on speech education in America.

37 Ibid., p. 219.
CHAPTER II

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE BOYLSTON CHAIR OF
RHETORIC AND ORATORY

Origin. The establishment of the Boylston Chair of Rhetoric and Oratory was a result of the generosity of a Boston merchant whose family was well known in Colonial New England - Nicholas Boylston, Esq.  

Born on March 13, 1716, Boylston lived the life of a solid New England businessman. In the Boston Gazette of August 26, 1771, the Reverend Dr. Thomas Cooper indicated that Nicholas Boylston, Esquire was a man of good understanding and sound judgment, diligent in his business, though not a slave to it, upright in his dealings, honest and sincere in all his professions, and a stranger to dissimulation.

1Aside from the fact that the Boylston name was made known through the Boylston Chair of Rhetoric and Oratory at Harvard, Zabdiel Boylston, Nicholas' uncle, achieved world-wide fame and distinction for being the first American to adopt the practice of inoculating against smallpox.

2Donald M. Goodfellow has done the most thorough research into the background of the family of Nicholas Boylston, Esq. For a detailed account of the Boylston family tree see Goodfellow's article in the New England Quarterly, 19:372-389, September, 1946.

3Boston Gazette, August 26, 1771.
Reverend Joseph McKean, the second Boylston Professor, pointed out, in regard to newspaper eulogies of the man, Nicholas Boylston, Esq., that "Equivocal as newspaper panegyric must be regarded, yet the rational estimate here given [in the Gazette notice of August 26, 1771] is confirmed by the united testimony of those who knew him."¹

In a Bulletin of the Public Library of the City of Boston reference is made to the entertainments of the Boylston family which "drew together all the distinguished families of the town."² Boylston's household furnishings elicited from John Adams the comment that "they are the most magnificent of anything I have ever seen."³

Boylston did nothing of brilliance. In his simple, direct fashion, he held the "noiseless tenor of his way." He was respectable and correct - a man of integrity, perseverance and piety. His business partner

¹Lecture XXI, p. 253 of the original manuscripts of the lectures of Joseph McKean in the Harvard University Archives, Widener Library, Cambridge, Massachusetts. Thirty-eight of McKean's lectures were donated to Harvard University by Mrs. Taylor in 1923. McKean's lectures were referred to as The Lectures of Joseph McKean.


³Ibid., p. 308.
was Joseph Green,\(^7\) celebrated among the wits and poets of New England. Boylston and Green complemented each other well, for Green was noted in Boston for being original and humorous while Boylston, on the other hand, offered "solid judgment" and "prudent wisdom." In his will, Boylston left £400 to Green.

It may seem surprising that Nicholas Boylston was not a college man, nor was his family of a college tradition. The only Boylston to graduate from Harvard was one by the name of Zabdiel, in 1724.\(^8\) He was not the Zabdiel Boylston who later introduced inoculation against smallpox into the United States. Ward Nicholas Boylston, Nicholas' nephew, also gave a great deal to Harvard, but he, like his uncle Nicholas, was not a Harvard man.

As was the custom in Colonial days, Nicholas was anxious to perpetuate his family name. Van Wyck Brooks indicated that,

> The merchant - patricians ... wished to ... glorify their capital [Boston] not only in the elegance of their mansions but also in churches, parks and public buildings, in professorial chairs at Harvard College, in schools and asylums and hospitals.\(^9\)

---

\(^7\)The Lectures of Joseph McKean, Lecture XXI, "Sketch of the Founder and Foundation," p. 255.


\(^9\)Van Wyck Brooks, op. cit., p. 41.
Boylston made a financial contribution to Harvard in 1764 when the library was lost by fire. Then on August 1, 1771, he bequeathed £1500 "lawful money" to Harvard College for the establishment of a Chair of Rhetoric and Oratory.

On August 18 of the year 1771, just as he was about to retire, Nicholas Boylston died. On February 11, 1772, his executors paid the amount of £1500 to Thomas Hubbard Esquire, Treasurer of Harvard College. The Corporation of the College gave thanks and asked Thomas Boylston, Nicholas' brother, and one of the executors of his estate "to permit a full length portrait of his deceased brother to be drawn, at the expense of the college, from an original in his possession, and placed in Harvard Hall." This portrait was painted by Copley and was presented to the College.

---


11 Manuscript extract of the Will of Nicholas Boylston, Esq., written by William Cooper. Widener Library, Harvard University.

12 Manuscript extract of the Will of Nicholas Boylston, Esq., written by William Cooper. Widener Library, Harvard University. See Appendix, Exhibit No. 1.

There seems but little to add to the achievements and life of Nicholas Boylston. He was the kind of man who "lived the good life" and, in the process, generally avoided the historian's notice. Two or three generations of the Boylston family lived in the neighborhood of Boston after Nicholas' death. One of Boston's main thoroughfares and a Hall at Harvard bore the family name. But perhaps the greatest monument to his life and work remained in the form of the Boylston Chair of Rhetoric and Oratory at Harvard University.

Upon the death of Nicholas' brother, Thomas, on December 30, 1798, the Boylston estate was willed to Ward Nicholas Boylston with this provision,

... if Ward Nicholas fails to have heirs, to the sons of the female line next to kin to me the testator, to wit: the descendants of Mary Hallowell, wife of Benjamin Hallowell, Esq., my late sister, and on failure of male descendants of this line, to the sons of the female line ... to wit: John Adams, Esq., now President of the United States of America, he being to next of kin to me the testator ...

\[14\] Thomas was erroneously named the founder of the Boylston Chair of Rhetoric and Oratory by Samuel Flagg Bemis, John Quincy Adams and the Foundations of American Foreign Policy (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1949) p. 132.

\[15\] The Will of Thomas Boylston - received as a gift of Reverend O. G. Everett of Charlestown on February 25,
Although John Adams actually never received the benefits mentioned in Thomas Boylston's will, his son, John Quincy Adams, did benefit by becoming the first holder of the Boylston Chair of Rhetoric and Oratory at Harvard.

Rules and directions. At the time of payment of the £1500 to Harvard College (Feb. 11, 1772) it was felt that hiring a professor should be postponed until the funds developed to the point where a professor would feel that it was worth his while to accept the position of Boylston Lecturer. Had not the American Revolution intervened, the Chair of instruction might have been established in 1781 when Joseph Willard was made President of Harvard University. 16

The Boylston grant was seemingly forgotten until 1801 when, upon his return from England, Ward Nicholas Boylston, 17 nephew of Nicholas Boylston, informed the


17 Ward Nicholas Boylston's paternal name was Ward Hollowell. He was the son of Benjamin and Mary Hollowell. By the wish of his maternal uncle his name was changed to Ward Nicholas Boylston. Between 1772 and 1776 Ward Nicholas traveled the world. He visited Newfoundland, Italy, Turkey, Syria, Palestine, Egypt, France and Flanders. He went into business in England,
Corporation of Harvard College that either the money which had accumulated from the original grant was to be put to use for the purpose for which it was given or he would sue for the grant and put up "a building to contain public rooms for the use of the college." By this time the original grant had developed at compound interest to a sizeable sum. On October 4, 1796, the legacy was found to be $14,660.63 dollars. By 1804 the capital had increased to the size of 23,000 dollars.

On January 12, 1803, under the threat of suit, President Willard, Dr. Eliphalet Pearson and Dr. Howard were named as a committee to draw up the rules for the office of Boylston Lecturer. On April 30, staying until 1800. He returned to Boston in 1800 and remained there until his death in 1826. It was shortly after his return to the United States that Nicholas became interested in the Chair that his uncle had founded.

18 Corporation Papers, Vol. I, 1801. Widener Library, Harvard University. This reference was also found in Donald M. Goodfellow, "The First Boylston Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory," New England Quarterly, 19:373, September, 1946.


1804, these rules were read and accepted by the Corporation at Harvard. On July 26, 1804, they were formally adopted by the Board of Overseers.

The rules and directions were based largely on the classical canons of invention, disposition, elocution, memory and delivery and were written for the committee by Dr. Pearson who was then Hancock Professor of Hebrew and other Oriental Languages at Harvard. Until 1810, English grammar and composition were taught by the Professor of Hebrew at Harvard. In 1810, however, teaching English composition became a part of the duties of the Boylston Professor. On March 15, 1810, the Board of Overseers voted that,

Whereas in the second law of the third chapter of the College laws, it is ordered that the professor of the [sic] Hebrew, and other Oriental Languages shall instruct the Sophomore and Freshman classes once a week, and the classes of Senior and Junior sophists once a fortnight in English grammar and English composition, and whereas a branch of the said instruction has been devolved on the Boylston professor of Rhetoric

21 Original manuscript of the Rules, Direction and Statutes of the Boylston Professorship of Rhetoric and Oratory in Harvard College, written by Dr. Pearson in the Widener Library Archives, Harvard University. See Appendix, Exhibit No. 2.

and Oratory, therefore, voted, that
the above recited order be repealed,
except that part thereof which enjoined
the instruction of the Freshmen in Eng-
lish grammar.23

The original manuscript drafts were found in the Pear-
son papers in the archives at Harvard. 24

Joseph McKeen paid tribute to the men responsible
for the original rules governing the Boylston Chair
when he wrote,

In the profound erudition of both [Will-
lard and Pearson], and the long prac-
tical experience of one of them [Pear-
son], in the course of instruction
which this department embraces, entire
confidence was reposed that they would
device the best practicable scheme for
rendering, to use their own words in
their report - the Institution most
extensively and permanently useful,
and thus to accomplish the benevolent
and patriotic designs of the Founder.25

The rules gave a broad interpretation to the meaning
of Rhetoric, allowing for both written and oral exer-
cises in English. Pearson's influence was largely
responsible for the fact that the rules for lectures

24 The original manuscript is a part of the Pearson
papers in the Harvard Archives, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
25 The Lectures of Joseph McKeen, Lecture XXI
were spelled out in terms of the classical canons of rhetoric and oratory. 26

Classical period, 1806-1851. The appointment of John Quincy Adams as the first Boylston Professor was delayed until June 24, 1804 by the death of President Willard on September 25, 1804. The appointment was confirmed by the Board of Overseers on July 25, 1805. 27 The work preparatory to Adams' inauguration was completed one year later. On June 12, 1806 he was inaugurated and the line of professors who were to make practical use of the Boylston grant was given its beginning in a technical sense. The first Boylston Professor specified certain conditions to his acceptance of the new post. He asked for and received relief from all private instruction and from half of the public instruction prescribed by the rules of the Chair. Adams also took exception to the statement concerning religion in the third section of the rules and regulations. On May 22, 1806, the Board

26 The phrase "classical canons" was used as another way of saying Cicero's five divisions of rhetoric. Cicero's five divisions were 1) invention, 2) disposition, 3) elocution, 4) memory, and 5) pronunciation. These divisions covered all steps in the development of a speech.

of Overseers repealed the third section and substituted the statement that the Boylston Lecturer should believe in "Christian religion and have a firm persuasion of its truth."\(^{28}\) He was not required to stay in residence at Harvard in deference to his position in the Senate. Despite these unique conditions, Adams lived up to the spirit of the rules of his office by directing his Lectures\(^{29}\) toward an application of classical rhetoric to contemporary oratory.

The story of his formal inauguration as Boylston Lecturer was told in Adams' own words,

My father and the family at Quincy came into town, and went also to Cambridge before dinner. I dined with my father, Mr. Boylston, and Professor Ware, at President Webber's. In the afternoon I was installed as Boylston Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory. The hour fixed for the purpose was half-past three, but just at that time there arose a violent thunder-gust and shower, which delayed the performances about two hours. From the Philosophy chamber, where there was a meeting of the corporation and overseers, we went in procession to the meeting house, about five in the afternoon. The president began by an introductory prayer. Next followed an anthem. Then an address by the president in Latin. Mr.


Ware read the regulations of the professorship. I read and subscribed the declaration, and delivered it to the governor as chairman of the overseers. The president then declared me a professor, and I delivered the discourse I had prepared for the occasion. It was well received; but the company present was very small. The business was concluded by a hymn sung.30

According to a review in the *Columbian Centinel*, Adams' inaugural address was a success. It stated,

Mr. Adams' Discourse gave high gratification to an intelligent and discriminating audience. It contained a comprehensive and animated view of the rise, progress and decline of Eloquence, announced its genuine object and end, and specified some of the most prominent impediments to its advancements in modern times. Its application and use, in deliberative assemblies, in the Forum and in the Temples of the Most High, were delineated; pertinent remarks were introduced in relation to this establishment; honorable notice was taken of the munificent founder, and of the benevolent public-spirited family of Boylston. An impressive address to the Students of the University closed the performance .... We Congratulate *Alma Mater* on the acquisition of such an instructor. If assiduity, regularity and docility among the Students be correspondent to their multiplied means of improvement, the public may justly indulge the most pleasing expectations from that distinguished seminary.31

---


31 *Columbian Centinel*, June 18, 1806.
Following his first lecture to students, Adams wrote in his diary an explanation of his own personal feelings concerning his new duties. This explanation revealed that Adams was highly enthusiastic and willing to undertake his course of lectures conscientiously.

In his own words, Adams stated,

I this day commenced my course of lectures on Rhetoric and Oratory, - an undertaking of magnitude and importance, for the proper accomplishment of which I pray for patience and perseverance, and that favor from above, without which no human industry can avail, but which, without persevering industry, it is presumptuous to ask. I have devoted all the time which I can borrow from the necessary business of life for seven years, if so much life is granted me, to this object. Of these seven years, one has already elapsed. My progress has been slow, and my own improvement, upon which is to depend much of the improvement of others, has been very small, yet the beginning is now made, and its success is not without encouragement. My lecture was well received, and could I hope that the issue of the whole course would but bear a proportion to the effect of this introduction, I should be fully satisfied. Few persons except the scholars (the three senior classes) attended.

Adams completed thirty-six lectures by August 12, 1808, and repeated twenty-four by July 28, 1809. On July 14, 1809, John Quincy Adams resigned. His tenure

of office was terminated on August 26 of the same year. Adams had been serving as senator from Massachusetts and suffered setbacks in his political party as a result of his stand on foreign policy, especially as it related to Great Britain. As a consequence he resigned as senator and was appointed Minister to Russia. This required him to give up his position as Boylston Lecturer. 33

Of his final lecture, Adams stated that,

After being very busily engaged all the morning, at twelve o'clock I went to Cambridge. My mother and brother came into town, and went to Cambridge at the same time. We all dined at Mr. Wainwright's where there was a company of perhaps twenty persons. At two o'clock I attended the declamation which was not entirely full. At three I read my twenty-fourth lecture, at the close of which I added some thoughts on taking leave of the college. All the classes attended, and the chapel was very crowded with strangers. 34

On the same day that Adams' term ended, his successor, Reverend Joseph McKean accepted the post. He took office formally on September 6, 1809. 35

34 Charles Francis Adams, op. cit., I, p. 551.
Although Reverend McKeans was relieved for a time of a part of the public lectures demanded of the Boylston Professor, "... all other duties contemplated by the original foundation were undertaken." 36

The Overseers voted to make residence at Harvard a prerequisite of McKeans appointment. He was asked "to reside at Cambridge, near the college, to perform all the duties of his office, and to be a member of the immediate executive government whenever required by the Board of Overseers." 37

During McKeans tenure of the Boylston Chair, Ward Nicholas Boylston renewed the ties between his family and Harvard by donating $1,000, the interest of which was to be used to establish the Boylston Prize for Oratory. 38 This prize was to be awarded to the winner of an annual oratory contest conducted at Harvard.


37 Barrett Wendell, op. cit., p. 207.

38 Corporation papers, Vol. I, August 18, 1820, and an excerpt from the Will of Ward Nicholas Boylston from the Donation Book, Treasurer's office, Harvard University. This document is in the Archives at Harvard University. See exhibit No. 3.
The Boylston Prize for Elocution was made permanent by the President and Fellows of Harvard on August 18, 1820. It was awarded from 1818 to 1958, with the exception of the year 1945-46, when the award was suspended because of the World War II emergency. The rules have remained relatively unchanged over a period of one hundred and forty years.

Largely because of the state of McKean's health, N. L. Frothingham was appointed on October 5, 1812, as instructor to help with the duties of the Boylston Lecturer. Frothingham's salary amounted to $500 for the school year.

Reverend McKean administered the duties of his office until his health failed seriously in 1817. He was granted a leave from his official duties in October of 1817. He died in Havana, Cuba, on March 17, 1818. McKean's widow, Margaret Stevenson McKean, received her husband's salary for the last quarter of the school year of 1817-18. The Chair remained vacant until December 8, 1819.

41 Overseers Reports, Vol. VI, p. 279.
On August 11, 1818, following McKean's death, Andrews Norton, later known as the "tyrant of the Cambridge Parnassus," and occupant of the Dexter Chair of Sacred Literature, was chosen by the Board of Overseers for appointment to the Boylston Chair. He declined the appointment.

On September 16, 1819, Edward Tyrrel Channing was selected to succeed McKean. He accepted and was initiated to his office on December 8, 1819. Channing remained in the Chair for thirty-two years, the longest tenure of any Boylston Professor. During this period the rules of the office were still in the minds of Harvard administrators and they checked Channing's work periodically. Many reports were drawn up and submitted to the administration by Channing from 1825 to 1851. These reports were routine and indicated the progress of his students and their course of study. By 1842, the salary of the Boylston Professor was $1,800.00.

---

42 Overseers Reports, Vol. VI, p. 290.

43 Edward Tyrrel Channing's brother, William Ellery Channing, was serving on the Board of Overseers at Harvard at the time Edward Tyrrel was appointed.

44 See Appendix, Exhibit 4.

45 Annual Reports of the President and of the Treasurer of Harvard University, 1842-3.
Channing devoted a great deal of time to the written work of his students. Due to his emphasis on the written side of student's work, teachers of elocution were appointed in 1820 to give substantial criticism on the oral delivery of students. Jonathon Barber, who later wrote *A Practical Treatise on Gesture*, was among the men hired for this purpose.

That the communication arts were considered of importance by the administration at Harvard is indicated by a report made in 1831 by a committee appointed to study curriculum at Harvard.

The arts of speaking and writing with ease and elegance are regarded by the committee as among the most important branches of a college course of study; and as those, in which a defective early education is supplied with the greatest difficulty in after years.

The committee's report also indicated that there was at this time (1831) improvement in the teaching of elocution.

**Period of change, 1851-1876.**

As late as 1840, oratory was still central to the

---


interest of the Boston mind, according to Van Wyck Brooks.⁴⁹ It was during Channing's tenure as Boylston Professor that emphasis gradually shifted from oral communication to written communication. This change of emphasis in his teaching was probably due to a composite of factors. First, New England was moving into the Golden Age of American literature. Consequently the importance of writing was becoming generally recognized. Channing's brother, Dr. William Ellery, typified this attitude when he wrote

> Through their writings the great men of antiquity have exercised a sovereignty over these later ages not enjoyed in their own. It is more important to observe that the influence of literature is perpetually increasing; for, through the press and the spread of education, its sphere is indefinitely enlarged. Reading, once the privilege of a few, is now the occupation of multitudes, and is to become one of the chief gratifications of all. Books penetrate everywhere, and some of the works of genius find their way to obscure dwellings which, a little while ago, seemed barred against all intellectual light. Writing is now the mightiest instrument on earth. Through this the mind has acquired a kind of omnipresence. To literature we then look as the chief means of forming a better race of human beings.⁵⁰

---

⁴⁹ Van Wyck Brooks, op. cit., p. 335.
Secondly, elocution was at this time coming more and more to be considered synonymous with spoken communication. The classical concept of invention was neglected in favor of elocution and delivery. Also Channing was undoubtedly influenced by his own background. His work as editor of the *North American Review* had prepared him to serve as a critic of written communication rather than of the spoken word. Finally, John Quincy Adams had done such a complete job of summarizing classical rhetoric that his work fulfilled the need for which it was written. Channing could justifiably direct his efforts to objectives different from those of Adams. Then again perhaps Channing felt that he couldn't improve on the treatment Adams gave to classical rhetoricians.

Edward Tyrrel Channing resigned on January 26, 1851, and retired at the end of the academic year. Francis J. Child, a twenty-six year old scholar of English literature, became Boylston Lecturer. During the first portion of Child's twenty-five years in the

---

51 The *North American Review* was one of the leading critical reviews of literature during the period before the Civil War. It is interesting to note that the need for a national interest in American literature was a common topic of discussion in the *North American Review* during the first years of Channing's tenure. For representative examples see the *North American Review*, Vol. IX: 115-137, 19-33. Vol. XIII: 478-491. Vol. XVIII: 157-178. Vol. XX: 453-455.
Boylston Chair, the original rules and directions for Boylston Professors were neglected. They were forgotten completely after Charles Eliot became President of Harvard in 1869 and reorganized Harvard's educational curriculum. His changes were harmonious with Child's specific interest in ballads.

Even before Eliot moved to reorganize education at Harvard, the change in the philosophy represented by the Boylston Chair was reflected in the 1851-2 catalogue. In 1851 the rhetoric heading for the lectures of the Boylston Professor had disappeared and his lectures were entitled "Lectures on English Language and Literature."52 His duties involving the spoken word were all referred to instructors in elocution.

After Eliot became entrenched as president the change in the approach of the Boylston Lecturer from oral to written communication was completely crystallized. Van Wyck Brooks referred to Eliot's change in policy in the following way,

In the sphere of education, the spirit of the new age declared itself immediately and clearly. Charles William Eliot, an energetic chemist, had turned Harvard over "like a flapjack." The phrase was Dr. Holmes's [sic] and

Charles Eliot Norton's cousin turned over many flapjacks as the years went on. The higher education of the country was largely remodelled on his ideas, for no one knew better than he what the country desired. Harvard had "struck bottom," he said, with a series of ineffectual presidents, who reflected the indecisiveness of the national mind. This mind halted between two opinions, the old classical system and the new technical system; and the cry had been going up for instruction on special, vocational lines.53

In the late sixties and early seventies oratory was considered a thing of the past, a part of the old classical system of education. Samuel Morison indicated that during this period of change "Forensics ... went the way of other things outlived."54 Up until the sixties,

English meant elocution and rhetoric ...
In 1858-59 the Freshmen had Lessons in Orthoepy [sic] and Lessons in Expression; the Sophomores, Lessons in Expression, Lessons in Action, Themes; the Juniors, Themes, Declamation, Rhetoric; the Seniors, Forensics: nothing more.55

But after the sixties and seventies, English as an academic discipline became very much like that which we have in colleges and universities today.

54 S. E. Morison, op. cit., p. 69.
55 Ibid., p. 66.
Although departments had been created in 1825 at Harvard, courses of instruction were not grouped by departments in the catalogue until 1872. Francis J. Child became Chairman of the Department of Modern Languages in 1872 and Adams Sherman Hill became Chairman of the Department of English in 1891.

Parallel to the development at Harvard of the move toward English and partly responsible for it was the cry of educational leaders for more teaching of written English.

During Professor Child's incumbency the inability of undergraduates to write correct English was being widely discussed in the public prints. Professor Lounsbury, who taught composition at Yale for forty years, and who condemned it so unsparingly as a compulsory subject, writes of Child's difficulties. 'What is the Boylston Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory doing?' was, he [Child] told me, the burden of many a cry which found utterance in the communications to the press of the neighboring city by men filled with anxiety, not to say anguish, for the literary future of the nation.' Even the men who recognized clearly the fallaciousness of the views so clamorously proclaimed, writes Professor Lounsbury, 'were forced to comply with the popular demand, if not to save themselves, to save the institutions to which they belong.... On no one subject of education has so great an amount of effort been put forth as on the teaching of English composition, with so little satisfactory to show for it."

56Everett L. Hunt, op. cit., p. 203.
President Eliot's reply to the need for training students in written communication was in the person of Adams Sherman Hill. Hill, the fifth Boylston Professor, in 1875 gave his own answer to the cry for more English by spearheading for Eliot the movement which resulted in a strong department, later a division and finally a graduate department of English.

The change in administrative policy at Harvard was a complete change, according to Van Wyck Brooks. He stated,

The first step at Harvard was to throw the classics overboard and promote the "specialist" system the age demanded. Thus died the old American college; the European model was discarded; the American university came into being. The classics, not too competently taught, went down before the new engrossing interests; and this marked, in literature, almost the greatest of possible changes. The change in literary style was not the most important, although this was sufficiently striking. The study of the classics had always been connected with accurate linguistic training and the study of form, while the modern tongues were loose in their construction; but, what was even more important, the classics had made spacious men and men prepared to meet great problems. None of the abundant cant that was uttered on this subject, both at the time and later, altered the fact. They kept alive great patterns of behavior, which all the American people had seen in action in the ample minds and characters of the earlier leaders, most of whom were steeped in Plutarch's lives and the legends of Greece and Rome. The close association of
intimate studies had made these patterns real, and the patterns had made great writers as they made great statesmen. They appealed to the instinct of emulation, an instinct that in later days followed the patterns set by industrial leaders, by bankers and by millionaires whose only ideal was the will to power and who ruled by the blind force of money. 57

As late as 1896, public commentaries were given over to the change in education wrought by President Eliot at Harvard. In *Nation*, Eliot's change was referred to as follows,

Down to the close of the war, the old system of oral instruction, combined with a curriculum consisting almost altogether of required studies, made the work of a professor at Harvard very different from what it is now. Teaching was done, not by lectures, but by recitation ... 58

Eliot's feeling that professors and students should be allowed to pursue their own interests and his faith in a more specialized education reduced required courses for Freshmen at Harvard from a full year of required courses in 1868 to seven required courses and nine electives in 1884. By 1884 all Senior, Junior and Sophomore courses were elected by the students. 59


58*Nation*, September 17, 1896.

Eliot, despite his changes at Harvard, was later quoted as being very much in favor of speech training.

President-emeritus Charles W. Eliot, of Harvard University, addressed the Conference on the general value of oral training. He said that never in the history of the country has there been a time when oral address has had as much use and influence as it has today. He emphasized the fact that in his own administrative work his care to gain a clear succinct statement in the form of speech has been a great, almost an indispensable, asset to him, and he had, he said, frequently observed the same fact in the case of others. Many suggestions were offered as to the ways in which oral training might be introduced into school instruction.60

This president's changes were met with favor by Francis J. Child. Although he made regular reports on his work as Boylston Professor until 1868 and fulfilled his obligations as a teacher of composition,61 he chafed under the required duties prescribed for him. Child had no enthusiasm for either the art of oratory or the problem of grading themes. According to Barrett Wendell, "He [Child] found it [oratory and rhetoric], for all the labors of his predecessors, a study of secondary importance."62 Child established English

61 See Appendix, Exhibit 5.
composition, however, as a study of the first academic rank. In regard to grading themes, one account had it that, "One bitter note in his [Child] sweet cheeriness was sometimes aroused by the remembrance of the great proportion of his life that had been spent on theme correcting." 63

In 1876 a Chair of English was created for Child as a result in part of job offers made to him by President Gilman of Johns Hopkins University. 64 In his new position Child was able to pursue his own interests, particularly those interests in English and Scottish ballads, without interruption. He became the founder of the school at Harvard which Kittredge later made famous.

Child enjoyed the full cooperation of the administration at Harvard during all of his tenure. He had a long acquaintance with Charles Eliot. When Eliot was an instructor at Harvard and lived on Kirkland Street "he liked to go" 65 to the house of his next door neighbor, Francis J. Child.

Modern period, 1876-1958. By 1876 the original rules and directions of the Boylston Chair of Rhetoric

63 E. Morison, op. cit., p. 66.
65 Ibid., I, p. 306.
and Oratory had become history. Adams Sherman Hill, a classmate of Charles Eliot, was elected to the Chair on June 28, 1876, and taught English composition from 1876 to the end of the school year in 1904. In 1872, Eliot had appointed Hill, an untried teacher, as an assistant instructor in English.

Hill published several books under the title of "rhetoric." His definition of rhetoric was based on grammar - a "far cry" from the classical concept of rhetoric as set down in the rules and directions drawn up in 1804.

The labors of Adams Sherman Hill and Charles Eliot were combined to produce the phenomenal growth of the area of English at Harvard. The administration seemed to "pull out of the picture" at this point because departmentalization gave to Hill autonomy of a sort that had not been known to previous Boylston Professors. John Quincy Adams, Joseph McKean and Edward Tyrrel Channing were all members of the general educational community of Harvard. After Francis J. Child and departmentalization the community broke up into a series of integral parts.

It has not been the purpose of this paper to go into the development of the areas of Speech and English at Harvard. The Boylston Chair has been primary in
this study and the broader aspects of training in communication at Harvard have been considered only when these aspects had a bearing on the development of the Boylston Chair.

In 1904, Adams Sherman Hill retired. He was replaced by one of his assistants, Le Baron Russell Briggs, beloved Dean of Harvard and President of Radcliffe. Briggs continued to administer the Chair in the tradition established in part by Child and completed by Hill. Much of his time, however, was taken up by his administrative duties as Dean of Harvard. The degree to which the duties of the Boylston Professor at Harvard had been modified from an office of central educational importance to an independent office is indicated by the fact that Dean Briggs could handle the teaching chores of his office "on the side."

After years of experience at Harvard, Charles Townsend Copeland replaced Briggs as Boylston Professor in 1925. He retired at the close of the school year in 1928.

Copeland was made Professor Emeritus in 1928. With two Boylston Professors Emeritus (Dean Briggs was also Emeritus at the time), the income from the Chair's endowment could not support a third Boylston Professor
so the vacancy left by Copeland was not immediately filled. The income was not great during this period. In 1928-9 the principal was $28,000 and the annual income was $1,558.54. A full professor's salary was $4,000.00. By 1937 the capital had doubled ($46,582) but due to the depression of the thirties, its yearly income had only increased to $1,900 a year. This was not the only explanation, however, for the vacancy of eight years. In a letter to President A. L. Lowell, dated May 1, 1930, Clifford Moore, Dean of Harvard, requested that the Chair be kept open until Robert S. Hillyer could attain the rank requisite to being appointed Boylston Professor. Consequently, the Chair remained vacant until Hillyer's appointment in May, 1937. It was reported in the Boston Herald that,

Although Robert Silliman Hillyer will suffer, in accepting the venerable Boylston Professorship of Rhetoric and Oratory at Harvard, the inevitable fate of being compared with such brilliant teachers as the late Le Baron Russell Briggs and the still lively Charles Townsend Copeland, he brings to the Chair a greater experience in creative literature than probably any of his predecessors.

66Treasurer's Reports, 1928-9
67Treasurer's Reports, 1936-7
68Correspondence from Clifford Moore to A. L. Lowell dated May 1, 1930.
69Boston Herald, May 15, 1937.
Hillyer and the last two men to hold the Boylston Chair have been poets.

Theodore Spencer was appointed to the Chair on July 1, 1946.\(^7\) His term of office was short-lived. He died of a heart attack in a taxi cab on January 16, 1949.

Archibald MacLeish has held the Chair of Rhetoric and Oratory from May 1, 1949\(^7\) to the present.

**Summary of the history.** Briefly then, the Boylston Chair has passed through the stage of classical rhetoric, a transitional stage from the classical to the philological approach, to its present stage of modern grammar and poetics, all under the name of rhetoric.

In the early classical stage of the Chair's history the ties between the original rules of the Boylston Chair and the policies of the Boylston Professors were close. During the period of the Civil War, and shortly after, the reports of the Boylston Professor to the administration at Harvard dwindled to almost nothing.

In the modern period the original rules have been

\(^{70}\)Office of Provost, Harvard University.

\(^{71}\)Office of Provost, Harvard University.
disregarded almost completely, - first, largely as a result of the combination of President Eliot's philosophy of specialized, vocational education and, secondly, the contradictory interests of those men who occupied the Chair during this period.

The department of English developed in the seventies along the lines of the interests represented in the philosophy of Adams Sherman Hill. Instead of representing an integral part of the general educational progress at Harvard, the Boylston Chair developed in the modern period into an honorary post. True, the Boylston Professor still taught, but a large part of his time was devoted to producing literature (specifically poetry) that was of a quality to attract national notice. In this the Boylston Professor was given a free reign in comparison with those who previously occupied the Chair. The men recently engaged in the activities of Boylston Lecturer have been practitioners of their art as well as professors in the traditional sense.

The development of the Chair must be written in terms of the philosophy of rhetoric held by those who

---


73 Archibald MacLeish's J. B. produced on Broadway was an example in point.
occupied it. The rhetorics of John Quincy Adams, Joseph McKean, Edward Tyrrel Channing and Adams Sherman Hill were especially representative and have been given emphasis in this paper. The views of Robert S. Hillyer and of Archibald MacLeish, the present incumbent, are also emphasized and reported from recent interviews.

Certainly the times and the administrative policy at Harvard had an influence on the philosophy of rhetoric held by Boylston Professors. The original rules and directions to an extent limited their work. President Eliot's policy as an administrator along with the general emphasis in education on written communications presented a very real factor in the development of the philosophies of Boylston Professors. But these influences were secondary. The primary reasons for the manner in which the character of the Boylston Chair was modified were the interests and points of view of the men who occupied the Chair. In the next five chapters the interests and views of these men will be elaborated.
CHAPTER III

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS

Introduction. John Quincy Adams has received the attention of biographers and historians in proportion to the number of activities in which he was engaged. He was one of the busiest men in the history of the United States. Biographers, among whom are Seward, Morse, and, more recently, Bemis, Lipsky and Kennedy, have approached the life of Adams from many different angles. As the son of an American president who became a president in his own right, as a member of one of the most illustrious of American families and

---


as a monumental example of the prolific writer, John Quincy Adams could hardly have avoided notice.

It is not the purpose of this chapter to attempt to add another biography to the biographies of Adams already written, but rather it is intended to study his activity as the first Boylston Professor of rhetoric and oratory at Harvard from 1806 to 1809.

The teacher. John Quincy Adams was related to the founder of the Boylston Chair through his grandmother, Susanna Boylston, who was a first cousin of Nicholas Boylston, Esquire. Donald Goodfellow pointed out in his study of a portion of Adams' unpublished diary that Adams "figured" in the settlement between Ward Nicholas Boylston and Harvard after Boylston's proposed suit for his uncle's unused endowment.

Aside from the fact that he was related to the founder of the Boylston Chair, John Quincy Adams was qualified and ready to fulfill the duties of the office to which he was appointed. His education in the classics at Harvard had indirectly prepared him for

---


7Donald M. Goodfellow, op. cit., p. 374.
dealing with the responsibilities of his office, since its rules were based on classical rhetoric.

As an undergraduate at Harvard, Adams was interested enough in forensics to notice the benefits of college exercises in syllogistics in his diary. He wrote his father,

Syllogistic disputes ... are held in detestation by the scholars, and everyone thinks it a reflection upon his character as a genius and a student to have a syllogistic; this opinion is the firmer, because the best scholars almost always have the other parts. There are many disadvantages derived from these syllogisms, and I know of only one benefit, which is this. Many scholars would go through college without studying at all, but would idle away all their time, who merely from the horrors of syllogisms begin to study, acquire a fondness for it, and make a very pretty figure in college ....

His interest in the classics predated his life in college. His mother was anxious that he should find pleasure in Rollins' *Ancient History*. Consequently, when he was only seven years old, she persuaded him to read a page or two every day. Upon his graduation in 1787 from Harvard, Adams delivered an oration on "The Importance and Necessity of Public Faith to the

---

9Ibid., p. 236.
Well-being of a Community." He continued to appear on the public platform regularly after his graduation from College.

Adams was experienced enough in the speech situation to recognize his own limitations as a public speaker and modest enough to admit them. Shortly before he became Boylston Lecturer, and during the debate over the Georgetown Dam bill in Congress, he wrote in his diary,

On this occasion, as on almost every other, I felt most sensibly my deficiency as an extemporaneous speaker. In tracing this deficiency to its source, I find it arising from a cause that is irreparable. No efforts, no application on my part, can ever remove it. It is slowness of comprehension - an incapacity to grasp the whole compass of a subject in the mind at once with such an arrangement as leaves a proper impression of the detail - and incapacity to form ideas properly precise and indefinite with the rapidity necessary to give them uninterrupted utterance. My manner, therefore, is slow, hesitating, and often much confused. Sometimes, from inability to furnish the words to finish a thought commenced, I begin a sentence with propriety and end it with nonsense. Sometimes, after carrying through an idea of peculiar force to its last stage, the want of a proper word at the close drives me to use one which throws the whole into a burlesque. And sometimes the most important details of

10 James Spear Loring, The Hundred Boston Orators (Boston: John P. Jewett and Company, 1854), p. 239.
argument escape my mind at the moment when I want them, though ever ready to present them before and after. 11

He felt strongly his responsibility as a college professor and, when he heard of his appointment to the Boylston Chair, planned a schedule for seven years of scholarly study in rhetoric and oratory. 12

There exist some testimonies to Adams' ability as a teacher. Ralph Waldo Emerson indicated that,

When he [Adams] read his first lectures in 1806, not only the students heard him with delight, but the hall was crowded by the Professors and by unusual visitors. I remember, when, long after, I entered college, hearing the story of the number of coaches in which his friends came from Boston to hear him. On his return in the winter to the senate in Washington, he took such grounds in the debates of the following session as to lose the sympathy of many of his constituents in Boston. When on his return from Washington, he resumed his lectures in Cambridge, his class attended but the coaches from Boston did not come and indeed many of his political friends deserted him. 13

Edward Everett also commented on his having heard Adams' lectures. Everett said,

It was at this time, and as a member of one of the younger classes at college, that I first saw Mr. Adams, and listened to his well-remembered voice from the chair of instruction; little anticipating,

that after the lapse of forty years, my own humble voice would be heard, in the performance of this mournful office. Some who now hear me will recollect the deep interest with which these lectures were listened to, not merely by the youthful audience for which they were prepared, but by numerous voluntary hearers from the neighborhood. 14

From these statements it is evident that Adams had success as a teacher while at Harvard. Further indication of the effectiveness of his lectures is the fact that when Adams terminated his life as a Harvard professor in July of 1809, the Junior and Senior classes asked that they be published. Adams replied in a letter on July 21, 1809. 15 He decided to publish his lectures and they appeared in book form in 1810.

In his final remarks to his students on the last day of his term as Boylston Professor, he referred to his students as his "unfailing friends" and gave a highly emotional and inspiring conclusion to his lecture. His mother, who attended her son's final performance, said that this passage was felt like an "electrical shock." It had an effect upon the entire audience. 16

14 William H. Seward, op. cit., p. 91.
15 See Appendix, Exhibit 6. This letter was found in original form in the Archives of Harvard University.
16 Correspondence of Miss Adams, II, 206-208.
Adams felt that his published lectures would do some good when he said, "They will excite the genius, stimulate the literary ambition and improve the taste of the rising generation." He took a strong personal pride in his literary efforts. When he received the published edition of his *Lectures* in Russia, he stayed up until morning reading them.

He expected adverse criticism of his "rhetoric" as a result of "national malignity" in Great Britain and "political malignity" in America. In this Adams was mistaken. Although they never had a second edition, criticisms of his *Lectures* were favorable. Two examples were as follows:

The *Lectures on Rhetoric and Oratory*, delivered at Harvard University, by the Hon. John Quincy Adams, are just published in a very neat and handsome style, from the correct press of Messrs. Hilliard and Metcalf. We wish the publishers extensive patronage, for the work is of extensive value, and ought to have a conspicuous place in every man's library who has any pretensions to polite and elegant literature.

The book before us, therefore, we take up with singular pleasure, as the first fruits of this establishment the Boylston Professorship; and though we will not say that it is faultless, yet it is

19 *Boston Patriot*, March 10, 1810.
certainly in a high degree honourable to
the talents and learning of the author,
and must be of great and permanent
utility. For him, who is desirous of
finding a compendium of all the best
precepts of the ancient masters of
rhetoric [sic], adopted to the state
of eloquence in modern times, and the
particular circumstances of our own
country, we know of no book to which
we should so soon refer, as to the lec-
tures of Mr. Adams.20

John Quincy Adams, after his work in the Boylston
Chair, lived to serve his country as President of the
United States and still later as a member of the House
of Representatives. He earned for himself the unofficial
title of "Old Man Eloquent." On February 21, 1848, he
fell ill in the House of Representatives and died two
days later.

Rhetoric. To understand fully John Quincy Adams' scope as a rhetorician, his Lectures on Rhetoric and
Oratory were boiled down and analyzed.21 Each lec-
ture was a complete speech. Adams, it is interesting
to note, did not revise his lectures before they were
put in book form. This fact was astonishing consider-
ing that they were written while he was holding his

21 See Appendix, Exhibit 7.
office as senator. The organization of individual lectures contained the basic essentials for effective speech making. Well constructed, each individual lecture had an introduction, a specific purpose sentence, main ideas, proof in the form of examples and analogies and a conclusion.

His definitions of rhetorical terms were particularly lucid and appropriate. When Adams approached a rhetorical term he generally cited the definitions of Aristotle, Cicero and Quintilian before he stated his own preference or his own modification of classical definitions. An example in point was his handling of disposition. After the fashion of Quintilian, he defined disposition or organization as "a useful distribution of things or of parts; assigning to each its proper place and station."²² In explaining the parts of a speech Adams first cited Aristotle's breakdown of a speech as the introduction, the proposition, the proof and the conclusion. He then indicated that Quintilian added a fifth part, refutation, which should come, said Adams, between the proof and the conclusion. Cicero added another portion to the parts of a speech, narration, which Adams placed between the introduction

²²Lectures, I, p. 394.
and the proposition. He concluded his discussion of disposition by indicating his preference for Cicero's concept of the organisation of a speech.

Adams' style was ornamented and a bit formal by present standards. An example of his embellished style was his emphasis of the use of imagination in public speaking. He stated that,

The power of imagination furnishes a substitute for the evidence of all the senses. It creates and multiplies all those incidents, which, being the constant attendants upon all realities, have always so strong a tendency to enforce belief. So indispensable is this power to the success of that oratory, which aims at the dominion of the passions, that a public speaker can institute no more important self-examination, than the inquiry whether it has been bestowed upon him by nature. If it has let him cherish and cultivate it, as the most precious of heaven's blessings. If it has not, let him graduate the scale of his ambition to the temperate regions of eloquence, and aspire only to the reputation of being the orator of reason.23

John Quincy Adams presented an overall view and comparison of the ancients for modern use, indicating that classical rhetoric could be put into practice in his own times. As he developed his lectures, he called upon the "giant shadows of the past" - Aristotle, Cicero and Quintilian. Adams was, in a sense, the Suarez,

---

23Lectures, I, p. 383.
the Fenelon, or the Ward, of the United States in that he kept alive and revamped classical rhetoric for contemporary consumption. He drew from Junius, Burke, Fenelon, Campbell and Blair in order to modernize his lectures with contemporary examples. His Lectures were broken down as follows: one chapter was devoted to the importance of rhetoric, one to definition in which he defined rhetoric according to Aristotle, Cicero and Quintilian. (Adams indicated his preference for the definition of Quintilian.) One chapter was devoted to objections to speech training, four to the origin of speech, one to divisions or the canons of Cicero, nine to invention, seven to disposition, ten to elocution, one to memory and one to delivery. He also added a chapter on pulpit oratory.

He disagreed with Quintilian's "good man" theory, and used Burke and Junius as examples of eloquent style. He disagreed with Blair and Campbell on their consideration of the use of words.

On the whole Adams' lectures were well organized, well delivered, according to Edward Everett, and clearly worded. On this last point - wording - Platz, who described Adams' style as a "repetition of verbiage" and a "multiplicity of words," overstated her case.  

Rahskopf summarized the work of Adams correctly when he said "His [Adams] Lectures though confused in some matters of detail, were an admirably organized summary of classical rhetoric ... probably the best such summary ever made by an American."\(^{25}\)

After quoting Aristotle's and Cicero's definitions of rhetoric, Adams stated that Quintilian's definition, "the science of speaking well," was more correct and more precise and would be used in his lectures. Quintilian's definition was favored by Adams because of its simplicity, its coincidence with the definition offered in the Scriptures and, finally, because Quintilian made a distinction in his definition between thinking and speaking. Adams, in his own definition of rhetoric, made the distinction between grammar and rhetoric. Grammar was, to Adams, speaking correctly. Rhetoric on the other hand was speaking well. He used an interesting analogy in making clear the difference between grammar and rhetoric when he made the point that grammar was to arithmetic as rhetoric was to geometry. Adams also made a distinction between oratory and rhetoric. He considered oratory an art and rhetoric a science and felt that the pulpit was the "throne" of modern eloquence.

Adams gave invention primary emphasis in his lectures. In dealing with invention Adams covered external topics, internal topics, arguments and the state of the controversy, which he defined as the purpose to which a speaker speaks. In dealing specifically with arguments he related argument to demonstrative, deliberative and judicial speaking. In judicial oratory Adams indicated that changes had been made in courtroom procedure since the days of the ancient rhetoricians and that argument was of greater importance to the contemporary lawyer than it was in earlier times. He also considered invention in relation to pulpit oratory. He discussed the intellectual and moral qualities of an orator and, finally, the management of the passions.

Adams felt that there was a clear distinction between disposition and invention. Invention was the "discovery by meditation of those things, which by their truth or verisimilitude gave probability to the cause."\textsuperscript{26} Disposition was "the orderly arrangement of things invented."\textsuperscript{27}

\textsuperscript{26}Lectures, II, p. 142.
\textsuperscript{27}Lectures, II, p. 142.
That the type of communication stressed by Adams was the type stressed by the classical rhetoricians was apparent when he dealt with a spoken rather than a written type of communication. He indicated that the Europeans had studied rhetoric as a theory but had neglected oratory as an art and that Americans had done likewise. He made the point that Harvard had been in operation for a little less than two hundred years and that his was the first formal course in public speaking. Since Americans enjoyed freedom of speech, public speaking should be given a primary emphasis in American education. His arguments smashing objections to the classroom teaching of public speaking were representative of Adams at his very best. He did, however, when discussing elocutio or style, reveal the influences of Blair's *Lectures on Rhetoric* and *Belles Lettres* for he indicated that elocutio was diction in the sense of composition, not delivery. He used Cicero and Quintilian as references for this point of view by indicating that they meant writing, not speaking, when they spoke of style. The classicists, according to Adams, would have considered delivery under the separate heading of pronunciation.

Adams' contributions as a rhetorician were not unique. Rather, he made his contribution as a definer
and organizer. His *Lectures* were very similar to those of John Ward. But the fact that the lectures of Ward and Adams were similar was a result of Ward's influence on Dr. Pearson when Pearson drew up the rules for the office which Adams followed. As an American, he took a stand on the use of the vernacular on all occasions. He advocated a nationalistic literature to be written by Americans.

Adams' consideration of pulpit oratory was an innovation in the United States. He was one of the first Americans to state explicitly that the means of a sermon are persuasion and the end result, action. Although the major writers of the period advocated extemporaneous speaking, he expressed his doubts about extemporaneous speaking in the pulpit when he stated that "The stream which flows spontaneously, is almost always shallow, and runs forever in the same channel."

Adams' closing admonition, which produced a noticeable shock in his audience, is a fitting conclusion to this section. It sums up his faith in classical rhetoricians and oratory in general.

In social converse with the mighty dead of ancient days, you will never smart

---

29 *Lectures*, I, p. 341.
under the galling sensation of dependence upon the mighty living of the present age; and in your struggles with the world, should a crisis ever occur, when even friendship may deem it prudent to desert you; when even your country may seem ready to abandon herself and you; when even priest and levite shall come and look on you, and pass by on the other side; seek refuge, my unfailing friends, and be assured you will find it, in the friendship of Laelius and Scipio; in the patriotism of Cicero, Demosthenes and Burke; as well as in the precepts and example of him, whose whole law is love, and who taught us to remember injuries only to forgive them.30

The effects. John Quincy Adams had little apparent influence on subsequent rhetoricians in the Boylston Chair or in the nation in general. Only two of the Boylston Professors who followed Adams gave him credit for any of their materials. Joseph McKean mentioned him several times in his lectures, but did not quote from his Lectures. Some of McKean's lectures resembled Adams' lectures greatly. Edward Tyrrel Channing at no time mentioned Adams. Adams Sherman Hill referred twice to his Lectures.

The effect of John Quincy Adams on speech education today was important but indirect in nature. The direct effect of his rhetoric was negligible. Adams' name and its connection with speech at Harvard has been

30Lectures, II, p. 396.
more important to speech education, it seems, than his rhetoric. He was quoted by Gilman, Aly and Reid,\textsuperscript{31} McBurney and Wrage,\textsuperscript{32} Brigance\textsuperscript{33} and Bryant and Wallace\textsuperscript{34} largely with emphasis on the effect his name produced rather than on his understanding of speech. Most modern authorities in speech have gone directly to the sources from which Adams drew rather than working from and through his Lectures. Adams' name of course along with Witherspoon's\textsuperscript{35} stood with those of the "ancients" when classical rhetoric was revived in speech education shortly after 1900.

Indirectly Adams seriously affected speech education today by virtue of the fact that when the name of Adams and the prestige of Harvard combined, the initial impetus was given to consider speech as a separate academic discipline in the United States. "Previously,"

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{31}Gilman, Aly and Reid, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 368.
\item \textsuperscript{32}McBurney and Wrage, \textit{op. cit.}, p. v.
\item \textsuperscript{33}Brigance, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 23 and pp. 318-319.
\item \textsuperscript{34}Bryant and Wallace, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 1.
\item \textsuperscript{35}John Witherspoon, \textit{Lectures on Moral Philosophy and Eloquence} (Philadelphia: Woodward's 3rd ed., 1810). These lectures were delivered from 1768 to 1794.
\end{itemize}
stated Ota Thomas correctly, "the subject [speech] had been taught by some tutor who also instructed in numerous other fields and was frequently not specifically prepared for teaching speech. But after Adams began his duties other colleges established similar professorships. From this meagre beginning have sprung the speech departments of the present day." The similar professorships to which Thomas referred were those at Amherst, Brown, Yale, Bowdoin and Andover. From these early days speech education, spread into the West via missionaries from Yale and other eastern schools, took root and flowered.

CHAPTER IV

JOSEPH MCKEAN

Introduction. On Massachusetts Avenue in Cambridge, Massachusetts, directly across from "J. August, Haberdashers" (1320 Massachusetts Avenue), stands one of many gates to the campus of Harvard University. This particular gate was built in 1901 with the following inscription:

"The McKeans Gate

The Reverend Joseph McKeans St. D., LL. D.
Born at Ipswich, Massachusetts 19, April 1776
Died at Havana, Cuba 17, March 1816
A Graduate of this college 1794
Teacher of Youth Minister of the Gospel
Boylston Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory 1809-1818

This gate is erected to the memory of

Joseph McKeans

By the members of the Porcellian Club of which he was the Honored founder"

Beyond the limits of Boston, Joseph McKeans is little known or remembered today. In all probability many pass this monument built in his honor without a pause. His name is sometimes to be found in books, nestled between the names of John Quincy Adams and Edward Tyrrel Channing, since both of these men and Joseph McKeans shared a common office. This office has given Joseph McKeans his claim on posterity. His claim stands in stone.
The teacher. In the past 130 years nothing has been written about Reverend Joseph McKeen, the second Boylston Lecturer. His was a short life. His star burned brightly but faded quickly and vanished on his death. Plagued with tuberculosis almost all of his adult life, McKeen died while still Boylston professor, at the age of 42.

William McKeen, Joseph McKeen's father, was born in Glasgow, Scotland, on April 7, 1739 and came to the United States in 1763. In 1769 William married Sarah Manning, the daughter of Dr. Joseph Manning who had graduated from Harvard in 1751. Sarah and William McKeen had five children. Sarah McKeen, Joseph's mother, died on May 15, 1776, one month after Joseph's birth. William McKeen, who lived to the age of eighty-one, outlived his son Joseph.

Joseph's childhood was marked by vivacity and great activity. He learned the basic rudiments of classical literature and English grammar at public school in Boston.


2Levi Hedge mentioned the following five children: the first daughter, Agnes, was born on January 13, 1770. Sarah was born on June 24, 1779 and died on Oct. 6, 1775. William was born on Feb. 15, 1773 and died on Nov. 6, 1790, Elizabeth was born on August 7, 1774 and Joseph McKeen was born on April 19, 1776.
and in 1787 attended the academy at Andover where he was prepared for college studies by Dr. Ebeneser Pemberton. In 1790 McKeen was admitted to Harvard. He received high marks and distinguished himself as a student of classical studies and mathematics. After graduation from Harvard in 1794, McKeen taught school for three years, first at Ipswich, where he commenced studies with Reverend Doctor Joseph Dana, and then at Berwick. He was at Ipswich for two years and at Berwick for one year and two months. In July of 1797, McKeen went to Harvard again to finish work for his degree for the ministry. He studied with Reverend Doctor John Eliot. While at Harvard for the second time McKeen was largely responsible for the founding of the Porcellian Club, a literary society whose members gathered to sing songs and read poetry. The club maintained a library which was responsible for a part of the information that has been used concerning McKeen in this study.

In November of 1797, McKeen was invited to Milton. He accepted the invitation and became the fourth minister of the church in Milton. Shortly after his installation he gave up his major responsibilities in the Porcellian Club. It was stated in the Centennial bulletin of the Porcellian Club,
Joseph McKeen, being ineligible for the higher offices, was made the Secretary, and Charles Cutter the Grand Marshall. The latter resigned upon graduation; and the former thereupon succeeded him, continuing preeminently influential in shaping the brilliant Destiny of the Club in 1798, when he declined reelection, having ordered its government, determined its Policy, and imbued it with his personality, as we believe, for many hundred years. 3

At Milton, McKeen was "greatly respected and loved." In preparation for sermons he examined the works of critics and commentators on theological issues and explained them from the pulpit. This tendency to collect critical reviews was revealed in full-blown form when he lectured as Boylston Professor to students at Harvard. McKeen married Margaret Stevenson in 1799.

McKeen remained active in the pastorate at Milton until the summer of 1803, when he suffered a severe pulmonary attack. He was granted a dismissal on the grounds of poor health in October 3, 1804. This attack was a real shock to McKeen's vigorous and healthy frame, for he never fully regained his vitality.

In regard to the young preacher's style in the pulpit, Hedge stated that,

In the pulpit, his manner was serious and fervent; his discourses plain, evangelical, and persuasive. He seldom discussed in publick [sic] any of those merely speculative questions, which are agitated by sectaries and polemicks [sic], and which tend to produce discord and alienation among Christians ... his discourses were always of a practical character.4

His sermons, according to Joseph Dana, were well received. He stated that "... the favorable receptions he [McKean] met, from his first entrance on preaching, his early settlement at Milton, are well known."5

N. L. Frothingham, McKean's student and later his assistant, observed that wherever McKean went as a preacher, he was paid respectful attention and regarded with deep interest. This was due in part to his imposing figure and manner and his solemn fervor. Frothingham stated specifically that, "The rhetorical language of his devotions, apparently unselected and inspired by the moment, flowed over his audience with copious power."6

---


6From an article in the Boston Daily Advertiser which was an excerpt from the Annals of the American Pulpit, or
Further, stated Frothingham,

His [McKean] appearance in the pulpit, though not what would be called graceful, was much more than that; - it was massive and grand. The intonations of his voice, though quite peculiar to himself, governed by scarcely any rules of the art that he taught from the Professor's chair, were yet agreeable to all hearers, and probably the more effective from their strong peculiarities. As regards the composition of his sermons, they were thrown off too rapidly and with too little anxiety of premeditation to allow of their being finished performances. They never seemed to me to do justice to his intellectual vigor. [This was also true of McKean's lectures as Boylston Professor] .... He has told me that he could never carry any but a blotted manuscript with him into the desk; for if he revised or copied it ever so many times, he should be always altering and interlining what he had written.7

Frequent references were made to McKean's physical appearance. These physical characteristics, as a part of his tools as a speaker, were a real asset to him because he looked like a portrait of Lorenzo de Medici

7 Ibid.
according to Frothingham, who said,

His [McKean] full black eyes threw their expression from under a brow and forehead that might almost be called severe; but his mouth was as full of sweetness as any I ever saw . . . . His voice was deep and rich, corresponding to such a physiognomy.

After his resignation at Milton, at his doctor's request McKean spent his summers in the South. He went to the Barbadoes in the summer of 1604, Charleston, South Carolina in 1805 and Savannah, Georgia in 1806. As a consequence of the mild southern climate McKean's health partially returned.

In 1807 McKean was told by a member of the Corporation of Harvard that the Hollis Professorship of Mathematics, made vacant by Dr. Webber's promotion to the Presidency of Harvard, would be offered to him. McKean was very much elated. It was this position he preferred to all others. Mathematics had been his favorite study in college. However, the position of the Hollis Chair was offered to Dr. Bowditch on the ground that, although it was known that Bowditch would reject the offer, Bowditch merited the honor of being asked.

McKean refused the Chair when it was offered to him. This action was a pronounced indication of the scrupulousness of his mind. He did, however, accept the Boylston

\[\text{Ibid.}\]

\[\text{Ibid.}\]
Chair of Rhetoric and Oratory in the summer of 1809. He was installed as Boylston Professor on October 31, 1809.

McKean fulfilled the duties of his office with diligence. Dealing in general views rather than minute speculations, he was able to classify thoughts easily. His memory was excellent, and he brought great reading and a discriminating mind to his office.

Hedge offered his personal reflections on McKean's activities as Boylston Lecturer,

As professor of rhetoric [sic] and oratory he [McKean] justly obtained the praise of uncommon industry and punctuality. He was governed by a scrupulous sense of duty, and a regard to the best interests of the University. The ability and success, with which he performed the business of instruction and his unremitting attention to the moral and religious, as well as to the intellectual improvement of his pupils, were perceived and acknowledged by those, who enjoyed the benefit of his labours [sic]. His publick [sic] lectures reflect honour [sic] on himself and the University. In these it was his aim to give condensed and summary views of what was most important to be known on the subjects, which successively came under his notice. The different kinds of eloquence, with their characteristic [sic] properties and appropriate rules, were described with clearness and brevity. He was happy in drawing his illustrations from sources which were both instructive and interesting. These were often made with such peculiar pertinency, and with such felicity of language, as to produce a visible effect on his audience.10

10Levi Hedge, op. cit., p. 5.
He not only drew frequent examples from classical rhetoricians but could read Greek and Latin with ease.

Frothingham offered a statement concerning McKeans delivery as he performed the duties of Boylston Lecturer. He said that,

As a lecturer in the college chapel he allowed himself great freedom. He would often discourse in the most desultory manner; not as any statute prescribed, but as his mind happened to be exercised by the public events of the day. [These 'Ad libs' did not appear in the manuscript of his lectures.] This, if it made his lectures more exciting, certainly detracted from their academic value. His more judicious friends, on giving them a careful examination after his lamented decease, could find nothing worthy of his reputation to be given to the press.11

When Frothingham was his student, McKeans was a great favorite with his pupils.

During his nine years as Boylston Professor, McKeans accepted many honors. He was Recording Secretary of the Massachusetts Historical Society, honorary member of the Historical Society of New York and a fellow in the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. He received the Doctor of Laws degree at Princeton in New Jersey and the Doctor of Divinity degree from Allegheny College in Pennsylvania. He produced a number of speeches during this period and they are on record in the Widener Library

11 Frothingham, op. cit.
In October of 1817, McKean fell ill again. He went to Havana, Cuba, and, after a few months, died. His body was buried in niche No. 345 of the Cemetery Espada en la Habana where it rested, undisturbed, until the year 1840 in which year all the niches which were not rented were emptied of their contents and the bones were transferred to the osario, in other words, to the indiscriminate heap in the corners of the cemetery.13

McKean's widow married Charles Pelham Curtis, the first solicitor for the city of Boston.14

12 McKean's writings exist at the Widener Library at Harvard University. They are as follows:

1) A Valedictory Sermon preached in Milton, September 30, 1804.
2) A Plea for Friendship and Patriotism, in two Discourses, preached at First Church, Boston: The first on Lord's day, the 27th of March, and the second on the annual Fast, 7th of April, 1814.
3) Sermon delivered at the Ordination of Rev. J. B. Wight, 25, Jan., 1815.
4) Sermon delivered at the Ordination of Rev. M. L. Frothingham, 15, March, 1815.
5) Sermon delivered in the Church in Brattle Square, Boston, on the Lord's day next after the death of John Warren, M. D., 10, April, 1815.
6) Sermon delivered at the installation of Rev. Dr. Richmond, Dorchester, 25, June, 1817.
8) Addition to Wood's Continuation of Dr. Goldsmith's History of England.

14 James Spear Loring, op. cit., p. 403.
Rhetoric. In 1949, Warren Guthrie stated that,

Joseph McKeen was Boylston Professor from 1809 to 1817, but so far as is known he left no written rhetorical doctrine and no notes on his public lectures have been found in this study.\textsuperscript{15}

There existed no accounts of Joseph McKeen's lectures in scholarly research. The fact that McKeen's rhetoric has never been discovered was due probably to the fact that it was donated only recently, from a private collection of papers, to Harvard University. It was given to Harvard by Mrs. Taylor as a part of the Folsom Papers in 1923.\textsuperscript{16}

These lectures on rhetoric amounted to five hundred pages in all. They were written on lined, $\frac{6}{2} \times 11$ inch pages in ink. All of the lectures (with the exception of the first) gave an indication that McKeen wrote only a first draft. Most of his manuscripts were interlined, rewritten, blotted and, in general, revealed hard use. Changes in wording and thought that McKeen made over an eight-year period were marked into his work on margins and between chapters. A few chapters, like Chapters XII and XIII on Internal and External Topics were no more

\textsuperscript{15}Warren Guthrie, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 102-103.

\textsuperscript{16}Widener Library, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
than outlines or lists of topics and in the case of some individual topics he did not bother to set down his definitions.

The fact that McKeen was at his best when speaking extemporaneously made his written lectures of less value, because in some areas of his thinking, that part which was not written down could have been of most value to later scholars. But, nonetheless, his lectures as they exist are of real value, particularly as examples of what was considered important to American speech making in the early 19th century.

Since nothing has ever been written concerning McKeen's rhetorical theory "pains" have been taken to give his writings a more detailed treatment than those of other Boylston professors covered in this study. 17

McKeen's style of writing and organization as a lecturer was spotty. At times his organization was clear and unified. In other lectures, his organization was confused. The same criticism applies to his composition. The table of contents of his lectures which follows gives a bird's-eye view of the subjects which concerned him.

17 See Appendix, Exhibit 8.
Table of Contents

I Introductory Lecture
II General View of the Subject of this Course of Lectures and Consideration of some Objections
III Rise and Progress of Oratory among the Ancients
IV Biographical Sketches of Grecian Orators
V Biographical Sketches of Orators and Rhetoricians in the Latter Portion of Grecian History
VI A Biographical Sketch of Some of the Most Distinguished Roman Orators and Rhetoricians
VII Roman Orators and Rhetoricians after Cicero
VIII To Explain the Nature and Objects of Oratory (3 usual divisions and sacred eloquence)
IX The Several Kinds of Oratory; Demonstrative; Deliberative and Judicial
X Connection of Oratory with the Powers of the Human Mind
XI Constituent Parts of Oratory, Invention
XII Internal Topics
XIII External Topics
XIV The State of the Controversy (Summary)
XV The Properties and Uses of Narration and Proposition
XVI Arguments Demonstrative
XVII Deliberative
XVIII Judicial
XX Character of an Orator
XX Excitation of Passions
XXI Disposition Properties and Uses of the Introduction
XXII Introductory to New Class-Sketch of the Founder and foundation
XXIII Confirmation and Confutation
XXIV Properties and Uses of the Conclusion
XXV Remarks on Digression, Transition and Amplification
XXVI Of Elocution Generally - and Elegance
Joseph McKeen followed the rules of his office even more closely than did John Quincy Adams, covering almost every individual stipulation in the rules and directions for the Boylston Professor. Frequent comments were made, indicating that his motivation for covering certain subjects was in effect the original dictates of his office.

McKeen, like Adams, relied on the classical rhetoricians in developing his lectures. In addition to explaining classical rhetoric, however, the former summarized the rhetorical works of his contemporaries. In Lecture

\[18\text{The table of the contents of McKeen's lectures was not originally set down by McKeen. This table was drawn up by the writer from the original lectures.}\]
III, "The Rise and Progress of Oratory Among the Ancients," his faith in classical rhetoric was made especially clear.

This [rhetoric] is one of the subjects of human attention in which the moderns have been contented to follow in the steps marked out by their illustrious predecessors of Greece and Rome. So judged those who prescribed this course of lectures which is on the exact plan of the system of Professor Ward, who candidly avows his full concurrence with the amiable and eloquent Pennelon, that to combine portions of Aristotle and Longinus with Cicero and Quintilian and to confirm their maxims by references to the purest authors of antiquity, would even now form the best system of oratory.19

The second Boylston Professor adopted Quintilian's definition of rhetoric because, first, it corresponded with the definition of rhetoric stated in the statutes of his office and, secondly, because it was a "satisfactory" definition. Although he accepted Quintilian's definition of rhetoric, McKean went on to indicate that

... it may still not be unpleasant or useless to trace the similarity and harmony between this [Quintilian's definition] and several of the most distinguished subsequent writers as well as incidentally in what it principally differs from those who had previously treated this subject.20

He proceeded to note the definition of rhetoric offered

19Lectures, p. 37.

20Lectures, p. 92.
by Aristotle, Tralles, Cicero and cited Vossius as one of Ward's chief sources. He said,

Professor Ward follows him [Vossius] in this as in most respects and defines oratory [sic] the art of speaking well upon any subject, in order to persuade. He [Ward] does not contemptuously wave the objections which had been urged against including this principle design in the definition of the art. Nor does he admit that the not infrequent failure to effect persuasion is any more decisive than to urge that because physicians are not always successful in curing diseases this therefore is not the end of the art of medicine. 21

Further, after citing the definitions of rhetoric offered by Lawson, Homes, Blackwall, Smith, Campbell, Blair and Barron, 22 McKean attempted to incorporate the similarities of the definitions of all the authorities into one comprehensive definition, as follows,

In the view now given of the nature of oratory, respecting which there is a near resemblance between all these writers in the most material respects, are implied its most important objects. It is the art of speaking well. This is with a view to some end; it is either to afford innocent and pure pleasure, or effect some important benefit. It is the art of persuasion; to accomplish this great purpose in the best manner, it must interest the attention, please the taste, inform the mind, and affect the heart. 23

In short, Adams' successor made use of almost all of the available authorities on rhetoric to develop his

21 Lectures, p. 94.
22 See Appendix, Exhibit 9, p. 10.
23 Lectures, p. 95.
lectures. He gave Greek and Roman rhetoricians great weight but, at the same time, held the works of the ancients up to the "hotter" if not "brighter" lights of those who followed them.

McKeen was the first of American theorists to fashion a history of the development of the philosophy of rhetoric. His scope was broad. He mentioned, at least, all notable writers on speech to his day and, consequently, his rhetorical theory was a conglommeration of a little of all that he criticised.

His analysis of what he covered was a bit superficial and his accounts of their importance were exaggerated, but for the breadth of his scope and his unique method of amalgamating classical and contemporary rhetoricians he has been recognised in this study as a contributor to the general development of rhetorical theory in the United States.

Although McKeen's concept of rhetoric was basically classical in nature, he extended his approach to include the similarities between classical rhetoric and the contemporary rhetorics of the Ciceronian tradition in Great Britain. His favorite among contemporary rhetoricians was Campbell. When referring to Campbell, he indicated that,

His [Campbell] name might never to be mentioned but with the respect due to
high intellectual powers and attainments, associated with the best affections and most amiable character. To rhetorical students he has rendered services second only to the great masters of antiquity... It yet cannot be superfluous to recommend his *Philosophy of Rhetoric* not merely as an interesting and useful treatise to peruse but as an invaluable summary to study, to digest. This is one of the few books which really is what its title implies. 214

The emphasis in some cases in McKean's theory was identical to that of his predecessor. He broke his discourse down in almost exactly the same proportions as Adams. He devoted one lecture to the nature of oratory, five to the history of oratory, ten to invention, six to organization, twelve to style and one to pronunciation.

In his coverage of style McKean included specific lectures on the style of epistles and dialogues, history, poetry and orations. His final lecture, used as a graduation "send-off," was developed in support of Quintilian's statement, "An orator is a good man skilled in the art of speaking."

It has been stated that specific points in McKean's lectures were identical to Adams'. Since McKean did not attribute these ideas to Adams, it was sheer conjecture.

214 Lectures, p. 117.
that he was directly influenced by the latter. Since both men were familiar with the same sources, it was likely that both arrived at the same conclusions independently. McKean was not the sort of man, it seems, who would have used materials without quoting his sources. He was too scrupulous and too much the scholar to plagiarize willfully.

Oral communication was the specific form of communication with which McKean concerned himself. He felt that oratory was associated with advanced civilization. Specifically, he said,

As these powers [speech] elevate man above other animals, so does the degree in which they are cultivated, separate, in great measure, the refined from barbarous nations, the civilized man from the savage. It is intellectual treasure, combined with moral character, rather than extent of wealth or territory that gives value or stability to empire.²⁵

In accomplishing his over-all purpose, McKean gave a few hints on his method of lecturing. His primary aim was to "adapt instructions to use by his audience." ²⁶ He asked his students to expect a plain, didactic style of writing and a familiar manner of delivery. Although he made it clear that his lectures would not be simply

²⁵Lectures, p. 3.
²⁶Lectures, p. 17.
a repetition of standard authorities, he was not anxious to develop "splendid novelties." His desire was to transmit the solid, tried works of the classical rhetoricians. He asked for questions and, finally, he asked for an objective treatment of subjects in student declamations. He felt that literature has been "too much associated with and influenced by the spirit of political and religious party," and went on to point out that

... in this favored season [college years], in this calm retreat of the muses, let none of the angry or turbulent passions of the world interrupt your quiet, disturb your harmony, obscure your judgment.

His students should, he said, "weigh in the scales of reason and truth the claims of authors and men" and "say nothing which in the remotest degree infringes on the reverence due to the Supreme Being." McKean himself was more the speaker than the writer.

McKean's unique contributions to rhetorical theory were not made in the sense of originality of thought or material. His contribution was his method. He organized poorly at times, but he was the first of American rhetoricians to organize a wide diversity of sources into a

27Lectures, p. 20.
28Lectures, p. 20.
29Lectures, p. 20.
unified whole. In brief comments on orators of his time - Hamilton, Ames and Dexter - he generally accorded them praise. He referred to Logan, an Indian chief, as an example of the beauty of primitive oratory.

McKean was also the first American to apply faculty psychology to the speech situation. This was largely a result of his interest in and knowledge of Campbell. His breakdown of faculties was much the same as Campbell's. He discussed (1) imagination, (2) reasoning and (3) emotions as faculties to which the speaker should refer when he addresses an audience.

The speaker's tool in affecting the understanding, said McKean, was logic, and rhetoric was the practical extension of logic. A study of poetry supplied the orator with an understanding of imagination which he could use in his speaking. Memory, he said, was not an essential requisite but an important auxiliary to good speaking. Rather than giving memory a separate treatment, he referred to it as a faculty of mind.

McKean gave the orator free rein in making use of allied fields. The orator combs sister sciences and explores the

---

30 Edward Tyrrel Channing was not the first American to bring faculty psychology into rhetorical theory.

31 Lectures, pp. 117-127.
treasures of all the arts, in order to give vigour to his powers of reasoning, and afford copiousness to his illustrations, that he may convince the minds of those whom he addresses.32

In summary, aside from his method, McKean made no unique contributions to rhetorical theory. He recognized the genius of classical rhetoricians, but was not unmindful of the more recent developments in British rhetoric. In many ways he skillfully combined the elements of the contemporary approach to the rhetorical process with those of the ancients.

The effects. McKean's effect as a teacher of speech was limited to the classes he faced. Frothingham, his student, indicated that "... no external proofs of his eminence stand forth to justify our partiality to a stranger's eye."33 He said, further, "I should address a large and sorrowing audience, were I heard by all those students, who most highly revered and tenderly loved him."34 McKean's rhetoric stood in the shadow of the first Boylston Professor. Both men had based their rhetorics on the rules for Boylston professors, but the name of the latter and the quality of his rhetoric

32Lectures, p. 122.
33W. L. Frothingham, Funeral Sermon (Boston: J. R. Buckingham, 1818), p. 5.
34Ibid., p. 13.
overshadowed the rhetoric of the former. Like Adams, McKean had, for all practical purposes, no impact on those who followed him in the Chair.

Further, McKean had no influence on speech education in the United States. His rhetoric has been presumed lost. His name was buried with his body in Havana, Cuba. It seems that his rhetoric met the same fate as his bones - discarded in the "indiscriminate heap in the corners" of the history of rhetoric.
CHAPTER V

EDWARD TYRREL CHANNING

Introduction. To a lesser extent than Joseph McKean, Edward Tyrrel Channing, until recently, has been overlooked as a factor in the development of American rhetoric. His name was remembered largely because he was the brother of William Ellery Channing. In a sense his life reflected the quiet glories of the intellectual powers of his famous elder brother.

His achievements as a teacher at Harvard, however, were striking. Further, he moved in the central whirlpool of literary activity in New England during the years when American writers were beginning to produce what later came to be considered the "beginnings" of American literature.

The teacher. Edward Tyrrel Channing was born in Newport, Rhode Island, on December 12, 1790. His father, William Channing, was Attorney General for Rhode Island and District Attorney for the district of Rhode Island.

---

1Dorothy Anderson, op. cit., pp. 81-92.
Edward Tyrrel Channing's father died as a young man on September 21, 1793, leaving his wife, Lucy Ellery, and nine children. Among the other prominent descendants of William and Lucy Ellery Channing were a grandson, Ellery Channing (Dr. William Ellery Channing's nephew and friend of Henry Thoreau), and a great-grandson, (Ellery's son) Edward Channing, the author of *The History of the United States*.

When Dr. William Ellery Channing was beginning his career as a preacher in 1804, Edward Tyrrel entered Harvard. As a student, Edward Tyrrel was involved in the student rebellion of 1807 and, as a result, his college career was delayed. But he received his degree a few years later.

His favorite studies were law, history, Greek and Latin. His interest in the classics led Dr. William Ellery Channing to call his brother Edward "the antiquary of the family." After he graduated from Harvard, Channing gave himself over to literary activities and became involved in the early organization of the *North American Review*.

---

4In all likelihood Channing heard Adams' lectures.
In 1817 he became editor. During his years with the Review, he was a central figure in a little group of men devoted to literary pursuits. Channing's small group of associates was later to be recognized on a national basis. Among this group of men were Richard Henry Dana, George Ticknor, Edward and Alexander Everett, Jared Sparks, John Gorham Palfrey, Dr. Gardiner Bowditch, Daniel Webster and Andrews Norton.

As early as 1817 while still a part of this core of literary men, Channing realized that "something" was in the air. Brooks stated that,

Professor Edward Tyrrel Channing and his cousin, Richard Henry Dana, had been driving from Cambridge into Boston. Channing was the editor-in-chief of the new North American Review, and Dana was his assistant. As they drove along, side by side, Channing read to Dana two poems that had just come into his hands by a young man named William Cullen Bryant, who lived in a village in the Berkshires. One of them was entitled Thanatopsis. As Channing continued to read, Dana exclaimed, 'That was never written on this side of the water.'

These men, along with other New Englanders, produced later in the century the "Golden Age," so called, of American literature.

On July 12, 1819, Edward Tyrrel Channing was voted

---

6Van Wyck Brooks, op. cit., p. 115.
an honorary A. M. degree at Harvard and on September 7 of the same year, he was elected to the office of Boylston Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory. When Channing took his new office as Boylston Professor, Mr. Edward Everett replaced him as editor of the *North American Review*. Channing's appointment was not completely accepted by the public. One newspaper article, dated November 10, 1819 indicated that,

> When the nomination was first announced, it was found that the publick [sic] sentiment (for the publick [sic] have a right to feel, and do feel interested on this subject,) was by no means united in favour of Mr. Channing. It was discovered, too, by the government of the college as well as by the publick [sic], that Mr. Boylston, the munificent founder of the Professorship, was utterly and irreconcilably opposed to the appointment of Mr. Channing. [The writer of this article was probably referring to Ward Nicholas Boylston]. Under these circumstances it was expected, and it was a favourable expectation, that, whatever might be the merits of Mr. Channing, the Board of Overseers would not be assembled to confirm the appointment until the approaching session of the legislature, when all the members of the Board might conveniently be present. A proper regard for the publick [sic] sentiment, for the feelings of Mr. Boylston, and for the future welfare of the College, seemed to require this delay. But on the day of the general review, in Boston, when the Governor [sic], if not other members of the Board, was necessarily absent, nine or ten out of nineteen overseers present confirmed the
appointment. The Board consists of more than seventy members.7

While he fulfilled his duties as Boylston lecturer, the third Boylston Professor continued to write for the North American Review. He also wrote a section in Jared Sparks' American Biography on the life of his grandfather, William Ellery.8 Seven years after he became Boylston Professor, McKean's successor married his cousin Henrietta Ellery, the daughter of William Ellery, Esquire.

Although he taught rhetoric and oratory at Harvard, he was himself a mediocre speaker.

As for oratory, Mr. Channing's professorship was a sinecure. ... He had, as a speaker, no grace, nor any great diversity of modulation; and his gestures were awkward, seeming to denote rather his discomfort at being obliged to speak than the mood of thought or feeling to which he gave expression.9

7Newspaper article from the scrapbook of Jeremiah Coburn donated to Harvard on May 6, 1882. The clipping is from a Worcester paper and is dated Wednesday, November 10, 1819.


Oliver Wendell Holmes wrote of his teacher's ability to speak: "Channing, with his bland, superior look, Cold as a moonbeam on a frozen brook ... ."

When Channing retired in 1851 he was one of the oldest teachers on Harvard's faculty. The students he had taught numbered in the thousands. It was difficult to generalize from a few statements from students concerning his ability as a teacher, for his general effect as a teacher, according to some, was of crucial importance. Dana said,

The department of themes, forensics and elocution has not usually, in our colleges, held a high position, compared with other departments, as respects the determining of academic rank, and the attention to it has been less exact and obligatory. But Mr. Channing carried his department forward until its relative influence was so great that excellence in it became essential to honors and high rank, and neglect of it incompatible with continuance in college at all.

That he was opposed to ornamented, flowery oratory was pointed up in his Lectures. But his view that emphasis should be put on an easy, natural delivery was set down shortly after he became Boylston Professor. On

11Edward Tyrrel Channing, Lectures, op. cit., p. xii.
12Lectures, p. 58.
December 12, 1826, in a letter of recommendation for Mr. Horatio Alger, Channing stated that Alger was a "natural and agreeable speaker." In addition, he said,

He [Alger] has what I esteem much better than a mere observance of rules, or an imitation of models, an easy, natural way of his own, showing that he feels his author, and can vary his voice and manner to suit every style and description of writing.13

In accord with his background in journalism and his interest in the literary movement in New England, Channing gave most of his efforts to the written side of his students' work. He devised themes and gave them to students. Declamation and written essays by students were then built around these themes. Two examples of the subjects covered under this procedure were as follows:

1) He that would write should read; not that he may retell the observations of others, but that being thus replenished, he may find himself in a condition to make and improve his own.14

and, 2) "an Analysis of Dr. Whately's view of analogy with examples to illustrate it."

13Letter of E. T. Channing dated December 12, 1826 in the Widener Library at Harvard University.

14A list of themes in original form donated to Harvard University in 1953. These theme topics were written by Channing and were given to classes between 1834-37.
Other topics were concerned with such subjects as the delights of a discoverer, the pursuit of money, keeping a private journal, conformity, criticism of polite society, descriptions of battles, the state of society in Rome and a comparison of the press and public speaking as means of communication.  

The labor that went into the criticism of these exercises was recognized and praised by James Spear Loring as follows:

One of the most useful of his [Channing's] duties, and at the same time the most laborious and wearisome, has been the reading and correcting the Themes of the students. Perhaps in this way, quiet and unostentatious though it has been, his power has been most generally and permanently felt.

Like his predecessor, Channing was brought into close, person-to-person contact with his students. According to an account in the *Advertiser*,

... Professor Channing's duty brought him into the closest personal relation to his pupils, and his instructions were on such subjects that every man of them has reason to recall them every day. We may say, therefore, that thousands of men, some of them in high positions of society, will gratefully acknowledge ... that they owed to him, more than any other man, what power they have in the ready use of the mother tongue.

---

16*James Spear Loring, op. cit., p. 385.*
17*Scrapbook of Jeremiah Colburn, newspaper article from the *Advertiser* dated February, 1856.*
Before moving into the lasting effects of his work at Harvard, it is necessary to consider his rhetoric. It wasn't until Channing's death, in February of 1856 after resignation as Boylston Professor, that his rhetoric was published by his wife. It has been said that he died reading Tully's *Offices* in Latin.

The rhetoric. In the preface of his *Lectures on Rhetoric and Oratory*, Edward Tyrrel Channing admitted frankly that he had not attempted to present a systematic view of rhetoric in "compliance with the statutes of the professorship" or any ideas of his own. He selected from his thirty-two years of teaching specific subjects about which he wrote essays. His published work does not then represent his entire course in rhetoric at Harvard.

Most of his obligations to other rhetoricians were, Channing admitted, forgotten. Since he made no reference to his predecessors in the Boylston Chair of Rhetoric and Oratory, it was evident that Joseph McKean and John Quincy Adams had little if any effect on him. At no point in his *Lectures* did he refer to John Quincy Adams. The reason for the absence of such reference was the difference that existed between the philosophies of Adams and Channing. Briefly, these differences were as follows. Adams with a few qualifications applied
classical rhetoric to modern times. Channing made distinctions between classical rhetoric and his own concept of modern rhetoric. Adams gave emphasis to the speech situation. Channing dealt with the written word and literature. Adams gave emphasis to the classical concept of invention. Channing stressed the habits and faculties of the writer. In short, Edward Tyrrel Channing's rhetoric represented the first important departure from the original rules and regulations set down for the Boylston Chair.

Channing undoubtedly had a working knowledge of classical rhetoricians. He was also a student of Shakespeare, Milton, Burke, Johnson, Goldsmith, Fielding, Richardson, Scott and Chaucer. Among the theologians, he studied Barrow, Taylor, Smith, Young, Cowper and Bunyan. He read Wordsworth, Coleridge, Byron, Campbell, Whately and Lamb, and preferred the philosophy of Thomas Reid. 16

The sources from which he drew in large part were writers rather than rhetoricians or speakers. His background and interests were such that his feeling for the written word evinced in his Lectures was quite understandable.

---

16 Lectures, p. xiii.
His written style was smooth and flowing - the style of an accomplished writer. His organization was not the clear-cut organization of the speaker, however. He made far greater use of deductive reasoning than the "example" or inductive methods in establishing his ideas. At times his reasoning was difficult to follow and his specific purposes in lecturing were not on the whole clear-cut. He wrote in general terms rather than the specific.

The first half of Channing's Lectures was unified by a series of comparisons between classical rhetoric and his own concept of contemporary rhetoric. In his first lecture he indicated that the circumstances in a state of society influence to a great extent the character of the oratory used in that society.

In the ancient republics, rhetoric was a part of all education and oratory was extremely important, stated Channing. The implication, though unstated, was that oratory was of lesser importance to modern society. The difference between the use of oratory in ancient days and the use of oratory in his time was a result of many factors. First, the people in ancient societies were ignorant and could be easily swayed by orators. Secondly, the orator had great freedom in ancient days. He was less restricted to the use of reason and formal
argument, particularly in the law courts; the orator in ancient days made freer use of imagination and appeals to the passions of audiences. Further, the ancients placed greater emphasis on national grandeur and glory than did those of nineteenth century days. This glory and grandeur of ancient times has been exaggerated and the defects of ancient society have been covered over by the "cloak of time." Finally, since the nation of ancient days sought power among nations rather than internal security, oratory became extremely important. Why Channing assumed that oratory was not important in securing internal harmony was left unanswered.

For his day and age, Channing felt that the importance of one man had diminished to the point where his ability to sway people was of less importance. More laws in modern times limited the speaker and audiences were more learned. The ancient speaker controlled audiences. In Channing's time, the reverse was true, he said. In the 1800's in the United States, he felt that the subject of a speech was more thought of than the speaker. He stated that,
... the splendor that surrounds him
(the speaker) must be the natural
light of truth, not the false brilli-
ancy that startles and blinds.19

Although the cause-effect relationship between
the different factors in ancient and modern societies
and the diminishing importance of speech was not clear
in most of these instances, Channing depreciated by
inference the importance of oratory in his own day. In
brief, he felt that the rules left behind by the ancien-
ts should be studied but with an eye to the altered
conditions of society.

According to Channing, there were five reasons for
studying the ancient rhetoricians. One studied them to
obtain rhetorical instruction, to enjoy literature, to
examine the examples in the classics of great men, to
understand history and, finally, to understand human
nature.

Although the setting for modern oratory has changed,
the purpose of oratory has remained unchanged since the
beginning of history. The object of eloquence, he said,
was "... to bring men, by whatever modes of address,
to our way of thinking, and thus make them act according
to our wishes."20 In achieving the purpose of eloquence,

19Lectures, p. 18.
20Lectures, p. 13.
the character of the speaker predominates.

Channing gave a good many pages to a discussion of the general view of rhetoric primarily for the purpose of setting up his definition of rhetoric in such a fashion as to include writing.

The word "rhetoric," he said, had come to be a reproachful description of a certain type of style. He was referring to the bombastic, flowery style of oratory in his day. He would probably have classified Joseph McKean as an example of this type of style. Originally, according to Channing, rhetoric was intended to instruct men in the composition and delivery of orations, but the preparation of an orator included a great deal that is equally appropriate for writers.

Rhetoric when reduced to a system in books was, according to Channing, "a body of rules derived from experience and observation, extending to all communication by language and designed to make it efficient." This definition was followed up with a chain of reasoning for the purpose of establishing written communication

21 Lectures, p. 31.
as a part of his activities as Boylston Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory.

His reasoning, paraphrased, went as follows: In thus extending the meaning of rhetoric beyond orators and speakers, the orator gains. Rhetoric analyzes methods of persuasion. The qualities in man's nature are the same for speaker and writer. Both must use the same approach. He stated, "I cannot see how a liberal and philosophical rhetoric can overlook any form of composition, any use of language that aims at power over the heart." To paraphrase further, community among the arts makes limiting rhetoric to speech unwise. The reason for making any course exclusive is to perfect the pupil. An exclusive course will shut out any matter that will interfere with the purpose of the course, but certainly not that which involves the same principle which the course portends to teach. A person will understand more "... even with the faintest differences that may naturally exist between the manner of the speaker and the writer," about rhetoric when he studies it in its various modes. Further, when one includes written communication in rhetoric, one eliminates the idea that persuasion is a vulgar instrument.

---

22 Lectures, p. 33.
23 Lectures, p. 34.
This then was Channing's rationale for including written communication under the general heading of rhetoric and oratory. Channing fulfilled the regulations of his office by basing half of his Lectures on classical rhetoric but he did so not for the purpose of indicating its contemporary use. He did not adhere to the spirit of the regulations of the Chair in that he repudiated by implication the modern application of classical theory.

Channing covered very generally the topics of demonstrative, deliberative and judicial oratory. He devoted one lecture to debate and three to pulpit oratory, and in accord with his tendency to emphasize the written word, he devoted the second half of his Lectures to the habits and faculties of the writer.

His lectures on rhetoric for the writer covered the literary tribunal for "great" literature, forms of criticism, a writer's preparation, a writer's reading, a writer's habits, a study of language, clearness of expression and thought, using words for ornament and, finally, permanent literary fame.

These lectures for the aspiring writer were an attempt to do basically two things. First, Channing

---

24 See Appendix, Exhibit 9, pp. 396.
attempted to inspire his students to strive for literary greatness and, secondly, he gave very practical "tips" to the young writer about his everyday behavior. These practical concrete steps that a writer could take were offered specifically to motivate him to achieve his purpose of literary greatness. A work of literary excellence, he said, was a work that met with acceptance from both authorities and common readers. In order to achieve the characteristic of universality a piece of literature must be enjoyed by the simple man and studied by those with greater and more refined sensitivity.

The emphasis of Channing's rhetoric was put on the specific habits that a writer should develop to nurture his own originality and his feeling for the written word.  

This man in a sense was the forerunner of the present day advocates of the "communications course" which is, in essence, a combination of the teaching of skills both in writing and speaking in one course of study.

25See Appendix, Exhibit 9, p. 310.

Although he devoted the same number of pages to the written and spoken word, his personal interests were revealed when he wrote of the writer. His insights into the situation of the writer were penetrating and basic. It was understandable that his students later established for themselves the titles of literary giants in light of his purpose stated succinctly in the concluding statement of his Lectures. He wrote, after urging his students to strive toward greatness,

> If we should bring into one view the fortunes of still other writers, who are considered as the most prosperous among the immortals, the lowly might be brought to think it better for a man to sleep quietly when he has no more to do with the earth in the body. But they will not persuade the soaring spirit that it is not worth ambition to be a great power in the world, ages after one's burial.27

**The effects.** During his thirty-two years as Boylston Professor, Edward Tyrrel Channing made subtle but lasting changes in the teaching of rhetoric at Harvard University. He was the teacher responsible for the shift of emphasis in the Boylston Chair from the oral to the written word. When Francis J. Child followed Channing in the Boylston Chair, precedent set by Channing gave Child the justification for unofficially turning the Chair into the "Boylston Chair of English and

---

27*Lectures*, p. 298.
Testimony to the effect that Channing had a sweeping effect on education at Harvard came from many sources. Barrett Wendell stated that,

His work [Channing's] as Boylston Professor, too, has undoubtedly affected our traditions and teachings as lastingly as has that of any teacher in the college history.\(^28\)

Loring indicated that,

The influence he has exercised, in forming and cultivating the taste of so many successive classes, has been surpassed by no one, probably, ever connected with the college.\(^29\)

Perhaps the clearest statement of his effect as Boylston Professor came from the pen of Van Wyck Brooks. Brooks stated that under his tutelage,

In a word, the students learned to think. Moreover they learned to write. Whatever might have been said of the Harvard professors, their taste could not have been impugned. ... Their scholarship was sure to be exacting especially when Edward Tyrrel Channing ... became professor of rhetoric, - two years after the birth of a Concord boy, Henry Thoreau by name, who was to acknowledge, in later years, that he had learned to write as Channing's pupil. In fact, the whole New England "renaissance" was to spring so largely from


Channing's pupils, Emerson, Holmes, Dana, Motley, Parkman to name only a few, .... One of these pupils [Thoreau] kept his college themes, and a list of some of the subjects that Channing set might go as far as any other fact to explain why his students were to go so far. ... Judging by the fruits of his instruction, one might almost say that Channing sowed more of the seeds that make a man of letters - when the seeds fall on a fortunate soil - than all the other teachers of composition all the writers of ingenious text-books that have ever taught a much-taught country. 30

Before the 1850's Channing's rhetoric had little direct influence on the development of speech education in America. Indirectly, however, his rhetoric prepared Harvard for the man who, twenty-five years after Channing retired, had a direct and telling effect on the teaching of rhetoric throughout the United States - Adams Sherman Hill.

In all, Edward Tyrrel Channing represented in education the link between the classical form of rhetoric as it was taught before 1830 and the discipline of English as we know it today.

CHAPTER VI

ADAMS SHERMAN HILL

Introduction. If, of all the works by Boylston Professors, one were singled out as the most circulated and widely used, it would be The Principles of Rhetoric by Adams Sherman Hill. At least one copy of one of Hill's books on rhetoric was invariably found in used book stores. These books, until recently, enjoyed a wide circulation.

It is surprising that except for scattered comments, little has been written about Hill's twenty-eight years as the Boylston Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory at Harvard. Not one book has dealt specifically with his life and activities. He remains, however, a leading figure in the development of the discipline of English in the United States.

The teacher. Like John Quincy Adams, Adams Sherman Hill was made Boylston Professor at the age of thirty-nine. Before he was appointed to the chair, Hill's life was the hurried, rugged life of a newspaperman.

Born in Boston, on January 30, 1833\(^1\), Hill went to

\(^1\)Student registration card of Adams Sherman Hill, Archives in the Widener Library, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
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Harvard and graduated with the class of 1853. He represented his class, upon graduation, as class orator.

Hill obtained a degree in law two years after his graduation from Harvard and then went to Worcester, where he was employed by Senator George Frisbie Hoar. After a year in law, Hill launched his career as a journalist, going to New York City as a member of the editorial staff of the New York Tribune. In 1856, he was made editor of the Tribune.

After his health broke in 1859, he and his wife, Caroline Inches Hill, went abroad for several months. In 1861 he was made Washington correspondent for the New York Tribune and in a newspaper article it was reported that

... as a war correspondent he had been one of the earliest to realize the greatness of Abraham Lincoln, and at a stage when the critical attitude toward him was only too fashionable in this part of the land young Hill anticipated in his letters from Washington what has since become the common judgment of mankind.

---

2 New York Globe, December 26, 1910

3 Scrapbook of Adams Sherman Hill, Widener Library, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

4 Ibid.
He again suffered from ill health in 1863 and realized that his physical constitution prohibited further newspaper work.

During the four years between 1864 and '68, Hill wrote and rested. His writings were published in the American Review and the Atlantic Monthly. From 1868 to 1871, he was in Europe a great deal of the time and his son, Arthur Dehon Hill, was born in Paris in 1869.5

In 1872 he was called to Boston by Charles Eliot. Eliot's selection of professors was made in many cases "by rule of thumb," and such was the case with Adams Sherman Hill. "Believing the American colleges were neglecting English, Eliot chose as the man to blaze the trail an aggressive young journalist who had been Washington correspondent of the New York Tribune ... ."6

Hill was physically tired and as a teacher untried; nonetheless, he was appointed to the faculty at Harvard as an assistant professor in English in 1872. Four years after his appointment he was appointed to the Boylston Chair of Rhetoric and Oratory to replace Francis J. Child.

5Ibid. Arthur was later to become the District Attorney for Suffolk County in Massachusetts.

6Ibid.
President Eliot felt that Hill would bring to the Boylston Chair a practical sense that would prove valuable to students who were interested only in writing for everyday life.

President Eliot, then [1872] a young man of thirty-eight, foresaw a greatly increased attendance at the colleges and universities of the country. Not only that; he felt sure that this attendance would be made up in large part of men and women who would work in the sciences and other subjects not linguistic or literary. Anyhow, the older literary training was rigid and artificial, and altogether too exclusively designed for state occasions. He would have students forearmed with such a working acquaintance with their mother tongue as would serve them unaffectedly in their daily lives.7

As Boylston Professor, Hill like his predecessor, Francis J. Child, had little use for oratory in the usual sense. He had a sort of veneration for the speeches of Lincoln and Webster, but his real delight was literature "... and poetry stirred him deeply."8

While serving in his capacity as teacher, he devoted a great deal of his energies to writing. He produced three major volumes on the subject of rhetoric: The Principles of Rhetoric,9 The Foundations of

---

8Scrapbook, op. cit.
Rhetoric in 1892 and The Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition in 1902. In these volumes he labored to establish criteria for determining what was correct usage in the English language, labors which helped him achieve the title of the "highpriest of correctness."\(^{12}\)

Adams Sherman Hill, as recalled by one of his students,\(^{13}\) was a small man. He cultivated a pointed beard and wore three sets of glasses; one worn in the customary way, another pushed up and back on his head and a third set which was usually on the table or lost in a book. His students had to wait for the right combination when he read a theme. His voice, high and thin, frequently broke. He spoke in sharp, quick sentences and cross questioned his students in Socratic fashion.

His early years as a teacher were difficult, as he had no sense of discipline.\(^{14}\) Sometimes his students hummed pleasant melodies as he read themes in class. But Hill persisted.

---


\(^{13}\)Boston Transcript, December 31, 1910.

\(^{14}\)Rollo Walter Brown, op. cit., p. 51.
After Eliot had hired Barrett Wendell and Le Baron Russell Briggs to assist him in the teaching of Eng-
lish, Hill was able to devote more time to his writing. He relied a great deal on his assistants. Brown stated that

... on account of Professor Hill's poor health, he delegated most of his [Hill's] authority to his young associate [Briggs].

.... So when Professor Hill handed him [Briggs] classroom lectures and said,
'I am too sick to meet the class, and you must lecture to them,' he [Briggs] ac­
cepted the difficult commission and read valiantly.\(^{15}\)

The fifth Boylston Professor brought his background in journalism with him when he came to Harvard. In an article in 1875, *An Answer to the Cry for More English*, he outlined the program of studies he set for his stu­
dents. In this article, he said, by way of introduction,

We can all remember a time when our schools and colleges gave even less instruction in the art of writing and speaking the English language correctly than is given at pres­
ent, and that too without much complaint from any quarter.\(^{16}\)

It was further pointed out in his article that the cry for reform in education toward greater emphasis on the teaching of English was being felt. His answer to the

\(^{15}\)Ibid., p. 52.

need for more teaching of English in education found expression in the new program for students at Harvard. He said that,

In 1874, for the first time, every applicant for admission to Harvard was required to present English Composition. The requisition was as follows: 

14. English Composition - Each candidate will be required to write a short English Composition, correct in spelling, punctuation, grammar, and expression, the subject to be taken from such standard authors as shall be announced from time to time.17

English should be taught at all levels of education, asserted Hill. He continued, "When the schools [all grades] shall be ready to teach the laws of good use in language and the elementary principles of rhetoric, a great point will be gained."18 Two class hours of English per week should be required of all Freshmen and training in the use of the English language should be given to all classes in college. Hill outlined, in detail, courses in English that would fill the need at Harvard. With the help of two able assistants, Le Baron Russell Briggs and Barrett Wendell he carried his program of required English into practice at Harvard.

In 1872 the University of Harvard had no Department of English. The classes in rhetoric or, by this time,

17 Ibid., p. 235.
18 Ibid., p. 237.
English were turned over to "whatever good man was obliging enough to take them. Scarcely anybody, teacher or student, was hospitable to Rhetoric." Adams Sherman Hill took the job and was the first head of the department of English and the first head of the division of English. Finally, he established the Graduate School of English at Harvard.

By May of 1904, his duties having become too exacting for his age and health, he retired. In December of 1910, Hill died, four years before the death of his wife Caroline. Among the pallbearers at his funeral on December 28 were President Eliot, President Lowell, Dean Briggs, Professor Bliss Perry and Dr. Henry P. Walcott, all staunch friends of the man who personally fashioned English as an academic discipline in the United States.

**The Rhetoric.** The most important of Adams Sherman Hill's books was *The Principles of Rhetoric*. It was the first book he wrote and most representative of his general philosophy. Explicitly stated in this volume, his concept of rhetoric was based on grammar. His books were all grounded on the assumption that rhetoric is defined as the set of principles behind correct writing. In *The

\[19\] Scrapbook, op. cit.
Principles of Rhetoric, there were included sections on grammatical purity, violations of good use, choice of words, number of words, written narration, exposition, argumentation and persuasion.

Hill referred to John Quincy Adams' Lectures on Rhetoric and Oratory twice: once in regard to verbosity in narration and, again, in regard to the arrangement of words. In the first instance, verbosity in narration, he stressed the necessity of saying "much in little."

As Hill referred his reader to John Quincy Adams' lecture no. 18 and Adams' discussion of brevity, he revealed his acquaintance with the work of Adams. In his consideration of the arrangement of words, he quoted Adams as follows:

'You shall find,' says John Quincy Adams, 'hundreds of persons able to produce a crowd of good ideas upon any subject, for one that can marshall them to the best advantage. Disposition (methodical arrangement) is to the orator what tactics, or the discipline of armies, is to the military art. And as the balance of victory has almost always been turned by the superiority of tactics and of discipline, so the great effects of eloquence are always produced by the excellency of disposition. There is no part of the science, in which the consummate orator will be so decidedly marked out, as by the perfection of his disposition.'

There was no further reliance on any of the other professors who preceded him in the Boylston Chair.

---

21 Ibid., p. 380.
Although Hill did make passing use of Adams' rhetoric, the difference between the philosophies of Adams Sherman Hill and John Quincy Adams was basic and all-pervading. Their rhetorics differed over definition, subject matter, emphasis and method.

When Hill referred to the art of rhetoric in his preface he made a pointed distinction between an art and a science. Rhetoric, he said, "... is an art, not a science: for it neither observes, nor discourses nor classifies: but it shows how to convey from one mind to another the results of observation, discovery or classification; it uses knowledge not as knowledge, but as power."\(^{22}\) In other words Adams Sherman Hill eliminated from the discipline of rhetoric completely the classical doctrines of invention and disposition. Since he dealt almost completely with writing rather than speaking, he also eliminated pronunciation (or delivery) and memory. The only classical canon left for him to work with was elocution or style, and he devoted his entire book to it. Hill's work reflects and was in part responsible for the movement after the 1850's in the United States toward elocution and away from the classical concept of invention.

\(^{22}\)Ibid., p. v.
Whereas John Quincy Adams referred to oratory as an art and rhetoric as a science, Hill eliminated oratory and developed rhetoric as an art. Hill's concept of rhetoric was diametrically opposed to the concept employed by Adams.

Hill also distinguished between logic and rhetoric, indicating that logic and truth were one and the ways of communication or rhetoric were many. Adams and McKeen were of the opinion that rhetoric was the extension of logic. In short he eliminated from his discussion of rhetoric all ethical considerations. He, as a teacher, would not have considered the substance of communication, but rather the means by which substance was transmitted. Rhetoric to Hill did not undertake to furnish a person with something to say; but it did undertake to tell him how best to say it. If this philosophy were carried to its ultimate conclusion, it would have allowed for "any" content in composition if this content were communicated well. Hill's rhetoric was implicitly opposed to Cicero's concept of the philosopher-orator\(^{23}\) and Quintilian's dictate that an orator must be a "good" man skilled in the art of speaking.

\(^{23}\) Cicero's rhetoric was based on the idea that the speaker must "know" before he can communicate effectively.
In support of his definition of rhetoric Hill called upon Coleridge who defined style as "... an art of conveying the meaning appropriately and with perspicuity, whatever that meaning may be; ... ." Evidently Hill met with opposition to his definition of rhetoric, for he wrote in his revised edition of *The Principles of Rhetoric* that,

While engaged in revising this book, I have seen no occasion to modify in any important respect what was said in the preface to the first edition. I still believe that the function of rhetoric is not to provide the student of composition with materials for thought, nor yet to lead him to cultivate style for style's sake, but to stimulate and train his powers of expression, - to enable him to say what he has to say in appropriate language.\(^2\)

In his revision of *The Principles of Rhetoric*, Hill profited, he said, from the criticisms given by Le Baron Russell Briggs and G. L. Kittredge.

Most of his examples were drawn from literary figures. In his notes written into Campbell's *Philosophy of Rhetoric*,\(^2\) he revealed that he was widely read. He

\(^{24}\)Adams Sherman Hill, *op. cit.*, p. vi.

\(^{25}\)Ibid., p. vi.

\(^{26}\)The original manuscript of Adams Sherman Hill in a copy of Campbell's *Philosophy of Rhetoric* in the Archives, Widener Library, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
had studied Bentham, Locke, Pope, Lowth, Hawthorne, Poe, De Quincy, Dryden, Burke, Johnson, Emerson, Robertson and Hume. And he referred several times to Aristotle's Rhetoric.

Hill had also become thoroughly familiar with Whately. Perhaps his greatest source for the outline of *Principles of Rhetoric* however was Campbell, to whom he refers frequently in his rhetoric. Hill did suggest, in his few pages on persuasion, that his students read the speeches of Burke, Webster, Cobden, and Bright.

Hill agreed with Campbell concerning the use of words when he established the criteria of "present" use. He was opposed to obsolete or ephemeral words. Time was the main factor, he said. Campbell held that any word which had not appeared in any book since 1688 or which was to be found in the works of living authors only should not be deemed fit for present use. Hill modified his position a bit from Campbell's. Words came and went more quickly, stated Hill, and more leniency than Campbell approved concerning present usage was needed in the modern day.

\[27\text{Ibid.}\]
\[28\text{Ibid.}\]
\[29\text{Adams Sherman Hill, *op. cit.*, p. 399.}\]
Hill carried his analysis of violations of good use to great detail. He discussed the misuse of "either," "neither" and "former" and "latter." He dealt with the verbs "shall" and "will." He covered adverbs, adjectives, propositions, "split infinitive," and double negatives, et cetera. His book is studded with illustrations and examples of this sort.

It was soon obvious that Hill's own style of writing was flawless. It was easy, clear and to the point. His background in journalism was evident in that he wasted few words. In several pages devoted to persuasion, Hill made the same distinction that Campbell made between conviction and motivation. Conviction dealt with belief, whereas motivation involved action as a result of belief. His suggestions to young speakers were brief: (1) Be concrete. (2) Use few words. (3) Use the climactic order. (4) Use variety in content and method. (5) Adapt your speaking to your audience.

In summary, Hill's modification of rhetoric is apparent in his attention to detail in composition. He narrowed the scope of rhetoric, excluding invention, disposition, memory and delivery, his concept of rhetoric being embraced by the word "style." In dealing with style, he standardized the rules of grammar and attempted to establish criteria for "correct" English. His
standard than for excellence in rhetoric was, in a word, correctness. Hill proved himself a master spokesman for written composition by building the area of English at Harvard from a second-rate "newcomer" in education to a position of first-rate importance.

The effect. In the minutes of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences it was observed that

... Mr. Hill gradually but steadily revolutionized the teaching of English Composition throughout this country, partly by his own exertions and partly through the efforts of his loyal disciples [Le Baron Russell Briggs and Barrett Wendell in particular]. There is no considerable institution of learning in America in which his influence, direct or indirect, cannot be traced by those who know the history of education for the past thirty years.\(^30\)

Gradually Hill, with the help of his assistants, had edged his way into a position of respectability in the educational world of Harvard. In the middle 1880's at Harvard, English was made a compulsory subject for all Freshmen. This change was made in the face of great opposition from the faculty. Nevertheless the change was made. In the 1890's and early 1900's, English departments all over the country were developed along the lines established by Hill and Briggs at Harvard. Rollo Walter Brown established the connection

\(^{30}\)Minutes of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at Harvard University, January 10, 1911.
between English training at Harvard and English train-
ing on a national basis when he asked the question,

Now how could this transaction [English becoming important and compulsory for students at Harvard], by any stretch of the imagination, become a matter of national significance? ... Harvard, with an honorable past, attracted many men who expected to do college teaching. These men, when they went to their posts all over the country, carried with them, as every college graduate must, some memory of the way things were done by their Alma Mater. And when these newer institutions sought a means of preventing students from disgracing themselves every time they put pen to paper, they almost invariably made use of Harvard's experience and established prescribed freshman courses in writing. A glance at the college and university catalogues of America will reveal how few institutions did not follow the precedent which young Briggs [and Hill], after much opposition, was allowed to establish.31

Thus Hill had a definite effect on the teaching of English in the United States.

As for Hill's effect on speech education, it was felt that in general Hill represented at best a neutral effect rather than a positive aid to the development of speech education in the United States. Hill made final the shift from emphasis on speech to emphasis on writing in the philosophy of rhetoric represented in the Boylston Chair. He shifted the emphasis of teaching

31 Rollo Walter Brown, op. cit., p. 54.
from invention to grammar and elocution, from classical rhetoric to literature. Finally, Hill gave authority to the feeling that public speaking was not the life blood of democracy or even a part of rhetoric. If Hill felt that public speaking was a part of the area of rhetoric at all, he felt that it was of secondary importance. In short, Adams Sherman Hill was of interest to those in speech education largely because his rhetoric indicated the extent to which the function of the Boylston Chair had changed from the teaching of speech to the teaching of literature and written composition.
CHAPTER VII

BOYLSTON PROFESSORS WHO DID NOT WRITE "RHETORICS"

Introduction. Six of the ten men who held the Boylston Chair of Rhetoric and Oratory did not produce a philosophy of rhetoric in organized form. There were a variety of reasons why some Boylston Professors did not formulate an organized set of lectures or essays on rhetoric.

Francie J. Child did not aspire to the title of expert in the field of rhetoric and oratory, consequently his energies were directed toward other interests indirectly allied to rhetoric. Le Baron Russell Briggs was too occupied with other interests of an administrative sort to produce a rhetoric as such. The "cream" of his fine mind was devoted to the "butter" of advice which helped many students at Harvard to employ their talents to better advantage. Charles Townsend Copeland made his mark by developing in a practical sense the art of oral reading. Robert S. Hillyer, Theodore Spencer and Archibald MacLeish were more interested in "poetics" than traditional rhetoric and oratory.
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This chapter (Chapter VII) is included in this study to indicate briefly the recent developments of educational philosophy in the Boylston Chair of Rhetoric and Oratory at Harvard. Again the development of educational philosophy in the Chair must be told in terms of the men who occupied it.

Francis J. Child. Francis J. Child, affectionately known by his friends as "Stubby," was considered by many to be the greatest American scholar in the English language to have ever lived. Upon his death glowing accounts of Child's life existed in public prints. In the Evening Transcript he was headlined as the "Most Learned Member of the College Community" at Harvard. C. E. Norton stated that, "When he died the world lost ... one of its great scholars." George Lyman Kittredge indicated that Child's scholarship "... not only defined the problems [of his study] but provided for most of them a solution which the researches of younger scholars have only served to substantiate." In Nation it was stated that "Francis J. Child ... was one of

---

1Evening Transcript, September 12, 1896.


the last of the remarkable men who, in the latter half of the century, have done so much to make the name of their university illustrious.\(^4\) He was described in the Hartford Courant as, "one of the most illustrious members of its [Harvard] faculty."\(^5\) In the Harvard Crimson the minutes of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at Harvard read as follows:

In the death of Francis James Child the Faculty[sic] of Arts and Sciences has suffered as healthy a loss as it is possible for such a body to sustain. His term of service, extending over fifty years, was far longer than that of any surviving member of the board, and was marked by the most punctual performance of the duties incident to his position.\(^6\)

Finally, Barrett Wendell indicated that Child was "Probably the most distinguished scholarly master of the English language and of English literature whom America has yet produced."\(^7\) Wendell added, "... Professor Child never found congenial the rhetorical duties which he dutifully performed for twenty-five years."\(^8\)

\(^4\)Nation, September 17, 1896.
\(^5\)Hartford Courant, September 15, 1896.
\(^6\)Harvard Crimson, 30:67. This clipping was found in Child's scrapbook which was donated to Harvard University by G. L. Kittredge on March 21, 1927. Widener Library, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
\(^7\)Wendell Barrett, op. cit., p. 207.
\(^8\)Ibid., p. 207.
Certainly the fourth Boylston Professor was recognized as one of Harvard's most respected scholars. His aversion to oratory, to which Wendell referred, was difficult to understand in light of his own educational background, particularly at Harvard.

Born on February 1, 1825, the son of a sailmaker, he grew up on the Boston waterfront, the third of a family of eight children. His teachers, while in the early grades, recognized his ability. He graduated with highest honors from high school in August of 1840 and spent two years in the Public Latin School, completing his college preparation in two years, and taking the Franklin Medal in 1842.

When Child went to Harvard he took the lead of a class of 60 students and kept it through graduation. He studied under Edward Tyrrel Channing and was chosen by classmates as class orator. It was said that,

His Class Oration was remarkable for its maturity of thought and of style. Its manliness of spirit, its simple directness of presentation of the true objects of life, and of the motives by which the educated man, whatever might be his chosen career, should be inspired, together with the serious and eloquent

---

9 Boston Herald, September 12, 1896.

10 Newspaper clipping found in Child's scrapbook and dated September 17, 1896.
earnestness with which it was delivered, gave to his discourse peculiar impressiveness and effect.\textsuperscript{11}

This oration\textsuperscript{12} had an effect, said C. E. Norton,

An eminent living graduate of Harvard, who was present on the occasion, having come to Cambridge to take his entrance examination, has said that he received from that oration his first vivid sense of the dignity of intellectual pursuits, and his first strong impulse to devote himself to them.\textsuperscript{13}

Perhaps a clue to Child's aversion to oratory in his teaching was the fact that while at Harvard in 1846 he won the Bowdoin Prize for writing a paper on "The Moral Views of Plato, as unfolded in the Gorgias."\textsuperscript{14} He gave no indication of having read the \textit{Phaedrus} by Plato.

After graduation from Harvard in 1846, he joined the Harvard staff as a tutor in Mathematics. A year later he was made tutor of rhetoric and history.

During 1849 and 1850 Child studied in Germany at Gottingen. Upon his return to the United States in


\textsuperscript{12}This oration is in the Archives, Harvard University.

\textsuperscript{13}C. E. Norton, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 163.

\textsuperscript{14}This paper is in the Archives, Harvard University.
1851, he was elected Boylston Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory at Harvard to replace Edward Tyrrel Channing. Even his good friend, C. E. Norton, showed surprise at Child's appointment as Boylston Professor. Norton stated,

In the time of some oldsters he was - God knows why! - Boylston Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory. He was not enamored of either of those great arts, but he had to correct themes. 15

This young scholar's undergraduate record in academic work and work specifically in oratory was enough recommendation for his ability to handle the responsibilities of Harvard's Chair of Rhetoric and Oratory. Before undertaking his new duties, he was given a year's leave for additional study in Europe and as a result of his work in Germany, he was awarded the Ph. D. degree from Gottingen in 1854.

It was during this period in Europe that Child became interested in medieval ballads and the works of Chaucer. While in Germany he did the groundwork for his later studies on English and Scottish Ballads. He studied with and was very much affected by Professor Grundtnig. Grundtnig's work on Danish Ballads served as the model for his masterpiece, The English and Scottish Popular Ballads, to which he devoted his entire life.

15Evening Transcript, September 11, 1897.
16Francis J. Child, ed., The English and Scottish
After many years, when he had completed his work, he had collected and edited every single English and Scottish ballad in existence, "with the possible exception of a single ballad." His *The English and Scottish Popular Ballads* was condensed and re-edited in 1903 by Helen Child Sargent and George Lyman.

At times in checking the validity of one ballad, Child had to read as many as two hundred books in a dozen different languages. To accomplish what he did, this professor called upon all his powers of concentration and great scholarly diligence. He planned his work and spent his life working his plan.

As a teacher and a person Child was seen in many different lights. His temperament was as mercurial as the medieval fantasies he studied. At times when he was playing with his children, tumbling and telling them stories, one could scarcely believe he was a professor; "... and, in fact, he liked to mimic the professors,

---


17 *Nation*, June 16, 1898. Signed by F. B. Gummere.

18 Child's other writings were *Four Old Plays* (1848), *Notice of W. T. Harris, Esq.* (1855), *Poetical Works of Spencer* (1855), *Observations on the Language of Chaucer and Gower* I (1862), *Poems of Sorrow and Comfort* (1865) and *The Debate of the Body and the Soul* (1888).
the solemn souls with brows bent, who strolled about with their arms in the breasts of their waistcoats.  "19

His one grand passion was roses.

Child did not look the role of a professor. His head was a mass of reddish curls. He was a stocky, little man with pink skin and fresh, blue eyes. His personality was an oddity in the academic atmosphere. It was stated that,

Odd as a gnome and gay as a cherub, with a brain that bubbled over with quaint conceits, he had a heart as light and warm as if he had lived in the greenwood, as if he were the merry man in Robin Hood's band who wrote the 20 ballads that he was so busy collecting.

A formalist, and punctual, he never missed a class during his fifty years of teaching.

One accident in the classroom revealed how much Child was like Edward Tyrrel Channing in his distaste of the bombastic and flowery in speaking.

Once, in a class which was reading Hamlet, he assigned some ordinary passage to a young gentleman who had been trained to wildest feats of 'elocution' and who now saw his chance for immortality. The rafters of that bare room at the top of University Hall fairly echoed to the frenzied performance; there were bellowings of rage, the low hiss of

19 Van Wyck Brooks, op. cit., p. 32.
20 Ibid., p. 32.
scorn, the ringing appeal, the cry of triumph, the wail of baffled hope, all accompanied by a kind of suppressed wheeze or asthmatic undertone which I take to have been the "deep breathing" indicated by doctors of this diabolical art. Mr. Child uncoiled himself slowly, craned out his head, lifted his spectacles, and peered, first amazed, then quizzical, then tragic at the performer. 'HEAVENS, MAN, - STOP!'

Self-absorbed in the classroom, he lectured more to himself than to his students. After roll, many of the students in the back of the room walked out unnoticed. In spite of great diligence, he lacked the "inspirational vigor possessed by some teachers who can arouse a man's interest in a hitherto neglected field of investigation." Child was at times dogmatic. "Actors," he told his students, were "a horde of raggamuffins gathered from the street."

Barrett Wendell described his superior as the typical German scholar, "an enormously industrious man of the common people ... a simple, kindly burgher." Wendell continued by indicating that "... the wholesale imitation of German methods in America, of recent years, might, naturally have been expected to vulgarize,

---

22 Evening Transcript, September 12, 1896.  
23 Ibid.  
24 Evening Transcript, September 17, 1896.
even while it solidified, the professor of learning."\[3\]

Kuno Francke, in answer to Wendell, eulogized Child for the latter's imitation of German scholarship. Francke stated, "Whenever I met him or thought of him, I felt as though I had been brought back to my old home [Germany]."\[26\] Since both Francke and Wendell agreed that Child imitated German scholarship, it was safe to conclude that his few years in Germany were crucial to his attitude as Boylston Professor and to his life in research. The German influence also might have in part explained his distrust of oratory. Continental scholars in the 1800's were never amenable to public speaking as a part of the academic curriculum.

Regardless of his reasons, Child's attitude toward oratory and declamation is clear. In a letter to Dr. Andrew Peabody, Acting President of Harvard, on December 4, 1868, he made pungent comments on the teaching of declamation.

I feel exceedingly little interest in what is called declamation and would much rather be a teacher of dancing. An elaborated training of the voice and instruction in the art of delivery (such as we conceive the ancients to have practised [sic]) is never assayed now a days. All that is done is to point out and perhaps correct a few faults.\[27\]

\[25\]**Ibid.**

\[26\]**Evening Transcript,** October 1, 1896.

\[27\]**Correspondence from Francis J. Child to Dr. Peabody**
In an interview, Francis B. Gummere drew from the professor his feelings about written rhetoric as he taught it. Child exclaimed "Twenty-five years - grading themes" and then kicked his chair half way across the room. As the only professor in his day at Harvard ever to have received an offer to teach at Oxford, England, he had reason for playing the prima donna.

After years of chafing under his duties as a teacher of composition, he enjoyed the results of an increase in the size of the teaching staff at Harvard and the "new and unequaled opportunities" to offer special courses that President Eliot provided for teachers. The staff at Harvard increased from twenty-four in 1886-7 to fifty-one in 1872-3. And by 1872-3, Child's teaching of rhetoric was cut, to part of a half course and he offered the following electives: Anglo-Saxon (three Sophomores enrolled), History and Grammar of the English Language (ten Juniors enrolled). The next year 1873-4 he substituted for the last of these courses a new elective on Chaucer, Shakespeare, Bacon, Milton, and Dryden in which thirty-three Seniors and twenty-seven Juniors enrolled.

dated December 4, 1868.

28 Francis B. Gummere, op. cit., 423.
29 Henry James, op. cit., I, p. 257.
30 President's Report for 1871-1872, Harvard University.
31 Henry James, op. cit., I, p. 259.
Early in the tenure of the Chair, the subject of oratory did creep into his classes, however:

On one occasion he was talking to a class on American orators, and remarked that Webster and Choate came from Dartmouth; that Wendell Phillips came from Harvard. Some of the pro-slavery boys began to sneer. 'Wendell Phillips! As good an orator as either of them.' he said.32

He and Professor Jennerson, who taught elocution from 1851 to 1860 as Child's assistant, were the only two pronounced anti-slavery members of the college faculty.33

Child's work, in summary, was not in rhetoric or oratory. He was enamoured of other things. This lack of enthusiasm was a real factor in the change in the characteristics of the philosophy embraced by the Boylston Chair. Since he was not interested in the subject of his office, other interests were permitted to be substituted and upon his departure from the Chair for a newly created chair of English in 1876, precedent had been set for the Boylston Lecturer's independence from restrictions governing subject matter.

Child did have an influence on George Lyman Kittredge and, through Kittredge, his work was influential in later efforts to collect the 'vagrant' American verse

---

32Evening Transcript, February 18, 1897. Signed by Le Baron Russell Briggs.

33Ibid.
of the Southern Mountaineers, the Negroes, the cow-
boys, the Maine lumberjacks, et cetera."

In February of 1896, Child went to the hospital and died eight months later on Friday, September 11, 1896. He left behind his wife, Elizabeth Ellery Sedgwick, whom he married in 1860, two daughters and a son. Child's son, Francis Child, became the pastor of the Congregational church in the towns of Granby and Victoria, Vermont.

La Baron Russell Briggs. Dean Briggs was perhaps the most beloved man ever to walk the Harvard yard. To read the eulogies of Briggs, of which there were many, was to believe that he actually was "the most romantic figure in higher education," 'the Abraham Lincoln of the university,' 'the greatest teacher in America,' 'the living patron saint of American college men,' 'the finest example of American civilization.'

---

34 Van Wyck Brooks, op. cit., p. 32.
35 Boston Herald, September 12, 1896.
36 Eulogies of Briggs were written by Kittredge, Merriman, Taussig, Hillyer, Dodds, Lippman, Lake and others. These were printed in the newspapers shortly after Briggs's death.
37 Rollo Walter Brown, op. cit., p. 2.
An understanding of the Dean's genius was, to a good extent, achieved by his student, Rollo Walter Brown, in 1926.

Brown pointed out that perhaps the chief reason why Briggs was so successful as a teacher and Dean was the fact that he loved human beings. He was willing to give his time to "direct, personal" contact with his students and, as Dean, all the students at Harvard were his students.

To have attempted an exhaustive study of Briggs' activities would have resulted in a study of the history of Harvard University from 1878 to 1925, for his life was interwoven into the very fabric of the cloth of Harvard University shortly before, during and after the turn of the nineteenth century.

Briefly, he was born in Salem, Massachusetts, on December 11, 1855, the son of Reverend George Ware Briggs. Briggs was related distantly to the first holder of the Boylston Chair, John Quincy Adams. In 1871 he was admitted to Harvard. He was made a tutor

---

40 Rollo Walter Brown, op. cit., p. 23.
in Greek by President Eliot in 1878. His one-year appointment as tutor was changed to a three-year appointment shortly after Harvard employed him. He turned to graduate study in English in 1861 and in 1862 received the M. A. degree in English. In 1863, he was made along with Barrett Wendell and W. B. Shubrick Clymer, assistant to Adams Sherman Hill who was then Boylston Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory.

In his early years as Hill's assistant, Briggs was instrumental in applying Hill's idea that English should be made compulsory for all students. He and Wendell under Hill's direction managed to slip through Eliot's concept of non-required courses and established English as a requirement for all students. It was his feeling that students "needed not merely courses in Greek and chemistry and German; they needed general information."\(^{41}\)

Later, after the required course for Freshmen was perfected, two men published a book in which the "methods of the course were set forth in detail."\(^{42}\)

As a teacher Briggs was tremendously effective,

\(^{41}\)Ibid., p. 55.

largely because he recognized in his students the moment of receptability. He possessed a lively tolerance, agreeing with William James that "our undisciplinables are our proudest product." He was conscientious and forever young in the eyes of his students. In the classroom Briggs read,

... from the works he had examined, called for discussion of it, sometimes discussed it with great earnestness or fascinating subtlety himself, and then asked the men to write at once, before they left the room, a criticism of what he had read; sometimes, of the classroom discussion. At the next meeting he read some of this criticism ...

When he became Boylston Professor in 1904, there was little change in the educational philosophy established by Hill in the Boylston Chair of Rhetoric. It was logical that Hill's "right hand man" would fill the position Hill vacated, and, until 1925, Briggs continued to make English acceptable in the academic life of Harvard. Almost all of Briggs' publications concerned his problems as Dean. He wrote about the social and academic environment which students faced at Harvard. Although

43 Rollo Walter Brown, op. cit., p. 80.
44 Ibid., p. 72.
45 Some of his writings were as follows: Girls and Education (1911), School, College and Character (1901), Routine and Ideals (1904) and College Life (1901).
his writings did not relate directly to his activities in the classroom, Briggs' students in English left Harvard in battalions. And his "battalion leaders" left trails that were, to say the least, impressive:


These men were not "little Briggs" but living testimony to the technique that their teacher made famous — developing students as writers along the lines of their own strength and talents. Although he was a speaker himself his teaching did not include speech education. In subject matter the Boylston Chair of Rhetoric and Oratory was no longer what its founder originally meant it to be.

Charles Townsend Copeland. In an interesting little book published in 1957,47 College in a Yard, there are

46 Ibid., p. 81.
listed thirty-nine brief reminiscences of Harvard by eminent Harvard graduates. Invariably these reminiscences are made in terms of teachers at Harvard. Many of those who "remembered" Harvard in College in a Yard referred to Briggs, Perry, Kittredge, Child and Wendell and the varied excellencies of their former teachers of English. S. N. Behrman, Roger Burlingame, Robert Cutler, Paul Hollister, Stanley Marcus, John F. Marquand, David McCord and Elliot Norton paid specific tribute to the memory of the teaching of Charles Townsend Copeland. Copeland, like Briggs, won the hearts of his students. He was affectionately known to his friends as "Copey."

Charles Townsend Copeland was a "Maine man." He was born in Calais in 1860, the first of three children born to Henry Clay Copeland and Sarah Lowell Copeland. His sister, Katherine, later married William Harrison Dunbar.

The seventh Boylston Professor, like all of his predecessors in the Boylston Chair, was a Harvard graduate. He graduated from Harvard in 1882. After studying in the Harvard law school and writing for a few years,

48 Bangor Commercial, January 7, 1904.
49 Boston Transcript, January 12, 1916.
Copeland was appointed to the Department of English at Harvard as an instructor in 1892. On October 1, 1910, he was promoted to Assistant Professor and, on February 26, 1917, to Associate Professor of English.

That Copeland was not made a full professor by 1920 became a matter of public concern. The writer of an article in the Boston Herald, entitled "No Promotion for Copey," said, in part,

No, he is just a plain teacher, with nothing of the pedant, and perhaps too little of the scholar, about him. He has not, at any rate, confined himself to a narrow field of intensive study. And yet he has awakened a love of good literature in thousands of his students, some of whom, after their entry into the outside world, have cared enough about him to dedicate books to him.

Perhaps one of the reasons why "Copey" was not promoted rapidly was the observation that he "aroused the discomfort of President Eliot by his thrusts."

In the twenties, publicity was given to "The Charles Townsend Copeland Association." This club was a solid core of Copeland's former students who were also members of the Harvard Club in New York City. Every year he would

---

50 Harvard University Gazette, October 14, 1910.
51 Harvard University Gazette, March 3, 1917.
52 Boston Herald, April 15, 1921.
53 Boston American, October 18, 1910.
visit the group in New York and read. The club grew until in 1922 fifty of Copey's former students met with him in New York. These students were loyal to their teacher. One of the methods that he perfected to cement relationships so closely with students, was to open his apartment at certain times of the day to young writers for personal visits.

Heywood Brown stated in an article, "It Seems to Me" in the New York World, that what the colleges of the twenties and thirties needed was more men like Copeland who would "stay home by the fire" and let students who required their services visit them. Brown cited precedent when he said,

One or two places have hired men to sit in front of the fire. A well known American poet has been engaged by a university with the understanding that he need give no lectures and that his duties shall consist merely of remaining at home and allowing young versifiers to come and try out their experiments upon him.

In 1937, Brown's suggestion, in modified form, was put into practice when Robert S. Hillyer became Boylston Lecturer.

---


Clipping found in the scrapbook of Charles Townsend Copeland, Widener Library, Harvard University.
Copeland's bachelor quarters in Hollis Hall became famous as the spot where students could converse, on an informal basis, with their favorite teacher. These sessions on the third floor of Hollis Hall were always a "... charming and instructive occasion." 56

When the Harvard wit became Boylston Professor at the age of sixty-five, there was great feeling among his friends. At a meeting in 1925, Paul Hollister said that

... when the Harvards met in Forty-Fourth Street to celebrate Copey for having been tardily given the best chair in the English Department. He splashed, cavorted and wallowed in the scented adulation of the Harvard Club's internal junta, the 'Charles Townsend Copeland Association.' I asked him how it felt to be the ponderous polysyllabic Boylston Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory, and he made a small mock groan and said: 'Ahhh ... Gahd! To think, that I, occupy the chair that once warmed the cold, forbidding tall of John Quincy Adams!' 57

Congratulations for Copeland's new professorship were printed in the newspaper shortly after he assumed his office. Hendrik Willem Van Loon, John P. Marquand, Eugene Field, Deems Taylor and James Wittlesey were among those extending congratulations. 58

56 *Boston Evening Transcript*, December 27, 1924.
58 *Boston Evening Transcript*, November 17, 1925.
three years as Boylston Professor, Copeland published the book which represented his activities over a long period of years as a teacher at Harvard - The Copeland Reader. 59

In his preface to the Reader he stated the purpose of his book:

The title of this anthology to a great degree expresses its composition and purpose. Wide as is its range, the selection includes only what I have read aloud during thirty-four years of teaching lecturing and reading. 60

In relation to his public lectures, it was evident that he was tremendously successful. He lectured all over the United States. Some of the reviews that were made of Copeland's public lectures were quoted as follows:

Mr. Copeland is one of the greatest and most interesting lecturers before the public today and his courses in Harvard are the most popular. 61

If ever there was an example of that art which conceals art, Mr. Copeland is the living personification of it, for his readings are simplicity itself, so transparent it appears, as to deceive many auditors as to the ease with which such results are attained. At the same time, both his lectures and his readings are shot through and through with a scholarship that no critical


60 Ibid., p. vii.

61 Lawrence (Mass.) Sun, April 20, 1910.
listener will overlook for an instant. 62

After he read before a Harvard group from James Barrie's works, Thomas W. Slocum, 90, said that Copeland's lectures were delightful,

First, because they are incomparably good to hear; second, because Professor Copeland represents one of the first bridges across that erstwhile dreary chasm between student and faculty, and, lastly and irrespective of the other reasons, because he is 'Copey.' 63

Copeland's Reader included selections from the Bible, Shakespeare, Milton, Defoe, Sheridan, Wordsworth, Macaulay, Dickens, Browning, Poe and many others. Basically the Reader was an anthology of prose and poetry. Everett Lee Hunt evaluated the Reader when he wrote that "it will have a nation-wide influence in raising the level of courses in interpretative reading and in humanizing the teaching of literature." 64

Copeland, like Adams Sherman Hill and Le Baron Russell Briggs, brought to the Chair an interest in literature, but he gave his own particular kind of emphasis to literature by using oral reading as the means of teaching it. He lived his philosophy.

62 Cambridge Tribune, August 1, 1908.
64 Everett Lee Hunt, op. cit., p. 206.
Although he resigned in January of 1928, Copeland's popularity did not diminish through his seventieth, eightieth and ninetieth birthdays in 1930, 1940 and 1950. The newspapers continued to give him full coverage. In 1944 he was quoted as saying that he had quit the Chair too soon. He had ten good years in him when he retired.\textsuperscript{65}

After Archibald MacLeish became Boylston Professor, an interesting event took place. Two Boylston Professors met. Along with Waldo Pierce and Ernest Hemingway, MacLeish visited Copeland after a football game. "I still carry," says MacLeish, "like a well-thumbed snapshot, the memory of that quick, appraising eye, that courteous gesture and that honest smile."\textsuperscript{66}

Professor Copeland died in July of 1952. Ironically there were less than one hundred people at his funeral at the Appelton Chapel.\textsuperscript{67}

The Chair was offered to James Bradstreet Greenough, a professor of Latin, who had collaborated with George Lyman Kittredge to produce \textit{Words and Their Ways in English Speech}. He declined the opportunity. The Chair

\textsuperscript{65} \textit{Boston Post}, April 27, 1944.
\textsuperscript{66} Newspaper clipping in the Archives, Widener Library, Harvard University.
\textsuperscript{67} \textit{Boston Traveler}, July 29, 1952.
\textsuperscript{68} James Bradstreet Greenough and George Lyman
then remained vacant specifically for the purpose of allowing one of Copeland's students, Robert S. Hillyer, to attain permanent tenure before installing him in the professorship. He became his teacher's successor in 1937.

Poets. 1. Robert S. Hillyer. After a lapse of eight years, during which time there was no active incumbent in the Boylston Chair, Robert S. Hillyer brought to the chair a new approach - the approach of the poet. Hillyer like those who followed after him in the Chair did not publish a rhetoric as such. Rather he was known for his poetry, a great deal of which he published before he was made Boylston Professor. 69 One account of his appointment to the Boylston Chair had it that,

Although Robert Silleman Hillyer will suffer, in accepting the venerable Boylston Professorship of rhetoric and oratory at Harvard, the inevitable fate of being compared with such brilliant teachers as the late Le Baron Russell Briggs and the still lively Charles Townsend Copeland, he brings to the chair a greater experience in creative literature than probably any of his predecessors. 70


69 Some of Hillyer's early writings were Sonnets and Other Lyrics (1917), Five Books of Youth (1920), Alchemy: a symphonic Poem (1920), The Hilla gave Promise (1923), The Coming Forth by Day (1923).

70 Boston Herald, May 15, 1937.
He was at the time of his installation classified among
the four or five greatest living American poets. He
had won the Pulitzer Prize for his "Collected Poems"
in 1934.

A graduate of Harvard in 1917, Hillyer was for
two years an ambulance driver in the American Expedition-
ary Forces during World War I. After the First World
War, he was granted a scholarship to study in Scandana-
via, but returned to Harvard to become an Instructor
of English. He remained at Harvard until 1926 and then
moved to Trinity College only to return once again to
Harvard in 1928 to teach "Advanced Composition," the
course which Briggs had developed thirty years earlier.

Early in May of 1937, Hillyer was made Boylston
Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory. In a letter dated
April 6, 1959, Professor Hillyer made the point that he
was not hired specifically as a poet but as a teacher.

I was not brought to the Boylston Chair
(in 1937) because I was a poet. My
literary career and the Pulitzer Prize
in 1934 stood in lieu of a Ph. D. Al-
though I have collected a Litt. D. since
then, at the time I was merely a Bache-
lor of Arts. Thus, if I had not had my
position in the literary world, I could
not have hoped to advance to the highest
academic rank. But I was not appointed

71Boston Herald, May 8, 1934.
72Boston Transcript, April 17, 1920.
to the Boylston Chair because I was a poet. I was appointed to it because I am a teacher. 73

That Professor Hillyer is an unusually successful teacher is attested to by comments from some who are now in the forefront of the literary world. 74 There was another reason for his appointment.

Le Baron Russell Briggs and I had been very close friends from my undergraduate days, when I took with him the courses I was later to teach. 75

Although he taught composition in verse and poetry in the classroom, Hillyer worked closely with Boylston orators.

I taught rhetoric and oratory in preparing undergraduates to compete for this [Boylston] prize, which was awarded to the competitor who best delivered some piece of standard verse or prose . . . . we might better call it public speaking. Out of some fifty contestants I would choose a number - ten, perhaps; I am not sure - to deliver their selections in Sanders Theatre before a full audience and a panel of judges whom I selected. I spent many afternoons training the finalists. 76

73 This information is taken from a letter of Robert Silliman Hillyer addressed to the author.


75 Hillyer's letter.

76 Ibid.
He remained Boylston Professor through most of World War II and resigned in December of 1944. Advanced Composition was dropped as a course of study during the war years (1941-45). When he resigned, Theodore Spencer, an Associate Professor of English who replaced Hillyer said,

Professor Hillyer has been a devoted encourager of the writing of verse during his years at Harvard; his friendly and sympathetic criticism and his deep knowledge of the technique of verse, have helped many students anxious to do good writing. He has been a generous and appreciative teacher, and several generations of students at Harvard and Radcliffe have become familiar with the best in English poetry through his reading and interpretation.

Hillyer was an artist rather than the traditional Harvard scholar so it was logical that he continued to write poetry, short essays and novels for national journals after he had resigned as Boylston Professor. He is presently the H. Fletcher Brown Professor of English Literature at the University of Delaware.

2. Theodore Spencer. Spencer was a Shakespearian scholar and poet. His interests matched those of his predecessor for he, like Hillyer, entered his new office

77 Harvard Crimson, December 19, 1944.
78 Ibid.
79 An example was The Death of Captain Nemo.
with the feeling that the union between the study of literature and creative expression should be emphasized. Expression was given to this feeling when he said,

> With the tremendous desire for guidance in writing which has been discovered among returning veterans, the Boylston Professorship should become the focus for building up such facilities.

Spencer was also a poet, but again this fact was not his qualification for the Boylston Chair.

> He was a Ph. D. and a very active scholar. The fact that he wrote poetry was an advantage for his equipment as teacher but not the cause of his appointment.

Born on July 4, 1902, in Villa Nova, Pennsylvania, Spencer had been appointed as an Instructor of English at Harvard in 1927. He received his Ph. D. degree in 1928 at Harvard and was promoted to the rank of Assistant Professor in 1936 and then to the rank of Associate Professor in 1940. After the Boylston Chair had remained vacant for two years, he was made Boylston Professor on July 1, 1946.

Spencer's salary did include the benefits of the

---


81 Letter from R. S. Hillyer, April 6, 1959.

82 Office of Provost, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
original grant of Nicholas Boylston, Esquire. In *Time* it was erroneously stated,

> As a full professor, Spencer will earn $9,600; the Boylston Chair itself pays only in prestige, though legend accords its holder the right to pasture a cow in Harvard Yard.\(^\text{83}\)

Although this figure ($9,600) was the salary of a full professor at Harvard, a fifth of it was provided by the Boylston grant. The ninth Boylston Professor's term of office was cut short in 1949 when he died of a heart attack in a taxi cab, on January the 18th.\(^\text{84}\)

Spencer was able to produce, before his early death, four major poetic works.\(^\text{85}\) His emphasis while Boylston Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory was on poetics.\(^\text{86}\)

3. **Archibald MacLeish.** On May 1, 1949, shortly after Spencer's death, Archibald MacLeish was installed as the Boylston Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory. The tenth Boylston Professor was, like all his predecessors,

\(^{83}\) *Time*, April 22, 1946.

\(^{84}\) *Harvard Crimson*, April 21, 1948.

\(^{85}\) His writings were *The Paradox of the Circle* (1941), *The World in Your Hand* (1943), *An Act of Life* (1944) and *Poems: 1940-47* (1948).

\(^{86}\) Spencer's lecture notes in the Archives in the Widener Library, Harvard University.
a student at Harvard. Although he was a graduate of Yale, the class of 1915, he attended the Harvard Law School. He graduated from the Harvard Law School in 1919 with highest honors.

MacLeish has led one of the most active lives of all Boylston Professors since John Quincy Adams. After teaching constitutional law at Harvard for a time, and writing, he won the Pulitzer Prize in 1933 for "Conquistador." He was special lecturer in creative writing at Princeton in 1937 and, the year following, he was made first curator of the Nieman Foundation in journalism at Harvard. In 1939, MacLeish went into government service as Librarian of the Library of Congress. Throughout World War II, he was Director of the Office of Facts and Figures, Assistant Director of the Office of War Information and Assistant Secretary of State.

During the years of 1945 and 1946, he served as Chairman of the American delegation to the conference in London which drew up final plans for the United Nation's Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, and was Deputy Chairman of the American delegation to the organization meeting of UNESCO in Geneva.

---

87 Office of Provost, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
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MacLeish's J. B. and Collected Poems won fresh honors for the Boylston Chair at Harvard. The fact that the present Boylston Professor is able to produce so much is explained in a letter from Professor Harry Kerr of Harvard University.

The Boylston Chair, as most endowed Chairs here, is considered a distinguished position. This particular Chair, according to Professor Packard, is almost equivalent to a "University Professorship" which means that not only is the occupant not restricted as to the courses he can teach, but University Professors are not even restricted to departments. For example, Professor Tillich, I believe, is a University Professor now. This means he can offer any course he pleases -- mathematics, religion, etc.91

Professor Kerr continued making the point that University Professors not only choose their own courses but they pick the times when these courses are to be offered. In many cases they do a "modicum of teaching -- what they like, when they like . . . ."92

Among MacLeish's many activities, his work in the area of creative poetry has perhaps been his most outstanding accomplishment and, as a result, he is recognized as a national authority in the area of poetics.


91A letter from Professor Harry Kerr, Harvard University, dated April 22, 1959.

92Ibid.

During an interview with MacLeish, the Pulitzer Prize winning poet indicated that, in his opinion, the function of the Boylston Chair is encompassed in his article "Why Do We Teach Poetry?" in the March 1956 edition of the *Atlantic Monthly*. "Poetry," as he sees it, "ought to be taught as a most essential form of human expression . . . ." "To be ignorant of poetry," he said, is to be ignorant therefore of the one means of reaching the world of our experience." When quizzed about the relationship of classical rhetoric to the Boylston Chair, he stated that his one attempt to teach classical rhetoric in a class in expository writing was "untimely."

MacLeish's actual classroom teaching at Harvard amounts to an advanced course in creative writing (English Sa.) and one course in Poetry (Humanities 130),

---


94Interview with Archibald MacLeish, November 11, 1958.


96Ibid., p. 53.
both of which were taught in the fall semester in 1957-58. He also works with graduate students who are working toward a Ph. D. degree.\footnote{Harvard University Catalogue, 1957-58.} Much of his time however is spent away from Harvard studying and speaking.

The effects of the poets who have recently occupied the Chair of Rhetoric and Oratory at Harvard on speech education have not crystallized to any noticeable degree. Their effects on educational philosophy in general have still to be determined. Judging from Archibald MacLeish's ability with the pen, and the fact that his writings\footnote{Archibald MacLeish, "What is a True University?" Saturday Review, p. 11, January 31, 1959.} have reached the nation at large, the Boylston Chair will continue to have a nationwide effect.
A COMPARISON OF THE RHETORICS OF BOYLSTON PROFESSORS

Introduction. The history of the development of the philosophy of rhetoric and oratory in the Boylston Chair at Harvard was the story of gradual but crucial change. This gradual modification of philosophy in the Chair gave "twists" to rhetoric and oratory that involved definition, emphasis, modes or kinds of communication and general innovations.

The changes in educational philosophy were "in time" with the national modifications of the educational philosophy of rhetoric until 1900. After 1900 however the modifications of the philosophy of education in rhetoric and oratory in the Boylston Chair were not characteristic of national educational tendencies.

In the late 1700's and early 1800's American rhetoric was "closely allied with oratory," stated Warren Guthrie, "but gradually moved more and more into the realm of composition and criticism - belles lettres."¹ The story of the development of rhetoric in the Boylston

Chair tends to bear out this statement.

Aside from John Quincy Adams at Harvard, Chauncey Goodrich of Yale, John McVicker of Columbia, Samuel Newman of Bowdoin, Ebenezer Porter at Andover were all, in the early eighteen hundreds, holding positions as professors of rhetoric and were drawing on the classics as a source for their teachings. Schools in Illinois and Indiana were setting up courses in rhetoric and oratory similar in purpose to those of the East.

Harvard's Boylston Professors from 1806 to 1851 were foremost in and, consequently, typical of the age. Adams drew directly from classical rhetoricians. McKean drew primarily from the classical rhetoricians but included in his rhetoric the works of his European contemporaries. Channing opened his course of study to belles lettres but still took cognizance of classical rhetoric in his Lectures. Channing's rhetoric bridged the gap between the classical rhetoric of the early portion of the century and the emphasis in rhetoric on written composition which was to become the inspiration for the development of the Department of English at Harvard.

---

This trend toward belles lettres grew until, in the decades of 1870 and 1880, English clearly predominated the departmental organization which was occurring in colleges and universities all over the country. Francis J. Child and Adams Sherman Hill in the last half of the eighteen hundreds were not only in step with the trend but were leading the field.

A counter reaction in the West was developing in the late 1890's that would ultimately result in the speech departments of the present day. It was observed that,

Now and then colleges in the West voiced the opinion that it was to be their duty and their honor to keep both oratory and debate alive. 'Oratory must always be foremost,' commented the Colorado Class of '99, 'if our ambition for the reputation and success of our institution is to be satisfied; eastern college men have turned their attention to athletics and things athletic in their nature, and it is for western colleges and universities to keep alive the interest in debate and oratory if we would have power and prosperity.'

At the same time men like Thomas C. Trueblood and Robert I. Fulton were preparing themselves to revitalize classical rhetoric in their teachings in the early 1900's.

---


In the 1900's Briggs and Copeland at Harvard continued to develop their own versions of belles lettres or written composition, while Departments of Speech were being set up at Iowa, Michigan, Wisconsin and other schools in the Midwest. While speech education has continued to grow in the West, Boylston Professors in their thinking moved from written composition to the specialized form of poetry.

After Adams Sherman Hill's incumbency, the Boylston Professor's influence on speech education in the nation became minimized in comparison to the sweeping influence wielded in previous years.

Definition. During the one hundred and fifty-three years of the Boylston Chair's existence extensive changes in the meaning of rhetoric and oratory at Harvard were made. The faith of John Quincy Adams and Joseph McKean in Quintilian was evinced clearly in their rhetorics. The "art of speaking well" as they understood it encompassed all stages of the development of a speech-getting

5Karl Wallace, op. cit., pp. 422-446.

the idea, formulating the idea, putting the idea into words, keeping the idea in mind and delivering the idea personally.

The definition of rhetoric in Edward Tyrrel Channing's tenure of the Boylston Chair was broadened to include "all forms of communication by language." Channing felt that an orator could no longer, as in Greek and Roman days, with a single speech change the course of history. In his day and age he indicated that the speaker had to work on a more limited basis and that oratory was no longer what the ancients considered it to be. Rather than applying the classical concept of invention to the speech itself Channing spoke more of invention in terms of the writer.

The definition of rhetoric as the classical concept of elocution was established for written communication by Adams Sherman Hill. Hill's standard for rhetoric was correctness and his criteria for determining correctness was grammar. Hill served to narrow the definition of rhetoric to what we now know as grammar.

Le Baron Russell Briggs and Charles Townsend Copeland followed in the path worn by Hill. Copeland emphasized a specific method, however, in teaching composition and an appreciation of literature - oral reading.
In the final years of the Boylston Chair, the separate classical concepts of "poetics" and "rhetoric" were combined under the general heading of rhetoric - the emphasis being put on poetics.

**Emphasis.** The specific emphases of Boylston Professors changed in accord with the change in their definitions of rhetoric. Adams and McKean gave little emphasis to delivery and great emphasis to invention. Channing also gave emphasis to invention. Adams Sherman Hill emphasized elocution as did those who immediately followed him as Boylston Professors. The Boylston poets gave emphasis to their specific form of communication.

**Forms of communication.** The form or kind of communication emphasized by Boylston Professors underwent a complete transformation over one hundred and fifty-three years. Adams and McKean stressed the spoken word. Channing gave consideration to both the written and spoken forms of communication, paying special attention to the former.

Adams Sherman Hill and subsequent Boylston Professors gave emphasis to the written form of communication. A final modification of form was made when poetry, a special kind of written communication, was emphasized by Robert Hillyer, Theodore Spencer and Archibald MacLeish.
Innovations. In a sense all of the Boylston Professors gave their own unique contributions to American education. John Quincy Adams was one of the very first Americans (preceded by a few years by Witherspoon of Princeton) to summarize classical rhetoric for American consumption. His rhetoric was perhaps the first high point in American rhetoric. Joseph McKean was credited with having been the first American rhetorician to incorporate intentionally classical and contemporary rhetoric in one single body of rhetoric. McKean's rhetoric was developed in such a fashion as to be classed as one of the first American attempts to write a history of speech education.

Edward Tyrrel Channing was one of the first of American rhetoricians to include all communication by language into one course of study.

Francis J. Child was the first American to consider philology or linguistic history of importance to the academic curriculum. His work was monumental in the field of ballads and folklore.

Adams Sherman Hill and Le Baron Russell Briggs led the American movement to stress elementals in written English composition. Hill's rhetoric served as a model for many subsequent "grammars," that were used in all
levels of education.

Charles Townsend Copeland's Reader was perhaps one of the most popular books of its kind - a stimulus to the art of oral reading.

The last three men to occupy the Boylston Chair, Robert Hillyer, Theodore Spencer and Archibald MacLeish, have been leading poets on the American scene in recent years. Hillyer and MacLeish were both Pulitzer Prize winners and considered in the forefront of the development of American poetry. It is felt by the author that MacLeish's play, J. B., is one of few worthwhile American dramas in verse form.

Although administrative influence and outside pressures were a factor to be considered in the development of educational philosophy in the Boylston Chair, the changes in philosophy that were made in the Chair were largely a result of the fact that the men who occupied it felt free to stress their own interests and their own ideas about rhetoric. If one common thread ran throughout the various points of view of Boylston Professors it was the fact that each Boylston Professor scrupulously avoided in his rhetoric the works of past Boylston Professors.
CHAPTER IX

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study has been to trace briefly the development of the philosophy of speech education in the Boylston Chair of Rhetoric and Oratory at Harvard University from 1804 to the present time. Emphasis has been given especially to the effects of the Boylston Chair on speech education. In research it was evident that little has been done to clarify the movements and cross currents that have marked the development of the Chair of Rhetoric and Oratory at Harvard. The summary which follows is an attempt to pinpoint the more important points already made.

Summary. It was not difficult, after surveying the personalities and activities of the Boylston Professors, to understand the effectiveness of the Boylston Chair of Rhetoric and Oratory at Harvard. Few academic chairs in the United States were graced with the powers, divergent though they may have been, of such men as those who occupied the Boylston Chair from John Quincy Adams to Archibald MacLeish.

Earlier reference has been made (p. 11) to the
fact that Everett Lee Hunt spoke of the Boylston Chair in these terms: "The men who have occupied this Chair, the books they have written, and the educational influence they have wielded have made it easily the most distinguished chair of rhetoric and oratory in America." This statement was typical of more recent statements made by other authors.

The story of the philosophy of speech education in the Boylston Chair was not a neat, easy story to trace. The main reason why an account of the Chair's history could not be easily traced was the fact that the policy governing philosophy and methods used in the Chair was highly inconsistent. This inconsistency seemed to be a result of the fact that despite administrative influences conforming to the intent of the founder of the Chair in the original rules laid down by the Board of Overseers at Harvard and President Eliot's reorganization of the curriculum at Harvard, Boylston Professors determined academic policy themselves. It has been necessary then to study the development of the Boylston Chair in terms of the men who were responsible for and administered the duties of the office.

---

It was noted that a Boston merchant, Nicholas Boylston, Esq., was responsible for the founding of the Chair. Boylston's endowment of £1500 in "lawful money" was paid to Harvard in 1772 for the purpose of a chair of rhetoric and oratory and the original grant plus interest was put to use in 1806.

The rules and directions for the Chair were drawn up in April of 1804 by a committee for the Corporation and the Board of Overseers. These rules were written for the committee by Eliphalet Pearson. The rules gave a broad interpretation to the meaning of rhetoric, allowing for both written and oral exercises in English. The rules for lectures and course content were based on John Ward, a British rhetorician, who utilized in his rhetoric Cicero's canons of rhetoric and oratory.

The first Boylston professor, John Quincy Adams, who was serving at the time in Congress as senator from Massachusetts, was inaugurated in June of 1806. When he accepted the position Adams adhered to the spirit of the rules set down by the Harvard Overseers. His speeches to his students were an application of classical rhetoric to modern oratory.

\[2\] J. Q. Adams, op. cit., 2 Vols.
As he developed his lectures he called upon the "giant shadows" of the past - Aristotle, Cicero and Quintilian. The first Boylston professor might well be called the Suarez, the Fenelon or the Ward of the United States in that he kept alive and revamped classical rhetoric for contemporary use. His lectures resemble those of Ward in general organization and were built around the five classical canons as prescribed in the rules and directions of his office.

After Adams' resignation, the Board of Overseers voted to keep a "full time" man in residence to administer the duties of the Boylston professor. They appointed Reverend Joseph McKean, who held the chair from 1809 to 1818. In his lectures, Joseph McKean followed the rules of his office even more closely than John Quincy Adams. He lectured on almost every individual point covered in the rules and directions for the Boylston professor. It may be well to repeat McKean's point of view as stated in his Lecture No. 3 (p. 67) as follows:

This[rhetoric] is one of the subjects of human attention in which the moderns have been contented to follow in the steps marked out by their illustrious predecessors of Greece and Rome. So

---

3The lectures of Joseph McKean, Widener Library, Harvard University.
judged those who prescribed this course of lectures which is on the exact plan of the system of Professor Ward, who candidly avows his full concurrence with the amiable and eloquent Fenelon, that to combine portions of Aristotle and Longinus with Cicero and Quintilian and to confirm their maxims by references to the purest authors of antiquity, would even now form the best system of oratory.  

McKean's lectures were not unique. They were in essence a condensed view of what he considered important to be known from past works dealing with rhetoric. His work was perhaps of greatest value for the criticisms which he gave of contemporary British rhetoricians and for his brief commentaries on the oratory of his time. The only American rhetorician to whom he referred was John Quincy Adams. In general he relied on the classics as a source for his lectures and in so doing continued to carry on the tradition for which Adams had set precedent.

Edward Tyrrel Channing was appointed to the Chair in 1819 and remained until 1851. His Lectures on Rhetoric and Oratory were published in 1856 by his wife Henrietta. In his essays he made no reference to his predecessors. Evidently Adams and McKean had little

---

5 Edward Tyrrel Channing, Lectures on Rhetoric and Oratory (Boston: Ticknor and Fields, 1856) pp. 298.
effect on him. The first half of Channing's Lectures was unified by a series of comparisons between classical rhetoric and his own concept of contemporary rhetoric. He fulfilled the regulations of his office by basing half of his work on classical rhetoric but he did so not for the purpose of indicating its contemporary use. He did not adhere to the spirit of the regulations of the Chair in that he repudiated by implication the modern application of classical theory.

In accord with his background in journalism, Channing defined rhetoric to include written communication. The second half of his Lectures dealt with the habits and faculties of the writer. In a sense, he was the forerunner of the present day advocate of the "communications" course. He gave most of his efforts to the written work of his students. Due to his emphasis on the written side of his students' work, teachers of elocution such as Jonathon Barber were appointed in 1826 to give substantial criticism to the oral delivery of students.

During Channing's tenure of the Chair, the gradual shifting of emphasis from the oral to the written word was probably due to a composite of factors. First, New England was moving into the Golden Age of American literature. Second, educators were stressing the need
for student exercises in written communication. Third, elocution at this time was coming more and more to be considered synonymous with speech. Fourth, Channing was undoubtedly influenced by his work as editor of the *North American Review*. And, finally, John Quincy Adams had done such a complete job of summarizing classical rhetoric that his work fulfilled the need for which it was written. Channing could justifiably direct his efforts to objectives different from Adams'. Perhaps Channing felt that he couldn't improve on the treatment Adams gave to classical rhetoricians.

In short, Channing's own bent and the circumstances of the times played together to produce the inclusion of both written and oral communication under the general heading of rhetoric.

Precedent was set. When Francis J. Child assumed the duties of the office in 1851, the movement in the Boylston Chair toward written communication and away from oral communication was crystalized. Child was trained in Germany in philology. While in the Chair, he taught composition and later published an edition of English and Scottish ballads. He had no enthusiasm for either

---

the art of oratory or the chore of grading themes. One account it was noted had it that, the "One bitter note in his sweet cheeriness was sometimes aroused by the remembrance of the great proportion of his life that had been spent on theme-correcting." In 1876 a Chair of English was created for him and he became the founder of the school which Kittredge later made famous.

Adams Sherman Hill, classmate of Charles Eliot, occupied the Chair from 1876 to 1904. He published several books under the title of "rhetoric." His definition of rhetoric was based on grammar and his books were grounded on the assumption that rhetoric is defined as the set of principles behind the skills of writing. In his book *The Principles of Rhetoric*, Hill includes sections on grammatical purity, violations of good use, choice of words, number of words, written narration, exposition, argumentation and persuasion. He referred to John Quincy Adams' *Lectures* twice; once with regard to

---


verbosity in narration and, again, with regard to the arrangement of words. Adams Sherman Hill was the chief force and guiding power behind the phenomenal growth of the area of English at Harvard. His effectiveness in influencing education was highlighted by the fact that his books until recently were in circulation.

The difference between the philosophies of Adams Sherman Hill and John Quincy Adams was all pervading. Their theories of rhetoric differed over definition, subject matter, emphasis and technique.

In 1904 Hill retired. He was replaced by one of his assistants, Le Baron Russell Briggs—beloved Dean of Harvard and President of Hadcliffe. Briggs continued to administer the Chair in the tradition established in part by Child and completely by Hill.

Charles Townsend Copeland replaced Briggs in 1925. This Boylston Professor’s trademark The Copeland Reader was an anthology of prose and poetry which he had read aloud to his classes. The last three men to hold the Chair have been poets. Robert S. Hillyer occupied the Chair from 1937 until 1944 when he resigned. Theodore Spencer’s tenure (1946-1949) was cut short by

---

his death.

Archibald MacLeish, the present incumbent, is a national authority in the area of poetics. His book Public Speech, published in 1936, was not what its title seemed to imply, but rather a series of short poems. During an interview with Archibald MacLeish on November the 11th, 1958, Professor MacLeish indicated that in his opinion the function of the Boylston Chair is encompassed in his Atlantic Monthly article "Why Do We Teach Poetry?" "Poetry," as he saw it, "ought to be taught as a most essential form of human expression ..." 11 "To be ignorant of poetry," he said, "is to be ignorant therefore of the one means of reaching the world of our experience ..." 12 When quizzed about the relationship of classical rhetoric to the Boylston Chair, he stated that his sole attempt to teach classical rhetoric in a class in expository writing was "untimely." 13

Stated in briefest terms the Boylston Chair has passed through the respective stages of classical rhetoric, philology, English grammar, oral reading and, finally, poetics all under the name of Rhetoric.

11 Archibald MacLeish, op. cit., p. 48.
12 Ibid., p. 53.
13 Interview with Archibald MacLeish, November 11, 1958.
ical rhetoric in the Boylston Chair was represented in the persons of John Quincy Adams and Joseph McKean. The Communications approach to speech training was outlined by Edward Tyrrel Channing. Francis J. Child was one of the first to introduce philology into the American curriculum. Adams Sherman Hill and Le Baron Russell Briggs represented the grammarian's approach to rhetoric. Charles Townsend Copeland took the point of view of those who, today, are interested in oral interpretation. More recent occupants of the Chair, Robert Hillyer, Theodore Spencer and Archibald MacLeish have approached their duties as Boylston professor from the standpoint of poetics, emphasizing poetry and drama. The spectrum of speech philosophies was represented here in almost all of its varied shades and tints.

Emphasis has shifted from speech to writing, invention to grammar and style, classical rhetoric to modern poetics and finally from the feeling that public speaking is the lifeblood of democracy to the attitude that speech is not a part of rhetoric or, if it is, it is of secondary importance.

What then and finally, have been the effects of the Boylston Chair on speech education in the United States?
The effect of John Quincy Adams on speech education today is important but indirect in nature. The direct effect of his rhetoric is negligible. Adams' name and its connection with speech at Harvard is more important to speech education, it seems, than his rhetoric. He was quoted in several modern text books largely with emphasis on the effect his name produced rather than his understanding of rhetoric. Most authorities in speech today have gone directly to the sources from which Adams drew rather than working from or through Adams' Lectures. Adams' name of course, along with Witherspoon's, stood with those of the ancients when classical rhetoric was revived in speech education shortly after 1900.

Indirectly the Boylston Chair has seriously affected speech education today by virtue of the fact that the name of Adams and the prestige of Harvard combined to give initial impetus to the idea that speech is a separate academic discipline in the United States.

From Adams' day an interest in speech was transplanted in the West and developed until today the Midwest is generally considered the stronghold of speech education. At Harvard and in some Eastern schools, however, it seems that the philosophy of those who followed Adams
and McKean in the Chair has prevailed. The Rhetorics of John Quincy Adams and Joseph McKean had little apparent effect on those who followed after them in the office of Boylston Professor.

Conclusions. One conclusion of this work was that, in the East, the Boylston Chair as a symbol of rhetoric at Harvard has represented at best a neutral effect rather than a positive aid to the development of speech education.

Hunt was correct when he stated that the Boylston Chair of Rhetoric was perhaps the most distinguished and influential chair of rhetoric in America— but the definition of the term rhetoric, as this study pointed out, was in need of severe qualification.

A second conclusion is that each individual occupant of the Chair defined rhetoric to include his own interests. In other words, definitions of rhetoric in the Boylston Chair were accommodated to the interests of the men who drew them up. For example, the interests and educational backgrounds of John Quincy Adams and Joseph McKean were such that the original rules set up by Eliphalet Pearson were amenable to their point of view.

It can be further seen that Edward Tyrrel Channing
developed his definition of rhetoric to include his basic interest in writing. The broad definition of rhetoric originally set down by the Board of Overseers allowed for Channing's inclusion of written communication in his duties as Boylston Professor. Channing's interests while Boylston Professor led to the special emphasis on written communication and to the neglect of the spoken word.

It is also notable that Francis J. Child saw little point in trying to fit his definition of rhetoric into the original rules of his office. He changed the name of his duties from Lectures on Rhetoric and Oratory to Lectures on Rhetoric and English Composition.

Adams Sherman Hill actually re-defined rhetoric, eliminating all of the classical canons except the one pertaining to his particular interest - style in written composition. Since Hill dealt with the basic elements of written composition or grammar, he defined rhetoric as the rules of grammar. His standard for judgment was correctness.

Le Baron Russell Briggs, who received his early years of training as a teacher under Hill, was content to build his teachings on precedent established by Hill. Charles Townsend Copeland made his name in oral reading
and the appreciation of literature and continued for his three years in the Chair to teach literature through oral interpretation. He did not feel obligated to define rhetoric. By 1925 definition was no longer necessary since the original rules were no longer recognized.

The last three occupants of the Chair have defined their function as Boylston Professor, either explicitly or implicitly, in terms of poetry. This of course is a result of the fact that the recent holders of the Chair have been poets. In short, the interest of the holders of the Boylston Chair have determined educational policy in the Chair.

We conclude further that two specific attempts have been made by the administration of Harvard to restrict the work of the Boylston Professor. The first attempt to prescribe rules for Boylston Professors was in the form of the original rules for the Chair. Gradually these rules were forgotten. President Eliot's policy was the second attempt to fashion teaching in the Boylston Chair. This move by Eliot was also forgotten by the time Robert S. Hillyer was appointed to the Chair. At present the Boylston Professor almost has the status of a University Professor. He can teach using materials from any area he
chooses at any time.

A fourth point to be made is that Joseph McKean did leave his lectures behind in legible form. They were not, as some supposed, lost to researchers. They exist in original manuscript form in the Archives at Harvard University.

Further, the Boylston Chair at Harvard University set the pace for education in rhetoric on a national basis until the early 1900's. In so far as speech education is concerned, Harvard's direct influence today through the Boylston Chair is negligible. Whereas Boylston Professors until 1900 were effective in helping to develop national educational policy toward speech education, more recent occupants are presently having little if any effect on speech education on a wider national scale. Instead their writings have been in the field of creative literature.

It is also recognized that the students affected by Boylston Professors have been leaders in many cases in the development of national thought. Certainly the Boylston Chair was not the only factor in the educational background of these men. Other professors at Harvard obviously affected students whose names were associated with Boylston Professors. But the statement that the
Boylston Chair substantially helped to fashion American thought by providing thinkers with the tools of communication seems justified.

The chief value of this current study is as a recognizable aid to the researcher's understanding of his field which may ultimately improve the researcher's ability to teach in his field. A philosophy of speech education is basic to teaching speech. A study of the development of rhetoric or speech education on the scale represented by the Boylston Chair is invaluable in aiding the teacher to develop his own personal philosophy of rhetoric.

This is a broad study. Certain points were raised that deserve further study. The effect of recognized universities on the development of national thought would provide interesting investigation. As an example, one might study the effect of Harvard University on the Abolitionist Movement in the United States. It was interesting to note that almost all of the Boylston Professors before 1865 were to some degree opposed to the institution of slavery.

Other endowed chairs of rhetoric or oratory might be studied with profit. Endowed Chairs at Yale, Andover and other schools were responsible for the teachings of
great rhetoricians - Chauncey Goodrich, for example.

Individuals, relative to this study but not central, who have had a specific effect on speech education deserve study. Some of these are Eliphalet Pearson, Jonathan Barbour, Horace Mann and, for those who have been schooled in literature and poetry and are interested in theatre, more recent occupants of the Boylston Chair, particularly Archibald MacLeish. J. B. deserves intensive study not only as an interesting commentary on the problems facing the individual in our society but as a well constructed piece of dramatic art.
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Extract from the Will of Nicholas Boyton Esq.

There I give & bequeath unto the President & Fellows of Harvard College in Cambridge in the County of Suffolk the sum of $1000.00 to be paid out of the estate or goods of the said Society in good security, & that the whole sum or interest thereof be forever applied towards the support & maintenance of some well qualified poor, who shall be elected by the President & Fellows of D College for the time being, & under the superintendence of the Treasurer, who shall receive the same for the use & benefit of the Donors, & that he shall discharge the duties of his Professorship according to such rules & regulations as shall be established & ordered by the President & Fellows, & the Treasurer of the same. And I declare that each Professor shall be elected by the President & Fellows, with the consent of the Fellows. & that the sum or interest thereon may be after my decease (or upon the removal of any Professor upon the foundation of the same) shall be applied & disposed of by the Charity Commissioners for the time being of the same, & that the same shall be applied & disposed of by the President & Fellows in this matter, in such wise as they shall see fit; & that if there be no such person or persons to be found or provided, the said Commissioners shall appoint & dispose of such person or persons as they shall think fit. & if the same shall appear any unnecessary delay by the President & Fellows in this matter, in such case they may order or cause to be done by themselves in the choice & appointment of a suitable well qualified person to the office of a Professor. & it is also my will that all the issue of this Donation during the time the Professorship may be vacated by & during the time the same may be vacated, shall be paid to the Treasurer, & shall be set aside & be set aside & be for the better support & maintenance of succeeding Professors, & I order my Executors to pay the sum of $1000.00 to the Treasurer of D College within six months after my decease.

A true Copy

+Prb 11, 1672

W. W. Conynch Reg. (n)
EXHIBIT 2

RULES, DIRECTION AND STATUTES OF THE BOYLSTON PROFESSORSHIP OF RHETORIC AND ORATORY IN HARVARD COLLEGE

(1) The Professor placed on the foundation laid by Nicholas Boylston late of Boston Esquire, for the support of a Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory shall be called Boylston Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory. (2) The said Professor shall be a Master of Arts, a believer in the Christian religion, support the character of a learned pious honest man, and be well qualified for the duties of his office. (3) The said Professor, at the time of his inauguration, shall publicly make and subscribe a declaration that he believes in the Christian Religion, and has a firm persuasion of its truth; that with diligence and fidelity he will discharge the duties of his office agreeably to the will of the founder; that he will also labor to advance the interests of general science and literature; that by his example, as well as otherwise, he will endeavor to encourage and promote true piety and all the Christian virtues; that he will at all times consult the good of his pupils and of the College in every respect; and that he will religiously observe the will of the founder and these statutes, excepting so far as the same may be duly repealed, altered or suspended and that he will also faithfully observe such other statutes and laws as are or may be made by the Corporation of Overseers relative to the said Professorship and not repugnant to the will of the Founder. (4) It shall be the principal duty of the said Professor to instruct the students of the several classes in the nature, excellence, and acquisition of the important art of Rhetoric in its most extended and comprehensive sense, or in the theory and practice of writing and speaking well, that is, with method, elegance, harmony, dignity and energy. This instruction shall be given in public or private Lectures as the Corporation shall direct. (5) In his private Lectures he shall not only develop to his pupils in a familiar manner the principles and rules of his art; but it shall be his particular care to aid their application of them in practice in suitable exercises, assigned by him for this purpose. To this end he shall in term time give two Lectures a week to the Class of Freshman, in one of which he shall instruct them from some Rhetorical treatise in Latin or Greek, as Cicerone De Oratore, Aristotle's Rhetoric, Longinus on the sublime, or some other ancient celebrated treatise on Oratory, assigned portions of which they shall recite or render to him in English; and in the other he shall be precept and example instruct and exercise them in the Arts of reading and speaking with propriety. To the Sophomores also he shall give two lectures a week, in the first of which he shall instruct them from some well approved Rhetorical Text Book in English, marked portions of which they shall recite to
him in vernacular; and in the second he shall instruct them in speaking and composition alternately, that is, once in a fortnight he shall improve their speaking by remarks in dialogues, speech, declamations delivered by them in his presence; and once a fortnight, during the first part of the year, he shall inspect and correct their written translations of elegant passages of Latin or Greek assigned by him for this purpose, and in the latter part of the year, specimens of their own composition, as their progress in letters may permit. To the Juniors he shall give a Lecture once in a fortnight for the purpose of forming their style, alternately correcting their compositions, and instructing from the text book, as before, till that be finished, after which they shall exhibit compositions of their own every fortnight. To the Seniors also he shall give one lecture every fortnight for the purpose of cultivating a correct and refined taste in style, pointing out the good and bad qualities and peculiar features of their compositions, which are to be required thus frequently for this important end. The Corporation is authorised [sic] to allow the first Professor on the foundation of all or any of the duties to omit, enjoined by this article, for such time as they shall judge expedient, and to assign the performance of such duties to some other Instructor. (6) The said Professor shall also in term time read a course of public Lectures, one at least every week to the resident graduates, and to the two senior classes of the undergraduates; in which, after giving a brief account of the rise and progress of Oratory among the Ancients, and a biographical sketch of some of their most Celebrated Orators, he shall explain its nature, object and several kinds; show its connection with the powers of the mind natural and acquired, and then divide it into its constituent parts, invention, disposition, elocution and pronunciation; in lecturing on which he shall make the most useful subdivisions, and discuss the most important articles, commonly observed and discussed by eminent writers on Rhetoric and Oratory. Here particularly, under the head of invention, he shall treat of internal and external topics, the state of a controversy, the different arguments, proper to demonstrative, and deliberative and judicial discourses; of the character and address of a finished Orator and the use of the excitation of the passions. Under the head of disposition he shall treat of the properties and uses of each of the parts of a regular discourse such as introduction, narration, proposition, confirmation, confutation and, conclusion; adding suitable remarks on digression, transition, and amplification. Under the head of elocution he shall first treat generally and largely of elegant composition; and dignity, and of their respective requisites; and then particularly of the several species of style, as the low, middle, sublime, and of their distinguishing qualities with respect both to the thoughts and the
words, illustrating the same by proper examples; and likewise of the various styles of epistles, dialogues, history, poetry and orations. Under the head of pronunciation he shall urge the immense [sic] importance of a good delivery, and treat particularly of the management of the voice, and of gesture, interspersing due cautions against what is awkward or affected with directions for the attainment of proper action, and incessantly pressing the superior excellence of a natural manner. Thus far the best precepts may be drawn from the writings of the Ancients, but, as Christianity has opened a new field to Eloquence, wholly unknown to them and differing in so many important respects from what they had explored, additional precepts as well, as a new application of old ones, are become necessary. Therefore not only on account of the different, but infinitely superior nature and object of sacred Eloquence, the Professor will not only accommodate the principles and precepts of ancient Rhetoric to this new species of Oration, but also prescribe the special additional precepts, to be observed in composing sermons, pointing out the qualities in the speaker, in his style and in his delivery, indispensably requisite to form an accomplished pulpit Orator. He shall also discourse on the various methods of improving in Eloquence, as reading, writing, speaking, imitation and together with the means of strengthening the memory, not forgetting to enforce the favorite maxim of the Ancient Rhetoricians, "Non posse oratorem esse nisi virum bonum." In addition to the preceding subjects, either in distinct lectures, or as opportunity may present during his course, he shall examine and compare the properties of the Ancient and modern languages, particularly of the English, with reference to composition, he shall also delineate the characteristic features of the most celebrated Greek, Roman, and English Historians, Orators, Poets, and Divines pointing out some of their numerous beauties and excellences in thought and expression; but above all let him inspire his pupils with a lively perception and relish of the inimitable simplicity, beauty, and sublimity of the Sacred Writings.

(7) The said Professor shall preside at the public Declamation of the two senior classes; and no declamation either public or private shall be delivered before him, without his previous advice and approbation, and upon each declamation he shall make such remarks either in public or private as to him may seem necessary to improve each individual in all the requisites of a good speaker.

(8) Previously to each public exhibition, and especially before the Annual Commencement, the said Professor shall in some large room privately hear each student pronounce, once at least, for the purpose of correcting errors in delivery and of encouraging and animating his performances.
(9) The aforesaid Rules, Directions, and Statutes shall be ever subject to such alteration, additions, and commandments, as experience shall prove to be expedient, and as the President and Fellows of the College with the Overseers thereof shall, upon mature consideration, deem necessary to render this institution most extensively and permanently useful, and thus to accomplish the benevolent and patriotic designs of the general Founder.
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Ward Nicholas Boylston's Prizes for Elocution.

Annuity for Prizes for Elocution.

Copy of Deed securing the annuity

"I, Ward Nicholas Boylston of Roxbury, in the County of Norfolk Esquire, taking into consideration the importance of the Art of Elocution, to the formation of an accomplished orator, actuated also by a wish to promote the reputation of Harvard College, and more especially with a view to advance the objects for which the professorship of Rhetoric and Oratory was founded by my late Uncle Nicholas Boylston Esq. Do hereby promise and agree to pay to the President and Fellows of Harvard College the sum of Fifty Dollars a year, the first payment to be made on, or before the first commencement which will be held in the year of Our Lord One thousand eight hundred and eighteen at Cambridge in the County of Middlesex, at the University.

(altered to)

( Sixty )
aforesaid, and the same sum to continue to pay annually during my life, with the exceptions and subject to the provisions herein after stated.

And I do further promise, that as soon as may be after my decease there shall be paid to the said President and Fellows by my executors or administrators the sum of One thousand dollars for the payment of which I will make provision in my

370.
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last Will and Testament or by my bond to said President and Fellows in my life time.

The said several annual payments and the income or interest of said Thousand Dollars to be applied and paid by said President and Fellows and their successors as follows, to wit:

In after "of"

"in"
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last Will and Testament or by my bond to said President and Fellows in my life time.

The said several annual payments and the income or interest of said Thousand Dollars to be applied and paid by said President and Fellows and their successors as follows, to wit:

In after "of"

"in"
lic exhibition, or trial of the advancement or progress of the Students at the University in Elocution, and to the end that the competitors and the Judges herein after provided, may not be diverted from the only object of the institution which is what is usually termed a good delivery, including therein gracefulness, energy and propriety of action, distinctness and clearness of enunciation, correctness of pronunciation, and a suitable regard to emphasis and modulation of voice, and in short everything which contributed to give freedom and beauty to written discourses when delivered publicly, it shall be a standing rule that the speaker shall never rehearse his own composition but may select any writings in verse or prose from approved English, Greek or Latin Authors, the selection so made to be first approved by the Boylston Professor of Rhetoric and

1817. (continued)
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"Oratory. The proportion of pieces are to be two at least in English, the others to be settled by him.

**Article 2d** All the Students of the Class which shall have the same year taken their degrees, and of the next two classes, may be competitors for the premium herein after mentioned, but the persons who intend to enter and contend for the prizes, shall enter their names with the President of the College fourteen days at least before the Exhibition.

**Article 3d** The President and Fellows of Harvard College, shall in each and every year select without any reference for approbation to the Board of Overseers, Five Gentlemen, who have been themselves distinguished for their Elocution particularly, either at the Bar, in the Pulpit, or in the Senate, who together with the Corporation, or a major part of them shall be the judges of the Elocution of the Competitors at said Exhibition, and shall have power to award the prizes herein after mentioned.

**Article 4th** There shall be four pris-
Article 5th  The two competitors who shall be deemed by the said Judges to have excelled all the others in the Art of Elocution, at any of the said Exhibitions shall be entitled to the first premiums.
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provided, the right after the expiration
of three years of revocating this Foundation
founder retain the right after the expiration
by a formal Letter to the Corporation to
that effect and that without being held
shall go to the Increase and Accumulation of
the Fund.

This clause is qualified by the
2 "Deeds".

At my decease, the income
will amount to Sixty dollars a year,
the Judges may either direct the extra-
ten dollars to be added to the principal,
or may give it to one or both the can-
dates who shall have taken the first pre-
miums, or may give a fifth premium
of the value of ten Dollars. The latter I
should prefer.

Provided however, as this Exhibition is
new and but an experiment, I as the
fnst skill and improvement to be en-

shall thereupon cease and be void.

This right is not reserved out of any dis-
respect to the Corporation, but for the reasons
afore mentioned.

The President shall if he sees fit give
notice as soon as may be after this shall
be accepted, of this Donation and that the
first trial will be held in August 1818.

The Hon John Adams and his son
Hon John Quincy Adams, as the rel-
atives of the founder, shall be considered,
during their lives (when resident in this
state at the time) members of the Board
of Judges, and a less number may at
such times be selected accordingly.

The Institution shall be called the Boyl-
ston Prizes for Elocution.

N.B. The motives for not requiring
the assent of the Overseers to the appoint-
ment of Judges were, that it might occa-
sion unnecessary delay, and the said officers
being appointed only for each year it would
be troublesome to both of the College Boards.

And I upon further consideration, do
substitute a Gold Medal instead of a Silver
one in the second premium.

---

"And I also further direct, that if I cause to be paid to the said President and Fellows of Harvard College, or to their Treasurer, the three annual payments, being the sum of One hundred and fifty dollars, on or before the first day of January next, (which I intend to do) that they will apply the interest that shall arise after deducting the annual premiums for prizes to a fifth first premium, English Prose or Verse, in the said third year, subject however to my reserved right of rescinding the same.

(Signed) Ward Nicholas Boylston.

Roxbury Nov 28, 1817.
"The preceding was by the founder, presented in a new draught, altered agreeably to the second paragraph in Article 9th and to the second paragraph in the N.B. subjoined to the preceding Instrument, I the said alterations noted in the margin:

(Signed) John T. Kirkland,
President.

See Votes of Corp. Aug. 18, 1920,
and Dec. 30th 1828.
June 14, 1875, Oct. 8, 1877.
### CHANNING’S REPORTS IN THE OVERSEEERS REPORTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volume I</td>
<td>report to visiting committee 187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2, 1825</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 29, 1826</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 8, 1826</td>
<td>122-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 28, 1829</td>
<td>174-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 19, 1829</td>
<td>236-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 4, 1830</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 19, 1830</td>
<td>323-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume II</td>
<td>report to visiting committee 40-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3, 1831</td>
<td>40-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 18, 1831</td>
<td>63-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1, 1832</td>
<td>137-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 16, 1832</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 30, 1833</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 15, 1833</td>
<td>233-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume III</td>
<td>report to visiting committee 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 29, 1834</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 21, 1834</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 28, 1835</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 20, 1835</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3, 1835</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume IV</td>
<td>report to visiting committee 29-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2, 1837</td>
<td>29-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 17, 1837</td>
<td>68-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1, 1838</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 16, 1838</td>
<td>174-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 7, 1839</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 15, 1839</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 5, 1840</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 20, 1840</td>
<td>373-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume V</td>
<td>report to visiting committee 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 4, 1841</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 19, 1841</td>
<td>126-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 20, 1842</td>
<td>159-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3, 1842</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 18, 1842</td>
<td>226-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2, 1843</td>
<td>307-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 17, 1843</td>
<td>315-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume VI</td>
<td>report to visiting committee 35-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 7, 1844</td>
<td>35-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 15, 1844</td>
<td>75-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 21, 1845</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 5, 1846</td>
<td>238-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 20, 1846</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 4, 1847</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 19, 1847</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume VIII</td>
<td>May 2, 1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct. 17, 1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 1, 1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct. 16, 1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 7, 1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct. 15, 1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume IX</td>
<td>May 6, 1851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 15, 1851</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXHIBIT 5

FRANCIS J. CHILD'S REPORTS IN THE OVERSEEERS REPORTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Report Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>60-1</td>
<td>April 17, 1859</td>
<td>report to visiting committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>132-33</td>
<td>Oct., 1860</td>
<td>report to visiting committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>170-1</td>
<td>May, 1860</td>
<td>report to visiting committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>259</td>
<td>Oct., 1861</td>
<td>report to visiting committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>284-5</td>
<td>May, 1861</td>
<td>report to visiting committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>343</td>
<td>Oct., 1862</td>
<td>report to visiting committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>385</td>
<td>Oct., 1863</td>
<td>report to visiting committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>May, 1864</td>
<td>report to visiting committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Oct., 1865</td>
<td>report to visiting committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>185</td>
<td>May, 1866</td>
<td>report to visiting committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>252</td>
<td>Oct. 22, 1867</td>
<td>report to visiting committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>273</td>
<td>Oct. 27, 1868</td>
<td>report to visiting committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>391</td>
<td>May 5, 1868</td>
<td>report to visiting committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>May 4, 1852</td>
<td>report to visiting committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>278</td>
<td>Oct. 19, 1852</td>
<td>report to visiting committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>308</td>
<td>May 3, 1853</td>
<td>report to visiting committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>418-9</td>
<td>Oct. 18, 1853</td>
<td>report to visiting committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>May, 1847</td>
<td>report to visiting committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>May, 1848</td>
<td>report to visiting committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Oct., 1848</td>
<td>report to visiting committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>124</td>
<td>May, 1849</td>
<td>report to visiting committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>May 2, 1851</td>
<td>report to visiting committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Oct. 17, 1854</td>
<td>report to visiting committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>May, 1855</td>
<td>report to visiting committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>194</td>
<td>Oct., 1855</td>
<td>report to visiting committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>233</td>
<td>May, 1856</td>
<td>report to visiting committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>373</td>
<td>Oct. 21, 1856</td>
<td>report to visiting committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>May 5, 1857</td>
<td>report to visiting committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Oct., 1857</td>
<td>report to visiting committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>187</td>
<td>May, 1858</td>
<td>report to visiting committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>225</td>
<td>Oct. 19, 1858</td>
<td>report to visiting committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>May, 1863</td>
<td>report to visiting committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Oct., 1863</td>
<td>report to visiting committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I have received your notice of the expected change in the state of the business and have been asked to report to you the steps that I will take in response to the new situation. I have informed my chief of the changes that have occurred and have instructed him to take appropriate action. I have also conferred with my colleagues in the board of directors to discuss the implications of these changes and to plan for the future. I have decided to take a series of steps to ensure that the interests of the company are protected and that the transition to the new situation is made smoothly.

I understand that you have also been informed of these changes and that you have taken action in response. I appreciate your efforts to maintain the stability of the company during this transition. I am confident that we will be able to overcome any difficulties that may arise and that we will emerge stronger and more successful.

Thank you for your continued support.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

[Note: The page contains handwritten text and appears to be a part of a legal or business document.]
Lectures on Rhetoric and Oratory, John Quincy Adams, L.L.D., Vols. 1 and 2. Cambridge: Printed by Hilliard and Metcalf, 1810. This set of lectures is dedicated to the classes of Sr. and Jr. sophists in Harvard University.

Nicholas Boylston esq. was an eminent merchant of Boston who died on August 18, 1771, age 56. He was "a man of good understanding and sound judgment, diligent in his business, though not a slave to it, upright in his dealings, honest and sincere in all his professions, and a stranger to dissimulation." (Preface iii-viii.) He bequeathed 1500 pounds "lawful money" as a foundation for a professorship of rhetoric and oratory in Harvard College. It was paid to the treasurer in Feb. of '72.

In 1804 the amount was considered enough for practical purposes. The rules for the "chair" were established. John Quincy Adams was installed on June 12, 1805. He was left free for his duties as senator.

On the 12th of August 1808, Adams completed the course (36 lectures given weekly). On the 28th of July he took leave of his students and embarked for Russia. These lectures were published without revision. "These lectures however comprehend what in his estimation, belongs to rhetoric; and contain the theory of his branch. The practical part, or what belonged to oratory, he intended to treat at a future period; ..."

His figurative language in delivering these lectures bothered some.


INAUGURAL ORATION
(Pgs. 11-31.)

Rhetoric's station in life has never been precisely assigned. Rhetoric has felt both assent and decline in the annals of history, "... and it still remains an inquiry among men, as in the age of Plato and in that of Cicero, whether eloquence is an art, worthy of the cultivation of a wise and virtuous man."

The difference between man and the animal is reason. An adjunct of reason is speech.

A. The power of speech in the social setting is felt if not acknowledged.
   1. Biblical history.
   2. Greece and Egypt.

orator - man of universal knowledge.
moral duties - good man

5. Middle Ages.
eloquence perverted from persuasion to panegyric.

5. Renaissance.
Continental oratory never recovered the glory of the ancients.

B. Present state of affairs.

1. Religion opened new avenue.
2. Speech in law is not completely lasting.
3. Speech in education - The Europeans have studied rhetoric
as a theory but have neglected oratory as an art. We
have done likewise. Harvard has been going for a
little less than 200 yrs. and this is the first course
in sp.

LECTURE I GENERAL VIEW OF RHETORIC AND ORATORY
(Pgs. 32-50)

The kindred arts of grammar, language and logic have been a part of
the curriculum at Harvard. Where does oratory begin and leave off? What
are its limits? Rhetoric and oratory are sometimes considered synonymous.
Rhetoric is theory. Oratory is practice.

A. Aristotle - "Rhetoric, says Aristotle, is the power
of inventing whatsoever is persuasive in
discourse."

JQA criticizes Aristotle's definition in the following manner:

1. This definition omits disposition and elocution.
2. Persuasion isn't the only end of speaking, inform?,
entertain? etc.

B. Cicero - "... rhetoric is the art of persuasion."

JQA criticizes Cicero's definition in the following manner:

1. Cicero makes success the only criterion of rhetoric.
2. This definition is not without exception

C. Quintilian - "Rhetoric is the science of speaking well."

JQA thinks this definition is more correct and precise. The reasons
are on the next page.

D. JQA favors Quintilian's definition because:

1. of the simplicity of the definition.
2. of its coincidence with the definition offered in the
Holy Scriptures.
3. Quintilian makes the distinction between thinking and
speaking.
Grammar is speaking correctly. Rhetoric is speaking well. Grammar is to arithmetic as rhetoric is to geometry. Oratory is the art of speaking well. Rhetoric is the science of speaking well. Oratory is not speech or conversation.

The utility of the art is obvious. Two out of the professions make particular use of public speaking—law and the pulpit. The pulpit is the throne of modern eloquence. Citizens must use speech.

LECTURE II OBSTRUCTIONS AGAINST ELOQUENCE
(Pgs. 50-73.)

A. Point 1. is sometimes supported by the jingle,

"All a rhetorician's rules teach nothing but to name his tools."

JQA tells us, "What can be more useful than to know the names and uses of your tools?"

B. Point 2. is based on the idea that some speakers mistake the means for the end of speaking. They let their gestures become more important than the point they are trying to make.

JQA uses an analogy between an army and a speaker to defend the practice of delivery. The drilling of the training day instills a basic feeling which makes for steadfastness in battle. It involves discipline. An army must move as one man in battle, cut hard, and win battles that turn the tide of history. So it is with oratory.

C. Point 3. is the most pressing of criticisms.

JQA points out that this criticism is against the constitution of human nature, the dispensations of providence and the moral government of the universe, not against oratory. The sun is life-giving but how often does it blind the eyes or " parch the plains?" Air without oxygen is poison. Virtue is the vital air of the moral world.

"If the incestuous Clodius and the incendiary Catiline had eloquence enough for the destruction of imperial Rome, what but the immortal voice of Cicero could have operated her salvation." (Pg. 66)

JQA concludes that there is nothing in these objections that could or should bar the learning of public speaking. Invert the advice of Timotheus to Alexander, "If the world be worth enjoying, Think! Oh! think! it worth thy winning."

Eloquence is the child of liberty (Greece and the U. S.). Let us "call on the shades of Demosthenes and Cicero" for they "shed the brightest lustre on the name of man."

LECTURE III ORIGIN OF ORATORY
(Pgs. 73-115.)

The first sounds resulted from passions of men.
A. The first note of eloquence was sounded by the Greeks. This was a result of the fact that the Assyrian, Persian, and the Egyptian states were dictatorships.

1. Greece was a "democracy of states" that set out on expeditions which stimulated oratory.
   - Jason and the Argonauts
   - War of Thebes
   - Trojan War

2. In the Corinthiacs of Pausanias it appears that Pittheus, the uncle of Theseus (25th century before the Trojan War) opened a school of rhetoric in the city of Troezen.

3. Odyssey and Iliad represent examples of rhetoric in the persons of Odysseus, Achilles, and Antenor. (Pgs. 79-80.)

4. Sicily had rhetoricians.
   - Empedocles - teacher of Georgias.
   - Corax
   - Tisias

5. Contemporaries of Georgias:
   - Thrasymachus of Chalcedon
   - Prodious of Ceos
   - Hippias of Elis
   - Alcidamus of Elea
   - Antiphon - first rhetoric and oration together.
   - Polycrates
   - Theodore of Byantium

6. Georgias was a master of extemporaneous declamation who was sent to Greece to solicit the aid of the Athenians. He was so well liked that his statue was placed in the temple of Delphi, an honor never shown to any other man. Georgias had Aristotle's approbation. Plato based his Georgias on his life. When Georgias first saw the work, he is quoted as having said, "How handsomely that same Plato can slander." His style was too affected and too presumptuous. He invented topics and oratorical numbers. He gave rise to the Attic - Asiatic Controversy.

7. Isocrates was the disciple of Georgias. He was a timid man and served as a "ghost writer." He opened a school of rhetoric and, as from the Trojan Horse, the school issued a host of heroes. He died of a broken heart at the battle of Chaeronea in 436 B.C. 20 of his 60 orations are still extant. He spent ten years on one panegyric! Isocrates gave rise to Aristotle's Rhetoric, the earliest extant scientific treatise on rhetoric.

8. Plato was inconsistent when dealing with rhetoric. In his Phaedrus he sets up Pericles as a highly accomplished orator. In the Georgias, Georgias with Pericles was pronounced to be no orator at all.
9. Aristotle wrote the *Rhetoric* in three books. He may have written another but it might have been written by Alexander.

10. Others were:
- Demetrius Phalereus
- Dionysius Halicarnassus
- Lucian of Samosata - 2nd century.
- Hermogenes

character of orations - 5 books
ideas - 2 books

Longinus ended the rhetorical genius of Greece. He lived in the 3rd century, wrote the *Sublime* and died in speaking against Rome in Zenobia.

LECTURE IV ORIGIN OF ORATORY

Oratory is the first principle of human association. In Greece it was common assent. In Rome it was force. In Rome the first notice of rhetoric was in the form of a decree passed in 592 B.C. which in effect caused the expulsion of all philosophers and rhetoricians taught in Greece by Greeks.

A. Plotius opened the first school of rhetoric. Rome produced Cicero.

"He represents the most perfect example of that rare and splendid combination, universal genius and indefatigable application, which the annals of the world can produce." (Pg. 99.)

B. Cicero produced seven treatises, having collected materials from Aristotle and Isocrates. The first three deal with 1) talents essential to the orator, 2) proof, 3) and elocution. He developed the Rhodian style which was a compromise between the Attic and Asiatic styles. Cicero felt that the florid style should be best used by youth on gala occasions. The close style should be used in judicial matters by the mature among men.

LECTURE V CICERO AND HIS RHETORICAL WRITINGS
(Pgs. 117-138.)

Cicero produced two rhetorical treatises that are beyond doubt his.
A. *De Oratore* - analytical decomposition of the art of public speaking.

B. *Brutus* and *de claris oratoribus* - summary review of all famous Greek and Roman orators.

Cicero's life was a life of labor. Hortensius enjoyed unequalled success before Cicero entered the scene. Hortensius was perhaps as talented as Cicero but did not have the tenacity or diligence with which
Cicero applied himself. Hortensius slipped while Cicero's star soared. JQA compares Cicero and Caesar, making the point that Cicero's accomplishments were universal. Caesar's were nothing in comparison.

LECTURE VI  CHARACTER OF QUINTILIAN
(Pgs. 139-160.)

Another difference between Greek and Roman rhetoric is time. From Pittheus to Longinus it was a period of 1300 years. From Cicero to Quintilian we have only a period of 100 years. Roman declamations at this time started as original oratory but became perverted. The purpose of speaking changed from persuasion to pleasure.

A. 1st book - preparatory.
B. 4th and 6th books - events in the life of the author.
   Quintilian's wife and two sons died.
C. 12th book - miscellaneous topics.

JQA attacks Quintilian's "Good Man" theory. Bad men may be gifted in oratory. If a man is a skilled speaker, don't conclude that he is by necessity, "good."

LECTURE VII  BRANCHES OF RHETORIC
(Pgs. 161-182.)

A. There are 5 branches of rhetoric.
   1. Inventio - verisimilitude.
   2. Dispositio - arrangement.
   3. Elocutio - words and sentences.
   5. Pronunciatio - voice and body.
B. JQA explains nos. 1, 3, and 5.
   1. The end of rhetoric is persuasion. Its irresistible instrument is truth. In this way rhetoric differs from poetics. The poetic is sometimes a "fascination with falsehood."
   3. Elocution is the act of committing your discourse to writing.
C. There are several types of oratory.
   Aristotle.
   1. Deliberation - deals with the future.
   2. Judicial - deals with the past.
   3. Demonstrative - deals with the present.
   French and Blair.
   1. Pulpit
   2. Popular Assembly
   3. Bar
   JQA
   1. Demonstrative
   2. Deliberative
   3. Judicial
   4. Religious
LECTURE VIII  STATE OF THE CONTROVERSY
(Pgs. 183-205.)

The three different types of oratory demand to some extent different treatment. The state of the cause does not mean a conclusion based on ground covered. It means the mark at which a speaker's discourse aims. In judicial speaking it means "issue." Conviction is the great aim of public speaking.

A. The state depends on:
1. co-ordinate states which are most frequent at the bar. It means that more than one question has to be answered.
2. subordinate states are subpoints distinct from the main point. "Faith, hope and charity" is an example in point. Charity is the main point here.
3. contingent states are connected with the main question but not essential as for example, the qualification of a juror.

B. In judicial oratory there are four kinds of states. They are:
1. conjecture. This type occurs when the facts are in question and the judge must decide by guess.
2. definition. In this case the fact is admitted. The definition of the fact is in question.
3. quality. The facts are admitted but whether an act is right or wrong is here in question.
4. quantity. This is a matter of establishing the degree of the crime - more or less.

The test of a speaker is the adaptation of the speech to the state of the controversy.

LECTURE IX  TOPICS
(Pgs. 207-228.)

Topics have been almost eliminated from modern rhetoric. Topics are commonplaces or circumstances belonging alike to every subject to facilitate the invention of public speakers. There are two kinds of evidence and two types of topics - internal and external.

A. There are 16 internal topics.
1. definition
   of things to the senses.
   of ideas for the understanding.
   An example from the funeral oration of Turenne by Flechier is set down. It is a definition of an army. (Pg. 210.)
2. enumeration
   separation into constituent parts.
   An example is made of Junius.
3. notation (etymology)
   tracing to a source.
   An example is here made of Milton.
4. genus
5. species

"Yes, every poet is a fool
By demonstration Ned can show it
Happy, could Ned's inverted rule
Prove every fool a poet"
fool - genus
poet - species

6. antecedents
past contingencies
7. consequents
future contingencies
8. adjuncts.
present contingencies
9. conjugates
different words derived from the same words
10. cause, effect, contraries, repugnancies.
16. similitude, dissimilitude, and comparison.

5. There are 6 external topics.
1. prejudications
   precedents or previous decisions made on the
   same question involving the same parties.
2. common fame
   common knowledge grants presumption
3. torture
4. written documents
5. oaths
6. witnesses

LECTURE X ARGUMENTS AND DEMONSTRATIVE ORATORY
(Pgs. 229-252.)

Adams first covers the arguments suitable to demonstrative oratory. He distinguishes between demonstrative oratory and the other two types.

A. Demonstrative - praise or censure - opinions.
B. Deliberative - utility - will.
C. Judicial - justice - judgment.

In olden times anything was considered worthy of praise or censure. Today in the U.S. we generally praise God or great men. Aristotle makes the point that when we praise we speak in terms of:
1. good - benefit of qualities to possessor.
2. fair - qualities that are of benefit to others.
3. virtue - both included.

In the panegyric you have two responsibilities:
1. to be biographical.
2. to be ethical.

In so doing be:
1. honest
2. specific
3. amplify
4. moralize
LECTURE XI  DELIBERATIVE ORATORY
(Pgs. 253-276.)

Deliberative oratory is persuasion at its best. It is of the greatest importance, even more than forensic oratory. When speaking to an assembly, the speaker should speak as if to one man.

There are three things the speaker should consider.

A. In considering the subject of your speech think in the following terms:
   1. The legality of the issue.
   2. The possibility of the issue.
   3. The probability of the issue.
   4. The facility with which action can be taken.
   5. The necessity or importance of the issue.
   6. The contingency of the issue.

B. In considering the audience - analyse the motives of the audience, characters and manners of the audience.
   1. The motives of an audience are,
      a. duty
      b. honor
      c. interest
      d. passion
   2. The character of an audience is
      a. rude - appeal to int. and pass.
      b. polished - appeal to duty and honor.

C. In considering yourself the speaker, you should remember,
   1. to maintain the confidence of the aud.
   2. to aim toward simplicity
      plain sense
      clear logic
      ardent sensibility
   3. to be buried in your subject
      Don't advocate what you don't believe. In making use of devices, remember Shakespeare's Isabella, who said, "I sometimes do excuse the thing I hate, For his advantage, whom I dearly love."

LECTURE XII  JUDICIAL ORATORY
(Pgs. 277-295.)

Judicial oratory involves the litigation of causes and eloquence of the bar.

In the Roman courts much more leeway was given to lawyers in the use of eloquence than in the U.S. today (1800).

A. There has been an all pervading change in judicial oratory. Demonstrative and deliberative oratory are much the same in terms of rules. Not so with judicial oratory. The following changes have taken place.
1. With the ancients the case rested on conjecture, definition, quantity and quality. Today we have issues of fact to be decided by a jury and law decided by the judge.
2. The law is more complicated now. We have moved away from the common law.
3. Passion is not allowed in courts of law. Lawyers have less leeway.
4. In ancient Rome judges had more power. Today the only decision left to the jury is the question "guilty or not guilty?" It is especially true in criminal law. (Pgs. 297-319.)

LECTURE XIII JUDICIAL ORATORY (Cont.) (Pgs. 297-319)

Since social institutions change there is a change in the law. There are three general rules that the student of law should keep in mind. The details are left for courses in law. These rules are:

A. Wrongs are divided into two types.
   public - civil
   private - criminal.
   In developing charges, you must deal with questions of "will," "power" and "fact."
B. Public wrongs are divided into two types. They are:
   personal wrongs.
   official wrongs which are dealt with by impeachment.
C. Duties are divided between judge and jury. The jury decides fact.
   The judge decides the law.

This kind of oratory is the most difficult type of oratory. The client is at stake. If the lawyer wins, it's simply a result of justice being done. If the lawyer loses, he may go hungry.

LECTURE XIV PULPIT ORATORY (Pgs. 321-341.)

Our needle no longer points to the pole. The ancients said nothing of pulpit oratory. The church did not become powerful until the middle ages so this type of oratory is the latest to be considered.

The functions of pulpit oratory are two,
address hearers and to address Supreme Creator.

A. When engaged in point no. 2, pathos is the most important appeal. The appeal of pathos should be simple and executed with ardor. The object is not conviction or persuasion but "prostration of the creature before his maker." In actual practice, remember that Christ taught against too much speaking. Too much speaking may seem like hypocrisy.
B. When engaged in point no. 1, the ends of speech are:
   1. the imparting of knowledge.
   2. the creating of virtue.

In you get to one person in a thousand, your work is not in vain!

The French are adept at making a gorgeous impression. Fenelon, the
Archbishop of Cambray is perhaps the best example in this school.
The English make cold appeals to the understanding. This difference
is probably a result of national temperament. In France the infalli-
bility of the church admits no argument.

In actual delivery, the sermon must be previously written.
"There is a force, an interest, an energy, in extemporaneous
discourse "warm from the soul and faithful to its fires,"
which no degree of meditation can attain or supply. But
the stream, which flows spontaneously, is almost always
shallow, and runs forever in the same channel." (Pg. 341.)

LECTURE XV  THE INTELLECTUAL AND MORAL QUALITIES OF AN ORATOR
(Pgs. 343-365.)

The orator must have basically three qualities. He must have:

A. qualities of the heart.
   Above all else the speaker must be an honorable man. He must
   have a good reputation. Develop a code of ethics of your
   own. Integrity is the jewel of the soul.

B. endowments of understanding.
   Industry can conquer all most anything. Knowledge leads to
   understanding.

C. dispositions of temper.
   1. benevolence
   2. modesty
   3. confidence

"Let no man presume to bespeak an ascendency over the passions of
others until he has acquired an unquestioned mastery over his
own." (Pg. 365.)

LECTURE XVI  MANAGEMENT OF THE PASSIONS
(Pgs. 367-389.)

Quintilian mentioned the passions even in regard to forensic oratory.
This not so today. The law is more important. Modern courts have lost
on the side of eloquence but they have gained on the side of solidity.
Appeal to the passions is still most important however.

Aristotle, Cicero and Quintilian refer to the passions as the most
important and effectual power of public speaking.
An orator should know the habits and passions to speak well. Aristotle indicates that a speaker does well to appeal to the malevolence of his listeners. JQA thinks that an appeal to other more worthy passions is more justified. He offers Burke as an example over and above Junius.

A. An orator should feel the passion that he is purposing to excite.
   1. To stir passion - begin by feeling it.
   2. To inflame anger - be cool.

B. An orator needs imagination.
   "The power of imagination furnishes a substitute for the evidence of all the senses. It creates and multiplies all those incidents, which, being the constant attendants upon all realities, have always so strong a tendency to enforce belief. So indispensable is this power to the success of that oratory, which aims at the dominion of the passions, that a public speaker can institute no more important self-examination, than the inquiry whether it has been bestowed upon him by nature. If it has let him cherish and cultivate it, as the most precious of heaven's blessings. If it has not, let him graduate the scale of his ambition to the temperate regions of eloquence, and aspire only to the reputation of being the orator of reason." (Pg. 383.)

C. The ruling passions are:
   1. legislature - jealousy.
   2. bar - avarice.
   3. pulpit - fear.
   This is a warning rather than a recommendation. Recapitulation, Invention: state of controversy, arguments adapted to demonstrative, deliberative, judicial and religious speaking, address and character of the orator, exciting and directing passions.

Look not to the lessons of a teacher but to the fertility of your own invention.

LECTURE XVII DISPOSITION EXORDIUM
(Pgs. 393-410.)

The 1st cannon, inventio was dealt with in the last ten lectures. JQA uses the analogy of the creation of the world to speech in clarifying invention. But order is needed. So we must consider dispositions. Cicero defines this term as "the orderly arrangement of things invented."

Disposition = work = exercise of judgment.
Inventio = genius = attribute of imagination.
Quintilian defines organisation as "a useful distribution of things, or of parts; assigning to each its proper place and station."
A. What are these parts?

Aristotle
1. introduction - exordium.
2. proposition.
3. proof.
4. conclusion - peroration.

Quintilian (adds a fifth)
1. introduction.
2. narration.
3. proof.
4. refutation.
5. conclusion.

Cicero (adds another)
1. introduction.
2. narration.
3. proposition.
4. proof.
5. refutation.
6. conclusion.

JQA follows Cicero on organisation.

Exordium is "a discourse to prepare the minds of the audience for the favorable reception of the remainder." (Cicero) Amity is necessary to every transaction of a peaceable nature among men.

B. The Introduction does three things:

1. engage good will - favor of speaker
   How do you get confidence and affection?
   a. He bespeaks favorable allusions to himself.
      direct or indirect.
   b. He protests charges against him.
   c. He professes honor and virtue.
   d. He leads audience to recall his services and good deeds.
   e. He enlarges on difficulties he has faced.
   f. He expresses open solicitation.
   g. He expresses confidence in his auditors.
   h. He praises whole group.
   i. He praises one person less openly.
   There is danger here of over emphasis.

2. engage attention to speech.
   There is the direct and indirect approach
   a. Direct approach is used in:
      popular subjects
      trivial subjects
      obscure subjects
   b. Indirect approaches are used in:
      equivocal subjects
      obnoxious subjects
3. secure a sense of docility toward your subj.  
   a. be simple and unassuming.  
   b. avoid vulgarity.  
   Sometimes you eliminate your introduction altogether ... as
   in Cicero's first oration vs. Cataline. An introduction is most
   suited to demonstrative and pulpit speaking. Extempore speaking
doesn't require an introduction. Oratory on the other hand generally
does.

LECTURE VIII NARRATION
(Pgs. 411-431.)

Narration is a general exposition of the facts upon which argument
is based. Generally, it is said, "deliberative oratory has no narra-
tion because it deals with future questions upon which there are no
previous materials. "Narration is most important in judicial oratory.
However no question deliberative or otherwise can arise without some
kind of a history. In this way narration is important even to delibera-
tive oratory. It is also important in demonstrative sp.

A. Characteristics of a narration are:
   1. brevity.  
   2. perspicuity or analysis.  
   3. probability.  
      an improbable truth is less effective than a probable
      falsehood.

LECTURE XIX PROPOSITION AND PARTITION
(Pgs. 1-25.)

This phase of the development of a speech is indispensible.
Proposition.
Your discourse may support one simple, one complicated or many
distinct propositions. Judicial speech has only one proposition. Pulpit
and deliberative oratory may have sub propositions or propositions divided
into several points by partition. Burke's speech on conciliation was an
attempt to accomplish peace - not war, not negotiations, not judicial
peace but a simple peace.

Your proposition or state of controversy should be clear and con-
cise.

A. Partition.
Partition serves two purposes: 1. to facilitate matters for the
speaker and 2. to facilitate matters for the listeners. Fenelon feels
that organisation should be excluded in sermons. He also reiterates
the objections to partition set down originally by Quintilian.
   1. Speaker may forget some points.  
   2. Speaker is exposed to omit certain points of importance.  
   3. Speaker may suffer the criticism that his speech shows
      stiffness and premeditation.  
   4. Organisation discloses the whole design of the speech.  
   5. Organisation interferes with an appeal to the passions.  
   6. The arguments may be feeble in themselves.  
   7. One strong argument looses strength to other weak ones.
B. JQA, Cicero and Quintilian approve partition. JQA answers objections above.

1. Without organisation it would be impossible to remember.
2. If so, it is the imperfection of his subject which is the fault not the principles of organisation.
3. Perhaps, but without premeditation the delivery of a speech on a complicated subject would be beyond the ability of man.
4. Organisation does not necessarily mean the premature disclosing of design.
5. Passion must be based on the feelings. Organisation in no way precludes feeling.
6. The accumulation of arguments would be facilitated by organisation.
7. The weak may be helped by the strong.

C. Partition is best when subtle. Advantages great, when time is given to partition.

   The pulpit needs partition. There are two kinds of divisions:
   1. divide text into parts.
   2. divide subject which arises from text.

Don't forget the rule of brevity in number of ideas. The French suggest no more than 2 or 3. Quintilian suggests 3. Avoid deficiency or excess. Organisation is a skill or an ability. The English are poor in this respect. The French are good.

Lecture XX Confirmation Ratiocination
(Pgs. 27-47.)

Now the task of proving the assertion still remains.

"The vital principle of every cause, I have heretofore told you, consists in the state, or proposition; and I may now add, that the whole duty of the speaker is comprised in the proof." (Pg. 28.)

External evidence consists of every thing, which the orator can allege (allledge), not resulting from his own talent. This amounts to evidence. Internal evidence is that which the orator draws from his personal resources of ingenuity. This is argument.

External evidence
1. legislator reads section of a statute.
2. lawyer introduces a witness.
3. divine in pulpit reads scripture.

Internal evidence
1. legislator infers from statute.
2. lawyer draws conclusions from testimony.
3. divine applies quotation from scripture.
A. External evidence is good only in courts.
Both internal and external evidence is used in other forms of oratory.
Aristotle classifies external evidence as follows:

1. laws.
2. witnesses.
   authorities  Quintilian adds,
   oracles  adjudications
   maxims  common fame
3. contracts.
4. torture.
5. oaths.

JQA includes the sign and example under this classification.
6. sign - a token by which anything is shown.
   There are two kinds of signs.
   a. certain.
   b. uncertain.
7. example - a thing, which by its resemblance may indicate another.
   The certain is that, "which so universally accompanies the thing it proves, that nothing can be opposed against it." An uncertain sign is "only an indication of probability." The ancients included the sign and the example in internal proof.

Certain signs are the basis for the syllogism.
Uncertain signs are the basis for the enthymem.
Examples lay the foundation of induction.

B. At this point we move into logic. The speaker should be a master of logic. There are two kinds of reasoning:
1. Ratiocination - the proposition is inferred by way of conclusion from certain other propositions or premises.
   Aristotle is an example of this.
2. Induction - inference or conclusion from facts or examples.
   Socrates is an example.

C. The forms of ratiocination are three:
1. syllogism - a process of reasoning based on indisputable truth. There are no alternatives to the conclusion of a syllogism.
2. enthymem - a process based on probabilities. It includes the conclusion of a syllogism and either one of the premises. JQA gives the following example:
   enthymem - Blessed are the poor in spirit; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven,
   syllogism - Blessed are they who (say) shall enjoy the kingdom of heaven.
   The poor in spirit shall enjoy the kingdom of heaven.
   Therefore blessed are the poor in spirit.
3. epichirema - a rhetorical syllogism having as many as five parts. It is based on the three parts of a syllogism. But the premises are not indisputable. The premises are based on probabilities. Hence they may need proof. If proof is needed then it makes up the rest of the epichirema. The speaker deals in probabilities.

LECTURE XXI RATIOCINATION INDUCTION
(Fgs. 49-70.)

A. Argumentation is to discourse as charity is to Christianity. Ratiocination and examples, which form the basis for induction, go hand in hand.

Examples of Cicero,
Demosthenes,
Burke,
Parables of Christ,
are used to illustrate the use of examples.

LECTURE XXII CONFUTATION
(Fgs. 71-92.)

Quintilian uses confutation in two senses, as it is adapted to judicial trials and to every form of public speaking. Answer to adversary's allegation.

Defense is more difficult than offense. Accusation is simple. The defense must deny, justify, excuse and extenuate. Accusation has time for premeditation. Defense has less time. Accusation knows what it is that must be proved. Defense has to adapt refutation to the case of the accusation set up.

A. Confutation is applicable to the bar today. It is applicable in both written and oral form.

Place your defense on one of four grounds. They are as follows:
1. take exception to forms to obtain abatement.
2. dispute right of plaintiff to action.
3. take issue with facts - trial by jury.
4. admit everything but a breach of law.

B. Confutation is applicable to every speech situation. In the panegyric you must defend men whom you consider to be great. If these men were leaders you can always point out that they had firmness, perseverance and fortitude in the face of opposition. In confutation you can attack the syllogisms of the opposition by:
1. attacking the major or minor premise.
2. attacking line of reasoning.
Skill in answering on the spot has limits.
1. don't answer saying too much.
2. don't answer saying too little.
3. don't answer yourself but your opponent.

A standard of oratory is time. Avoid being diffuse in your speech. A speaker needs perfect control.

Your proof should be arranged as an army. Put the strongest in front and behind. Your weakest proof should be placed in the middle. But quality is more important than placement.

LECTURE XXIII  DIGRESSION TRANSITION
(Pgs. 93-115.)

The ancient schools of declamation assigned digression to a permanent post between narration and proof. It was generally a moral lecture served up as refreshment. It was abused however.

A. Quintilian protected digression for,
   it furthered argument
   and ornamental speech.

JQA feels that digression is a stranger to argument. These are the causes for digression.
1. indolence.
2. deference to passion and prejudice.
3. professional competition - mutual example.
4. vanity of speaker.

Digression is generally drawn from general history. Lucian and Martial satirised this propensity among lawyers. Martial wrote,

"No dagger keen, no poison'd bowl
   Forms, of my suit, the constitution;
'Tis of three kids my neighbor stole
   I came to court for restitution.
With thundering voice, and outstretched arms
   My lawyer fights o'er all our battles;
Now thrills with Cannas's dire alarms,
   And now of Mithridates prattles.
Oh! let thy tongue, Verboso, cease,
   Which trust in Punic faith forbids;
Let Sylla, Marius, sleep in peace;
   And say - one word about my kids." (Pgs. 104-5.)

Transition is a connective passage. It should be fully displayed for perspicuity. It can be a circumstance or an incident of an extemporaneous nature. JQA gives examples from Burke, Cicero, and Demosthenes.

LECTURE XXIV  CONCLUSION
(Pgs. 117-138.)

In the Areopagus in Athens no appeal to the passions are allowed. Only the proposition and the proof were admissible. The Romans used
pathos and theatrical proof in the courts. The conclusion can be used for the use of pathos or a summary.

A. Aristotle listed four uses.
   1. conciliate audience in favor of the speaker.
   2. amplify and diminish.
   3. arouse passions.
   4. recapitulate.

B. Quintilian also listed four.
   1. a climax of ascending ideas.
   2. comparison.
   3. inference.
   4. accumulation of examples.

JQA suggests that we don't sit down and lump pathos in one section of the speech and logos in another. Remember to consider pathos when you think of the judge and logos when considering the subject. Pathos generally works in the peroration.

LECTURE XXV ELOCUTION PURITY
(Pgs. 139-159.)

JQA opens this lecture by summarizing all of his previous lectures. He compares the English writers and the ancients in dealing with the definition of elocution.

Sheridan, Walker and others define elocution as a mode of speaking or delivery. Cicero and Quintilian refer to writing not speaking when they speak of elocution. They would consider delivery under the heading of pronunciation.

JQA feels that elocutio is diction not delivery. He interjects comparative definitions from Cicero at this point.

Cicero defines the following terms as follows

- invention - "discovery by meditation of those things, which by their truth or verisimilitude gave probability to the cause."
- disposition - "orderly arrangement of things invented."
- elocution - "the application of the proper words and sentences to the materials of invention."

Invention furnishes the matter; organisation, the order and elocution furnishes the manner involved in composition. The subject of elocution is words. There are three parts to the process of elocution. These are:

A. elegance - choice - eligo - to elect.
B. composition - arrangement - putting together.
C. dignity - decoration - figurative language.
A. Elegance or choice of words involves two things. They are perspicuity and purity.

1. Purity involves three things.
   a. latinity. We should use English not Latin. The Romans felt that anything other than latinity or/and Hellenism was barbarian. The Greeks felt that anything not a part of Hellenism was barbarian. The audience should get the full import of the words.
   b. preference. In the preference for words to be chosen, JQA disagrees with Campbell. Campbell resolves all language to fashion. No standard of purity is offered other than common use or custom.

JQA disagrees in that:

1. This standard cramps liberty. No word can be properly used that has not been used before.
2. Using only words in common usage would put language in a state of perpetual decay.
3. Purity would then mean the compound of impurities multiplied.

JQA states that the simplest and best rule in purity is that the purity of speech may be derived from the purpose of the speaker. The choice of words must be the best to convey the idea to the mind of the hearer.

b. Comply with the requisites of propriety and grammar.
   1. Propriety allows no moral impurity.
      Allow no indelicacy or affectation in your choice of words.
   2. Grammarians indicate the exclusion of old, new and foreign words. The examples to the contrary outweigh the rule. The speaker should relax his muscles of grammatical prudery.

Let your words bear the express image of your thoughts.

LECTURE XXVI PERSPICUITY
(Pgs. 161-183.)

JQA introduces this lecture with a statement of purpose. He intends to answer the following questions: 1. "What is perspicuity?" 2. What are the reasons for its influence? 3. What are the means by which it is obtained?

A. What is perspicuity? The word means transparency. In the Latin the terms were "per aspicio" meaning "to look through."

B. Reasons for its influence. Speech is a double operation. It involves the operation of the speaker and the operation of the listener. To get to the listener your words must be clear. In talking your words have wings. Hence the special emphasis on perspicuity in speech. You must be immediately clear in speech. This is not true in written communication. There are three indispensable things to the process of speech, aside from the listener.
1. the speaker's mind.
2. the medium or words and sentences.
3. an absence of all else.

C. Eliminate offenses against perspicuity.
1. the unintelligible. The causes of which are:
   a. a want of ideas or means of expression.
   b. an excessive attention to sound.
   c. the language itself. Some words are quite obvious for they refer to concrete things. Others are more difficult for they refer to words representing words or ideas.
2. the ambiguous. This is also a defect in language. This characteristic is the source of puns.
3. the obscure. This is a "half meaning."
   a. defective language
   b. the speaker may not want to divulge everything. This is a result of the fact that under the Empire, Romans had to be very careful about what they said. One wrong word might mean death.
   c. lack of attention.

"...if in public discourse you can always make choice of such words, as will convey effectually to the minds of your audience your meaning, your whole meaning, and nothing but your meaning, you will fairly be entitled to the character, and unquestionably obtain the reputation of an elegant speaker." (Pg. 183.)

LECTURE XXVII COMPOSITION ORDER
(Pgs. 185-206.)

Composition is the process of putting words together. This subject was considered important by the ancients. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Cicero and Quintilian all covered the subject. Three ideas were set down by the ancients. They are order, juncture and number. JQA adds the period or sentence.

A. There are four general types of numbers:
   1. natural order - "presents words in a succession, corresponding with the feelings of the speaker."
   2. grammatical order - "exhibits them words according to their bearing upon one another."
   3. metaphysical order - "forms them by the file of abstract ideas."
   4. musical order - "marshals them in the manner most agreeable to the hearer's ear."

B. Greek and Roman speech was based on the natural and musical orders. The speeches of modern Europe are based on the grammatical and metaphysical orders. There are three kinds of discourse used in every society. They are:
1. conversation - generally based on grammatical order.
2. formal - the natural order runs through all oratory. The metaphysical order serves as a basis for speculative oratory.
3. poetry - based on the musical order.

In other words the distinguishing characteristic of all kinds of discourse is arrangement of words. The ancients used only one word many times where we would use many words. English depends a great deal on prepositions. The noun and verb predominate. In Latin the important word was placed at the beginning of the sentence. This is not necessarily true in English. There are too many obstacles. When it is done it is very effective. Milton is used to illustrate this point. When you strive to effect the understanding use the grammatical order. If you appeal to the passions, invert the rule. Put the most important word first. The first and last positions in a sentence are the important positions.

**LECTURE XXVIII JUNCTURE AND NUMBER**

(Pgs. 207-227.)

JQA opens this lecture with a brief biblical history of speech. A juncture is that part of a sentence which connects the main elements.

A. There are certain rules resulting from the large number of consonants in English.

1. The juncture of a syllable terminating in a vowel should be made with a syllable commencing by a consonant. This avoids a collision of two vowels.
2. Avoid the same sound or syllable at the close and commencement of two successive words. Numbers no longer exist although they were covered by the ancients. Latin had a harmony that is impossible in English. The modern English writers are wrong when they try to adapt numbers to English. JQA gives a history of the development of number or metre in Greece. Don't try to arrange sentences according to Latin prosody, but be aware of the music in speech.

**LECTURE XXIX SENTENCES**

(Pgs. 229-247.)

JQA opens with a summary of the last few lectures. Sentences are built on a subject and a predicate, or an agent and action.

A. A period is basically a sentence. There are two kinds of sentences, 1. the simple and 2. the complex. The simple involves one subject and one predicate. The compound deals with two subjects or and two predicates. JQA then gives examples of periods based on Aristotle's definition, "a portion of a speech having written itself a beginning and an end."
There are basically two styles in the use of periods:

1. the consolidated union.
2. the complex, loose sentence.

JQA gives examples from Junius, the Duke of Grafton and Cicero.

**LECTURE XXXI FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE**
(Pgs. 249-267.)

The means of adding dignity to speech is through figurative language.

A. Mr. Locke states that ideas are derived from two sources. They are:

1. objects perceptible to the senses.
2. reflections of our minds on objects.

Figures are sometimes considered modes of speech and are referred to as uncommon. This is not true. Figures are very common. They have always been used. JQA gives a brief history of figurative language.

Dr. Johnson defines a rhetorical figure as any mode of speaking in which words are distorted from their literal and primitive sense. A trope is the change in the use of a word. A figure involves the affection of an entire sentence. Dr. Blair confuses figurative and literal language. JQA then gives examples.

B. There are three sources of figures:

1. analogy between matter and spirit.
2. analogy between matter and matter.
3. association of sounds.

Sometimes all are used in one figure. Speakers must show (by words) the listener with what he, the speaker, was first affected in expressing an idea. This is done by figures.

**LECTURE XXXI FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE (CONT.)**
(Pgs. 269-286.)

What are the rules regarding figurative language in actual practice?

A. The purpose of figurative language is "to address the eye through the medium of the imagination." The eye is the most important of senses. Imagination is the "faculty of the human soul, by which we are enabled to bring into mind ideas of sensible objects, which are not present and accessible to any of the senses." Imagination is the key to figurative language. One rule effecting imagination or figurative language is:

1. Unity.

"Suppose a painter should clap the head of a man upon the neck of a horse; and, gathering from all quarters the limbs of various animals, should stick them over with variegated feathers; or join together the form of a beautiful woman and a
disgusting fish; would you not laugh at such an object? Precisely such is the book made up of parts, as incoherent as a sick man's dreams." (Pg. 273.)

B. There are three kinds of figurative language. They are:
1. literal - which is direct representation to the memory and rational faculties.
2. figurative - which is indirect representation to the imagination.
3. intermediate - mixture of first two.
JQA supports these terms with examples.

LECTURE XXXII FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE (CONT.)
(Pgs. 267-306.)

The second rule regarding figurative language is

A. Congruity. This should apply to three elements in the speech situation.
1. to subject. If your subject is grand don't use mean figures. JQA uses examples from Homer and Dryden.
2. to speaker. Suit your figure to your mood and your purpose. JQA uses examples from Burke and Johnson. Since these two men debated the American colonies in parliament, it would be interesting to make a study to compare the use of reasoning and sentiment that both made.
3. to the audience. JQA uses Demosthenes as an example.

LECTURE XXXIII METAPHOR AND ALLEGORY
(Pgs. 307-327.)

A. These are used for:
1. necessity
2. energy
3. beauty

B. The metaphor and the allegory are based on the principle of association. There are four principles of association:

1. similitude. This especially involves the metaphor and the allegory. A metaphor is a simile in one word. An allegory is an extended metaphor. Generally in the allegory the figure is so complete that the literal definitions are totally disregarded as in fables and parables.
2. cause and effect. This is metonymy.
3. whole and parts. This is synecdoche.
4. opposition. This is irony.
C. JQA gives examples of the allegory. The following are rules regarding the use of the metaphor.

1. Make sure that there is a resemblance between the figure and the literal object.
2. Don't dwell on the figure.
3. Don't draw figures from mean or disgusting objects.
4. Don't let your metaphors be too thickly crowded.
5. Recognize the difference between the poet and the orator in their use of figures.

The poet can soar beyond the flaming bounds of space and time. The orator is under the power of gravitation.

LECTURE XXXIV METONYMY AND SYNECDOCHE
(Pgs. 329-349.)

A. Metonymy is sometimes classed as a metaphor, but this is not so. The following represent the use of metonymy:

1. cause for effect - "Cicero" for Cicero's work.
2. effect for cause - "death in pot" for poison.
3. container for contents - "bottle" for beer.
4. place for things produced in it - "China" for China dish.
5. sign for thing signified - "sceptre" for crown.
6. abstraction for concrete - "redness" for red eyes.
7. antecedent for consequent - "remember not, Lord, our transgressions."

B. The synecdoche is the whole for parts or vice versa. Examples from Franklin and Pope are given.

Irony involves three things. They are:

1. litotes - means more than it says.
2. hyperbole - overstatement.
3. catachresis - it turns imperfection into beauty. Examples are given.

LECTURE XXXV MEMORY
(Pgs. 351-372)


JQA defines memory as a "faculty of the human mind by which we are enabled to call up at pleasure ideas, which have been before lodged in it." (Pg. 357.)

Some things we simply can't remember. Others force themselves on us like unwelcome visitors. A memory completely under the control of the will is unexampled among men.
A. What are the means to good memory? They are three.
   1. keeping yourself free from causes that impair memory.
      a. The latest idea acquired will be easily remembered.
      b. The memory is the first of the intellectual faculties which follows the decay of the body.
      c. Debauchery lessens memory.
      sexual excesses
      intoxication
      emotions - grief, anger and fear.
      prejudice and superstition.
      This is a job for the moralist rather than the rhetorician.

B. discipline of persevering which involves
   1. application
   2. labor
   3. work in the mornings and nights for they are best adapted to retention.

C. certain contrivances.
   1. association of people and places.
   2. organisation. Cut large areas into smaller pieces.
   3. Grey in England has a special system involving the memorizing of the dates of all the kings and queens in England.
   4. Learn shorthand.

LECTURE XXXVI DELIVERY
(Pgs. 373-400.)

Delivery is divided into two parts. They are:

A. Action or the deportment of the body and gestures. Cicero refers to action as the emotion of the soul.
   JQA refers to the work of Quintilian and gives several direct quotations.

B. Pronunciation or utterance of words. You must transmit words and electrify with sentiment.
   1. You must be heard.
   2. You must speak slowly.
   3. You must use variety.

JQA has attempted to give the principles upon which rhetorical doctrines of the ancients were founded. But, the knowledge of the Greeks and Romans would be of little use if "their instructions were not accommodated to the manners of our times and the language of our own country."

To open the avenues of science is the duty of the teacher. To explore them is the labor of the student.
"In social converse with the mighty dead of ancient days, you will never smart under the galling sensation of dependence upon the mighty living of the present age; and in your struggles with the world, should a crisis ever occur, when even friendship may deem it prudent to desert you; when even your country may seem ready to abandon herself and you; when even priest and levite shall come and look on you, and pass by on the other side; seek refuge, my unfailling friends, and be assured you will find it, in the friendship of Laelius and Scipio; in the patriotism of Cicero, Demosthenes and Burke; as well as in the precepts and example of him, whose whole law is love, and who taught us to remember injuries only to forgive them." (P. 396.)
The lectures of Joseph McKean, Boylston Professor from 1809 to 1818. These lectures were found in manuscript form in the Widener Library at Harvard University. They were donated to Harvard in 1923 by Mrs. Folsom. They were never published. Some of these lectures were only outlines, but most of the lectures were written in full form. There were 38 lectures.

INTRODUCTORY LECTURE
(Dated Dec. 15, 1809. Pgs. 1-20.)

Pgs. 1 through 13 are included "verbatim" in Lecture No. II. The purpose of his course of lectures was given on pgs. 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20 in Lecture No. I. These pages were not included in Lecture II. The purpose of McKean's lectures was as follows:

"... to elucidate the great principles of writing and speaking in that manner which shall tend to please and persuade intelligent and accountable beings; leading them by right means to pursue noble ends, and ever to bear in mind their immense responsibility, not only to their fellow beings and themselves, but to the Universal witness and 'judge'." (Pg. 14.)

McKean made introductory apologies for weaknesses in his lectures when he said,

"These are some of the interesting and arduous duties which are devolved on him who now commences his appeal to your candor. Unaffectedly conscious of very circumscribed acquaintance with the subject and with but opportunities for very partial preparation since the unexpected honour of this important appointment has been conferred, your reflection will suggest the many and powerful special claims which the present professor has to indulgence from his hearers. That this will be afforded by his superiors and associates is guaranteed by the fullest reliance on their high moral and intellectual worth." (Pg. 14-15.)

The mediocrity of his lectures was a result in part of his poor health, said McKean.

A. Hints of McKean on his methods of lecturing were included.
   1. The first object of lectures was to adapt instructions to use by audience.
   2. McKean's audience could expect a plain, didactic style of writing and a familiar manner of delivery.
   3. "A free use not a servile repetition of the standard authorities will be indulged."
   4. The classical scholars represent the best in rhetoric.
   5. Sources will be pointed out, said McKean.
   6. Questions were requested.
7. JMcK made the point that reference would be made to a speaker's style rather than his opinion.

8. He asked for an objective treatment in the declamations of his students. Literature has been "too much associated with and influenced by the spirit of political and religious party." (Pg. 20.)

"In this favored season college days, in this calm retreat of the muses, let none of the angry or turbulent passions of the world interrupt your quiet, disturb your harmony, obscure your judgment." (Pg. 20.)

There was one qualification, McKean felt that his students should feel curiosity at great occurrences of the day in the world.

a. Keep free from prejudice.
b. Cherish a spirit of candor.
c. "Weigh in the scales of reason and truth the claims of authors and men." (Pg. 20.)
d. Don't forget tact.

9. Forensic discussions, philological and ethical criticism, poetry, drama and history open before them, said McKean.

II GENERAL VIEW OF THE SUBJECT OF THIS COURSE OF LECTURES AND CONSIDERATION OF SOME OBJECTIONS

This lecture is included in its original form as an example of McKean's lectures. The form of this lecture is "cleaner" than most of the other lectures.

III THE RISE AND PROGRESS OF ORATORY AMONG THE ANCIENTS
(Oct. 18, 1811 and in 1814 and 1816.) (Pgs. 25-40.)

Eloquence developed as early as the faculty of speech. Language was a special gift from the Creator. Advancements in eloquence must be among the earliest of human improvements. The very first language was probably animated expressions of disgust and delight. But a simple language would not suffice for all occasions. Prayers and supplications to God kindled oratorical ardour.

"Thus the simple elements of speech will in every country soon receive [sic] a new form and character. Rhetorical structure and embellishment will be as early as any of the advances towards improvement, and the refinements of speech will usually accompany and test the progress of society to the enjoyment of all the complex provisions which constitute a state of civilization. Toward this improved state men must have made considerable progress, before any system of rules or any standard of excellence will be prescribed or adopted in this or any other of the elegant arts. The eloquence of a rude age and a barbarous people will partake of their general character. With many excellencies will be blended many faults; great virtues will be shaded with bold and strong vices." (Pg. 28.)
I am deeply interested in the grand demonstration between subordinate animals and others. The language seems to have been able to express the idea that the line of this branch will. Many of the inhabitants far exceed him in strength. Before the state, respect, not to mention the weak elephant or the tall more gigantic ones, except the cat remains entire. Another, the physical power of the strongest man, diminishes to the size of infancy. Nor could he, by his moves controlled and escape, any more than he could comprehensively assist the beasts of the field. [Contrasted with the feelings of the bear, the ram, or numerous others, the utmost speed from the treading of a snail] with many of them he was in natural cunning. [The craft for which only the prudent, might often torment the animal high and immense] was not the attribute natural against
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You have heard the story of the merchant who was to be sued for $253.34 by his former partner. In the suit, the amount was disputed, and the case went to trial. The merchant claimed he had paid the amount, but the partner argued otherwise.

The court was in session, and the case was heard by a judge and jury. The merchant's lawyer presented his case, and the partner's lawyer countered. The court adjourned until the next day for deliberation.

The matter was serious, and the outcome could have far-reaching implications. The merchant was certain he had paid the money, but the partner was equally convinced he had not.

The case was commented on by a reporter who noted that the outcome would depend on the evidence presented. The merchant had a receipt, while the partner had a bill. The court would have to decide which was correct.

The reporter speculated that the case might be decided on the basis of who was more persuasive in presenting their case. The outcome would hang in the balance until the jury reached a verdict.

The case was a matter of justice and fairness, and the court would have to decide whether the merchant or the partner was telling the truth.

The reporter ended by saying that the case was a reminder that in matters of commerce, the truth was often difficult to determine.
The argument is based on the general view of the value of important principles involved in, as stated briefly, the doctrines which have been expounded at the official organ of the convention which is the purpose of the document to fulfill that goal, having done so. The means to be followed in making a study method as well as the evidence of the book are those required in the past place. So brief account of the main thoughts of contemporary writers in historical fields of thought and culture.
A. Examples of savage eloquence are:
1. Logan - a chief among the aboriginals of our country.
2. Scythian ambassadors to Alexander, Moses, Abraham, Ulysses and Nestor. Many other examples are found in Greek mythology.
3. Hermes was a Greek god who originated form in the oratorical arts. Paul was referred to as a speaker of eloquence.

Our earliest records of communication were poetical. Rhetoric followed soon after. Theory follows practice. It is difficult to say when rhetoric was introduced. No records of rhetoric remain from the Assyrians or Egyptians. The Egyptians had eloquence. Moses said, "I am not eloquent neither heretofore and now - but I am slow of speech and of a slow tongue." (Pg. 32.) McKean goes on to cite examples from the Bible of references to speech.

B. In Greece tradition can be traced.
1. Pausanias (quoted by Dr. Ward) said that he had read a book on this art, the author of which was King Pittheus of Troesene, a city of Peloponnesus. This tract has been questioned.
2. In De Oratore Aristotle was the first to set down a Rhetoric.
3. Corax and Tisias, native of Sicily, wrote rhetorics in the 5th century B.C.
4. In the Institutes Empedocles was the first to teach speech.
5. Aristotle's rhetoric was the high point of Greek rhetoric. Demosthenes was the high point of Greek oratory.

C. In Rome Cicero and Quintilian were great teachers of rhetoric. McKean continues:

"This is one of the subjects of human attention in which the moderns have been contented to follow in the steps marked out by their illustrious predecessors of Greece and Rome. So judged those who prescribed this course of lectures which is on the exact plan of the system of Professor Ward, who candidly avows his full concurrence with the amiable and eloquent Fenelon, that to combine portions of Aristotle and Longinus with Cicero and Quintilian and to confirm their maxims by references to the purest authors of antiquity, would even now form the best system of oratory." (Pg. 37.)

McKean concludes this lecture by referring his students to Ward. He says of Ward's lectures:

"Though not highly alluring by ornaments of style, and without much of that interest which brilliant imagery, pointed antithesis, and
bold exlamations are wont to excite; they will repay the attention which is given to them. Like a plain substantial repast, if these wholesome viands provoke no eager appetite they will not soon produce satiety; and the nourishment they afford will be real and salutary." (Pg. 37.)

IV BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES OF GRECIAN ORATORS
(This lecture was given in October 25, 1811.) (Pgs. 41-52.)

In his introduction McKean urges that his students avoid all partial estimates of orators.

A. He lists Greek Orators. Pausanias said that Pittheus taught a school at Troesene. This school flourished 800 years B.C. Pittheus was admired for learning, wisdom and application.

1. "Empedocles is said by Quintilian, first to have taught in the art of rhetoric. Diogenes Laertius quotes Aristotle as authority, for conferring on him the honor of its invention. He is said to have been the preceptor of the famous Gorgias of Leontium, and was as estimable for social virtues as he was eminent for intellectual vigor. He was a native of Sicily and flourished about 450 B.C. He was a warm advocate for the Pythagorean doctrine of transmigration, and wrote a poem in its defence which was held in such estimation, as to be recited at public festivals in connection with the productions of Hesiod and Homer." (Pg. 42.)

2. Tisias and Corax were the first men to digest rules for the rhetorical art and received compensation for instruction in it.

3. Gorgias was the next orator of note. He professed that he could speak on any subject. A gold statute was erected for Gorgias in the temple of Apollo at Delphos.

4. Plato censured Gorgias. Longinus censured Gorgias. Socrates was a student of Gorgias.

5. Some contemporaries of Gorgias were Thrasymachus, Prodicus, Protagoras, Hippias, Alciades and Theodorus. Prior to these speakers was:

6. Pisistratus who was the earliest of the Greeks to cultivate eloquence. He was responsible for the preservation of Homer. He founded a public library.

7. Pericles was another of the early Greek orators. Cicero praises Pericles as an Olympian. Quintilian is less enthusiastic because of the licentiousness in which Pericles indulged. Pindar is quoted by Blair as assigning the first written oration among Athenians to Pericles. Quintilian however assigns this honor to Antiphon.
8. Socrates was called the "father of eloquence" by Tully. Socrates, said Quintillian, was a student of Gorgias. According to McKean "... an insuperable timidity prevented the exercise of his oratorical powers in public speaking ..." (Pg. 47.)

9. Longinus and Dionysius of Halicarnassus compared Socrates and Demosthenes as orators. Demosthenes was clearly superior.

10. Lysias was also a speaker of importance.

V BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES OF ORATORS AND RHETORICIANS IN THE LATTER PORTION OF GREEK HISTORY (Pgs. 53-66.)

A. McKean lists and discusses Greek orators.

1. Plato was cited by Cicero, Quintillian and Longinus as a great rhetorician. McKean agreed that Plato was a man of great eloquence. Plato's academy was described: "Here at the academy was taught a philosophy so sublime and morals so pure that many in their wonder and delight have contended that during his travels in Egypt he must have derived assistance either from the writings of Moses or from some who had been instructed in them." (Pg. 54.)

   Plato's Gorgias is not a condemnation of rhetoric but rather, false rhetoric. Quintillian points out that Plato's Phaedrus establishes the excellence of rhetoric, "but also, especially the necessity of virtue in order to its attainment." (Pg. 55.) Plato's style is figural.

2. Aristotle, a descendent of Erculapius, was of the same age of Demosthenes and Alexander. Before studying with Plato, Aristotle wasn't interested in letters. Alexander was committed to the care of Aristotle. Alexander's father, Phillip, wrote to Aristotle as follows:

   "I am grateful not so much that I am a father, as that I have a son in an age when he can learn from you, his instructor. I am confident you will make him a successor worthy of me, a king worthy of Macedonia." (Pg. 56.)

   Aristotle's followers were called Peripatetics. "... 'It is no longer heresy to express the opinion that it Aristotle's rhetoric is rather the Philosophy of words than things.'" (Pg. 58.)

3. Descartes substituted mystical formulas for those of Aristotle. Bacon reformed science. Newton finished what Bacon started. Blair said that Aristotle's style was concise and dry and somewhat difficult in parts.
Knox felt that Aristotle knew human nature. Aristotle, said McKean, is contemplated as a book for the Freshman class. "Whether it will be well adapted for an introductory treatise, may admit of a question until decided by experiment. But that it well deserves the careful perusal of advanced students is incontrovertible. That portion of it which treats on the passions of men, and the means of exciting and influencing them is one of the most thorough investigations ever given of that difficult subject." (Pg. 59.)

4. Professor Lawson says, "without reserve" that Aristotle's Rhetoric is the "product of deep thought and exquisite discernment." (Pg. 59.)

5. Isæus, a pupil of Lysias, was the teacher of Demosthenes who was the "Prince of Eloquence."

6. Demosthenes had great perseverance. He secluded himself from festive and social gratification. He read a great deal and engaged in profound meditations.

7. Aeschines was Demosthenes' only competitor. Aeschines was banished to Rhodes after a struggle with Demosthenes. The Rhodians lavished praise upon him. "Ah, exclaimed he Aeschines , what would have been your delight could you have heard the great orator himself."

8. Demetrius Phalereus was a "consummate orator and pure patriot."

9. Dionysius of Halicarnassus was a "historian, critic and rhetorician."

10. Hermogines marked the decline of liberty and literature.

11. Longinus was the last of the "Oriental luminaries."

So vast was his learning that he was called the "living library." Fenelon said that Longinus' taste was superior to that of Aristotle. McKean recounts the death of Longinus.

VI A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF SOME OF THE MOST DISTINGUISHED ROMAN ORATORS AND RHETORICIANS - to the time of Cicero. (Given Nov. 29, 1811.) (Pgs. 67-78.)

A. McKean lists Roman orators. Rhetoric and Oratory were neglected in Rome for several centuries. But gradually rhetoric became recognised.

1. Lucius Plotius, a Gaul, was the first to teach oratory among the Romans. Previous to Plotius many Greeks had tried to establish schools in Italy. They were not well received.

2. Marcus Cato was the first writer in rhetoric in Rome. He wrote about 200 B.C. Tully perused about 150 of Cato's orations. He praised Cato highly.

3. Sergius Galba was called to Rome by Laelius to work on a
law case. Galba closed the case in one day with his oratory.

4. Antonius and Crassius were considered among the great Roman orators.

5. Julius Caesar was considered briefly by McKean.

6. Marcus Tullius Cicero's life, services and literary accomplishments are covered by McKean. McKean draws from Plutarch when he discusses Cicero. McKean quotes Salust as follows:

   "A writer on ancient characters [Cicero], who unites considerable smartness with much extravagant and censurable reflections on a few distinguished personages of Antiquity ..." (Pg. 75.)

   Livy comments on Cicero. Dr. Conyers and Dr. Middleton praised Cicero. Gibbon and Cibber criticized Middleton. Melmoth, Guthrie and Jones disparage Cicero. Dr. Aiken comments on the personality of Cicero. McKean stated that, everyone agreed that his, Cicero's, style was splendid and polished. "Much of his writings have perished but enough remains to constitute a proud monument to his intellectual and literary fame." McKean included an index to his next lecture.

VII ROMAN ORATORS AND RHETORICIANS AFTER CICERO
(Given Dec. 13, 1811.) (Pgs. 79-90.)

A. After Cicero, Quintilian only deserves notice. For those rhetoricians between Cicero and Quintilian McKean is indebted to Suetonius.

1. Augustus is characterized as eloquent. It must be remembered that sycophants were always around to praise the Caesars. Augustus tried to substitute his style for the standard of the ideal set by Cicero. Horace, Virgil and Mecenas helped in praising Augustus' style. As time passed the Caesars did more and more to deprecate the name of Caesar. Augustus then was a patron of letters but led the attack against true eloquence.

2. Asinius Pollio decried the standard of Ciceronian oratory. Virgil honored Pollio by dedicating to Pollio one of his Elogues.

3. Messala is briefly mentioned by Quintilian.

4. Cassius Severius was exiled by the Emperor by making use of his best weapons - satire and ridicule.

5. Domitius Afer was one of Quintilian's teachers. He practiced oratory long after he was able, producing laughter among his enemies and pity among his friends. By the time of Afer, "... empty and showy declamation had in a
great degree superseded a chaste and manly eloquence."
(Pg. 64.)

6. Seneca was the last before Quintilian to condemn Ciceronian style. He was preceptor to Nero and showed hostility to Virgil and Tully.

7. Marcus Fabius Quintilianus was probably an Italian but according to Dodwell he was from Spain. Rollin edited a Quintilian and gives a description of the conditions of oratory in Quintilian's day and the reforms of Quintilian.

Quintilian was a pleader at the forum and an instructor in an academy of oratory. He followed the Old School and Cicero. He was held in good standing even against the bold and daring Juvenal, who spared nothing which he could attack. The Emperor gave his two sons to Quintilian for training. He wrote the Institutes. According to McKean,

"If personal opinion may be admitted, it the Institutes is placed without any hesitation at the head of the treatises in the art of rhetoric." (Pg. 88.)

8. Rollin, Blair, Lemprieve, Knox and Ward all agree on this point. Rollin prepared an edition for the use of the students of the University where he presided and taught rhetoric. He translated Patsall and Outhrie. Some of Quintilian may make us laugh or evince pity, but

"But in its essential characteristics, in its great features, it is copied from nature; it has the sanction of reason and experience. Every line evidences the hand of a Master. The coloring and drapery are most just and graceful. With the correctness of the artist, there is none of the stiffness and austerity of one whose skill is limited to a single art. With all the accuracy of science appears the freedom and the boldness of enthusiasm."
(Pg. 89)

This work was buried for more than 13 centuries. It was discovered among the lumber of a monastery. In Cicero's writing the man of the world appears. In Quintilian's writing the student and teacher appears.

VIII NATURE AND OBJECTS
(This lecture was given on Nov. 4, 1814, Mar. 3, 1812, Oct. 12, 1816)

Treatises on rhetoric and oratory differ according to definition. These differences, according to Quintilian, are caused by "a culpable solicitude after novelty."
"On this principle utility of rhetoric, finding what seems the best description of Rhetoric — the art of speaking well, — he who aims at a better will probably admit a worse."
(Pg. 91.)

A. The end and excellence of rhetoric is to speak well. McKean adopts this definition because
1. it corresponds with that adopted in the statutes.
2. it is a satisfactory definition.

But
"it may still be unpleasant or useless to trace the similarity and harmony between this definition and several of the most distinguished subsequent writers as well as incidentally in what it principally differs from those who had previously treated this subject."

B. Some of the definitions of rhetoric are as follows:
1. Aristotle's definition is given in Greek.
2. Trapesuntius says "Vis qua quod in unaquaere sor babile est prespicitur."
3. Quintilian's definition is given in Latin.
4. Vossius' definition is given in Latin.
5. Cicero calls it the art of persuasion.
Persuasion is not necessarily the property of eloquence. Eloquence in other words is not the only means of persuasion. Money, personal favor and authority may persuade. Aquilas won acquittal by showing scars. The moderns too have used other means than eloquence to persuade. The Earl of Stafford used his children to persuade.

"I have troubled your lordships a great deal longer than I should have done, were it not for the interest of these pledges which a faith in heaven left me. What I forfeit for myself — it is nothing; but, that my indiscretion should forfeit for my children, it wounds me very deeply. Pardon my infirmity — Something I should have said, but shall not be able, and therefore leave it."

6. Vossius prefers the Stagyrite and Tully.
"Professor Ward follows him [Vossius] in this as in most respects and defines oratory the art of speaking well upon any subject in order to persuade." He does not contemptuously wave the objections
which had been urged against including this principal design in the definition of the art. Nor does he admit that the not infrequent failure to effect persuasion is any more decisive than to urge that because physicians are not always successful in curing diseases this therefore is not the end of the art of medicine. (Pg. 94.)

7. Dr. Lawson recommends eloquence as the "handmaid of truth, the ornamental clothing [sic] with a view to convince, to affect and to please."

8. Homes, the author I believe first used in this branch of study in this University terms it [rhetoric]. "The art of speaking and writing well, and ornamental on any subject."

9. Blackwall defines it, "the faculty of speaking and writing with elegance and dignity in order to instruct, persuade and please."

10. Smith calls it, "the art of eloquent and delightful speaking."

11. Principal Campbell in the commencement of his profound and elegant work says, "that in its greatest latitude eloquence is that art or talent by which the discourse is adapted to its end." He rejects the appendage "persuasion" as defecting and superfluous.

12. Dr. Blair considers it as, "the art of speaking in such a manner as to attain the end for which we speak," and adds that, "as the most important subject of discourse is Action, and as it is principally with reference to influencing conduct that the power of eloquence appears, it may under this view be regarded as the Art of persuasion."

13. Professor Barron thinks the preference due to Quintilian's definition and that, "Eloquence consists in conveying opinions or arguments to the minds of others in the most effectual manner which can be done by words."

Oratory, rhetoric and Eloquence are words persistently used in the statutes. McKean quotes the statutes: "... the theory and practice of writing and speaking well, that is with method, elegance, harmony and dignity."
C. McKean's definition combined similarities of all others, in that he stated

"In the view now given of the nature of oratory respecting which there is a near resemblance between all these writers in the most material respects, are implied its most important objects. It is the art of speaking well. This is with a view to some end; it is either to afford innocent and pure pleasure, or effect some important benefit. It is the art of persuasion; to it must interest the attention, please the taste, inform the mind and affect the heart." (Pg. 95.)

D. Oratory is not as Fenelon observed a trifling invention to amuse and dazzle.
Campbell sets down the ends of speech clearly. They are:
1. informing
2. convincing
3. pleasing
4. moving

"Extending therefore his views and directing his aims to more elevated objects, the man desirous of the honourable need to genuine eloquence will place continually before his eye and perpetually revolve in his mind some important result." (Pg. 96.)

The orator may use whatever may regale and gratify taste, sensibility and the soul to achieve a noble end.

McKean said further that,

"To accomplish such momentous purposes no common attainments and exertion will suffice. Scope is afforded in oratory for the highest exercises of the greatest minds. Every power and faculty possessed by nature, every acquisition of wisdom and experiment derived from study, observation and reflection; every virtuous principle and affection, may be here advantageously displayed." (Pg. 97.)

E. Some of the ancients suggested that the orator should have a command of the whole of knowledge whatever may be the case. Intelligence and goodness are of great importance. The kinds of speeches are set down by Aristotle. They are:
1. Demonstrative
2. Deliberative
3. Judicial
These will be discussed in another lecture. The rest of this lecture dealt with pulpit oratory. McKean quoted the statutes on pulpit oratory. The question arose, how would Chatham, or his far greater son Burke, Fox, Sheridan, Curran, Hamilton, Ames or Dexter have used their powers in the pulpit? Pulpit men have produced able speakers and writers. Have, however, preachers of Christianity been eloquent in proportion to the subjects (glorious themes) provided for them? No, they have not, because some of the more experienced speakers and preachers feel that eloquence represses the effort and checks the hope when dealing with incomparable sublimity. It is also felt that there should be a calm character to the oratory of the pulpit. McKean felt that subjects of a religious nature would seem to suit themselves to ornament resulting from oratory and rhetoric. "These impediments in the way of what is commonly regarded as the most commanding eloquence seem to apply in the full magnitude to but comparatively a small part of a preacher's subjects. The whole mass of pious, moral and social duty remains; the most interesting truths, precepts and examples are afforded in Scripture on which to address the understanding and move the heart." (Pg. 101.)

IX THE SEVERAL KINDS OF ORATORY: DEMONSTRATIVE, DELIBERATIVE AND JUDICIAL
(March 27, 1812, November 4, 1814, October 25, 1816.) (Pgs. 103-114.)

Joseph McKean gave a summary as an introduction. He stated that some peculiarities of sacred eloquence were considered. "A rapid review of the definitions given by the most celebrated rhetorical writers ancient and modern led to the conclusion that the nature of oratory as explained in our statutes, corresponded in a good degree with most, and included the essential ideas of all of them." (Pg. 103.)

Aristotle "the great Stagyrite" classified kinds of speech as:
1. Demonstrative - the agreeable
2. Deliberative - the useful
3. Judicial - the equitable

McKean elaborated on these points. He stated that
1. "Demonstrative oratory is that which treats on subjects of manners and morals adapted to interest and gratify men, and chiefly respects the time past." (Pg. 104.)
2. "In Deliberative Oratory hope and fear is addressed in reference to the future, and the aim is to lead to such convictions and resolutions as will secure important benefits or prevent fatal misconduct."
3. "Judicial Oratory is employed in obtaining a decision, according to equity and justice, on a past act."
Many times these objects unite.

Aristotle said that the speaker, subject and hearer are all important in speech making. McKean quoted Aristotle's letter to Alexander.

Cicero used the same dimensions in Ad Herennium.

Quintilian felt the same as Aristotle. Quintilian felt that the word Commandatory was preferred to Demonstrative.

In McKean's judgment Pulpit Oratory is distinct from these other three "as its objects are infinitely superior."

A. McKean elaborated briefly on Demonstrative Oratory. France has made great use of this type of speaking. Churches and monarchs have used demonstrative speeches for ceremonies.

In England this kind of oratory is employed chiefly on topics of literature and taste.

B. The purpose of Deliberative oratory is to persuade or dissuade. Deliberative oratory is used in discussion and debate.

McKean would place pulpit speaking under this class, if the exhortations of preachers were not a separate type of speaking. Some, McKean said, have contrived to place pulpit speaking under demonstrative oratory. England provided good examples of deliberative speaking. Parliamentary speeches in England are second only to those of Greece and Rome.

C. Judicial discourse is used to establish or repel accusation.

Joseph McKean quoted Dr. Notts on Hamilton as follows,

"As a Counsellor, Hamilton was at once the pride of the bar, and the admiration of the bench. His apprehensions were quick as lightning, and his development of truth was luminous as its path ..." (Pg. 113.)

X CONNECTION OF ORATORY WITH THE POWERS OF THE HUMAN MIND (October 2, 1812.) (Pgs. 117-128.)

"The objects of oratory are summarily included under three heads, Proving, embellishing, and moving the passions. It is natural here to consider the several faculties in the human mind to which the speaker and writer has reference. His proofs are addressed to the understanding; his descriptions appeal to the imagination; and to complete [sic] his purpose he strives to move and engage the passions, to influence and determine the will." (October 2, 1812.) (Pg. 117.)

Principal Campbell discusses these topics in the most complete and satisfactory discussion McKean knew. McKean said of Campbell that,
"His name might never to be mentioned but with the respect due to high intellectual powers and attainments, associated with the best affections and most amiable character. To rhetorical students he has rendered services second only to the great masters of antiquity... it yet cannot be superfluous earnestly to recommend his Philosophy of Rhetoric not merely as an interesting and useful treatise to peruse but as an invaluable summary to study, to digest. This is one of the few books which really is what its title implies."
(Pg. 118.)

A. Understanding. The purposes of language are truth, virtue and happiness. Speech is not used just to amuse, but to instruct and persuade.

Speech is used to inform, to explain, to prove what may be disbelieved or but doubtfully admitted as ordinarily the first step to persuade to a particular course of action. There is a distinction between the sisters - logic and rhetoric. The former - contemplates truth, absolutely or abstractedly. The latter - considers it in relation to its effects on practice. The first is used to instruct the mind. The second is used to influence the will and heart. Logic deals with the subject only. Rhetoric considers the audience as well. The orator's subjects do not admit of pure logic. Geometricians use ratiocination. The orator cannot. But the orator should be familiar with forms of logic.

Instances of men who know little of logic and succeed in oratory are few. Why do some who do not know logic succeed in oratory? First, they have natural brilliance or they are hiding their associations with logic and sciences. Perseverance in labor and theory is needed. McKean stated,

"Alike in intellectual and mechanical applications of the faculties of man, the eminent and the useful men are the industrious and the diligent." (Pg. 122.)

The orator combs sister sciences and explores the "treasures of all the arts, in order to give vigour to his powers of reasoning, and afford copiousness to his illustrations, that he may convince the minds of those whom he addresses." The orator won't let "show" overshadow "substance." The orator who approaches only the understanding will probably fail. He must consider other things.
B. Imagination. The degree to which imagination is used depends on the nature of the discourse or writing. In the cases of some writing or discourse, embellishment is chaste and tempered. Abstract, speculative subjects cannot allow of much imagination. Mathematical demonstration discards fancy. On the other hand, drama and descriptive verse admit to ornate imagery. Poetry involves gratification and amusement. Oratory is principally subservient to instruction. McKean uses a continuum to make clear the degree to which imagination is used in the different types of subjects dealt with by the speaker. There are countless shades between the extremes of the continuum. The use of imagination becomes increasingly more important in the following subjects; abstuse speculations, logical and metaphysical theology, ethical and moral speaking, literature and discussion, entertainment and descriptions. The speaker can make freer use of imagination than the writer.

C. Memory. Memory is another faculty of the mind. The ancients made it a constituent part of rhetoric. Today, memory is not an essential requisite to the speaker, but an important auxiliary. McKean stated,

"Without its aid, the speaker or writer, will but in a very partial and imperfect manner use his knowledge, or exercise his imagination."

The listener also has the necessity of memory. (Pg. 127.)

XI CONSTITUENT PARTS OF ORATORY, INVENTION
(October 9, 1812, February 17, 1815, November 1, 1816.) (Pg. 129-139.)

McKean covered the importance of the sources for and the materials of invention. Invention, Disposition, Elocution and Pronunciation are common to written and spoken discourse. McKean combined classical and British rhetoric. Aristotle considered pronunciation incidentally but admits its importance.

A. Importance. Cicero and Quintilian covered memory. McKean stated that,

"The orator is to reflect in order to discover what is true or probable to support his cause. He is to arrange in best order what invention furnishes. He is to express in suitable words and phrases these digested thoughts; and to deliver them with corresponding dignity, grace, and propriety. The first of these, its importance, sources and materials will occupy the present lecture." (Pg. 130.)
Invention is essential to public speaking. Oratory brings into requisition all the powers of conception to furnish thoughts, reasoning to straighten arguments, imagination to develop ornaments, memory to retain facts and feeling to generate pathos. Having all of these amounts to genius. What is genius? It is passed off as many things. Real virtues are overlooked at times for fancy. Genius is rare and scattered over the ages.

B. Sources. The Creator gives endowments to his people. He gives natural ability - of course in different proportions. We have to work. "In order to succeed and still more to excel, in any or all the occupations of the body or the mind, diligent application and exertion are the sole and certain conditions." Oratory is one sure test of genius. Invention rests not solely on natural powers, but their development through diligence. Work then is the answer. The orator and the genuine poet must combine the wisdom of ages past and present. "To improve his gifts to the extent of our ability, and exert them according to our opportunities, is our bounden duty to the Giver."

Bodily exercise is important for health. So is with the mind. Exercise of the faculties is valuable not solely to get knowledge but because of its general influence on the habits and characters of our minds. Intellectual pursuits make a scholar. McKee stated,

"The incidental results of application to study are the invigorating of the faculties, the inducing of a habit of reflecting; the producing of a sound and healthful mind; rich in acquired treasures, but still richer in the power of using and enjoying the rewards of literary labours and pursuits. These traits constitute and mark the truly Wise Man." (Pg. 136.)

Reflection is the result of diligence. Without reflection whatever knowledge we have will be crude and undigested - a mass.

C. Materials. Invention is used to get the good will of the audience, to engage the feelings of the audience and to lead the audience to action. Invention of arguments will be developed in the next lectures.

XII INTERNAL TOPICS (sic) (October 23, 1812, February 24, 1815, November 8, 1816) (Pgs. 140-153.)

Speeches may be given with little preparation but speeches, which survive the age, must be the well ripened fruit of a strong and cultivated soil. With this in mind, assistance can be gained from the use of topics
or commonplaces. McKean stated,

"The blighting manner, which Dr. Blair uses, in speaking of this part of technical rhetorick [sic] ... which have been abundantly directed, at the pretended plan, of making Orations by a mechanical process, may possibly have created in some of your minds a degree of indifference, or some prejudice, to the present subject."

"The lectures of the Edinburgh Professor are, in general respects, a very valuable, as well as highly interesting and agreeable compilation of principles and examples. But he does not appear either just or candid in noticing the rhetorical works of his predecessor at Leyden and Amsterdam [Vossius]. From these very writings which he terms 'a heap of ponderous lumber,' it is very apparent that his own labors were greatly facilitated."

(Pg. 142.)

McKean praised Vossius. (Vossius and Blair have different talents.)

A. Topics can be laid aside after preliminary use.

1. Definition. Whatever is true of the definition is true of the thing defined. Burke's speeches are beautiful examples of using definition in supporting a point.

2. Enumeration. Cicero's topics are examples of enumeration.

3. Notation.

4. Conjugation.

5. Genus.

6. Species or form.

7. Similitude.

8. Differences.


10. Adjuncts. McKean stated,

"In each field of argument it is clear, that the several adjuncts or incidents, of the principal idea, go to prove the truth of the proposition." (Pg. 150.)

11. Antecedents.

12. Correlatives. These two topics antecedents and correlatives furnish the judicial pleader with most of his presumptive proof.

XIII EXTERNAL TOPICS
(October 30, 1812, November 15, 1816, February 24, 1815.) (Pgs. 153-160.)

McKean stated,
"Every person who attempts to compose
any kind of discourse must pursue some
process ... under the technical topics."

In the Bible we read,
"Take ye no thought, how or what thing
ye shall answer, or what ye shall say."

A. In other words principles and human science are not intended to
apply to inspiration of the kind of the Apostles. But normally
method is essential. The sixteen artificial or internal heads
are, according to McKean, indispensable to the speaker. The dis­
tinction between internal heads and external heads is that
internal heads originate within the subject, and external heads
originate without the subject. Most of the modern authors do
not admit that external topics are of importance to the speaker.
The ancients disagreed about them. Aristotle mentioned five ex­
ternal topics. They were Witnesses, Covenants, Tortures, Oaths
and Laws. Quintilian omits the last mentioned. In sermons
proof comes from the scriptures.

XIV INTRODUCTION TO RESUMING LECTURES, AFTER LONG INTERVALS
(June 6, 1817.) (Pgs. 161-164.)

This lecture was a summary of all of McKean's previous lectures.

XIV THE STATE OF THE CONTROVERSY
(November 20, 1812, March 3, 1815, June 6, 1817.) (Pgs. 166-177.)

The state of the controversy is the question, the cause, the state
or the principle point of view. It is "what is admitted or what is
sought." The orator must keep arguments supporting the "state."

A. In Ad Herennium Cicero states three "states." They are fact,
nature and motive. Quintilian divides states into conjecture,
definition and quality. Vossius discusses this matter of states.
States come up in judicial oratory. Ward takes up states. Blair
calls states mechanical and is against them.

In demonstrative oratory the state is generally definitive
or concerns the degree of merit or demerit. In deliberative ora­
tory the question is, shall a measure be adopted? In pulpit ora­
tory the scripture represents the state. Sometimes the state is
left to the discretion of the speaker. In law the issue is well
defined by justice. Blackstone is a good authority.

A man wastes his faculties if he speaks without object. Just
as paintings give emphasis to the important so this is done in
speaking.
XIV THE PROPERTIES AND USES OF NARRATION AND PROPOSITION
(April 19, 1611, March 5, 1813)

The parts of regular discourse are the Introduction, the Narration, the Proposition, the Confirmation, the Confutation and the Conclusion. Cicero and Ward both set up these divisions.

A. The introduction is used to make clear the main purpose and announce the purpose of the discourse. There are good examples in the Bible and in the three great epics.

B. Narration is a recital of facts. Narration is chiefly applied to judicial causes. The characteristics of narration are brevity, clearness and probability. The Bible contains good examples of narration. Burke's speeches are excellent examples of narration. "The American Burke" is another example. Narration in demonstrative speaking may be a man's history. Narration in deliberative speaking may be reference to the occasion and audience. Narration in judicial speaking sometimes determines the essence of the plea. Narration in sermons helps to explain.

C. The Proposition is "... expressly exhibiting the subject, upon which an orator is about to discourse." Somewhere it should be made manifest. The proposition should be precise, definite, single and practicable. The approach can be direct or indirect. Subdivisions under the proposition are usually needed, but "unnecessary multiplications into minute subdivisions are to be avoided." McKean doesn't impose a limit however against limitations.

XV ARGUMENTS - DEMONSTRATIVE, DELIBERATIVE AND JUDICIAL
(February 15, 1811, March 3, 1815) (Pgs. 178-189.)

McKean stated,

"previous lectures on Topics - The States - more time had been occupied, and the close of the term - December 1812 seemed to recommend not resuming this part of invention after a long vacation. It was intended to have made three lectures on the arguments appropriate to each of the three kinds - but that is referred to third time of delivery - if my life be spared - or my patience continue equal to retaining the office - February 12, 1812."

There was a recapitulation of "the different arguments proper to demonstrative, deliberative and judicial discourses."

A. 1. Demonstrative (Lecture XV). The state of controversy in demonstrative speaking is for the most part a state of quality. It concerns the kinds of excellence or defect, the degree of value
of merit or demerit, and the variety of beauty or deformity. After the death of great men there are many examples of excellent demonstrative speeches.

B. 2. Deliberative (Lecture XVI). This oratory deals with conviction and persuasion or conduct. The commonplaces are suitableness of time and means proposed, practicability and probability of success and, finally, interest, pleasure, and reknown which will ensue.

C. 3. Judicial (Lecture XVII). This oratory is to convince of belief. Statutes refer to written law. Common law is custom. Generally the commonplaces are right and fact. Issues of fact are those of conjecture, definition and quality.

XVIII XV CHARACTER OF AN ORATOR
(March 1, 1811, February 12, 1813, July 15, 1814.) (Pgs. 213-223.)

If an orator is to get good will etc., he must "possess, in a good measure, those qualities, affections and endowments which are most highly valued by those whom he would influence." Quintilian defined an orator as a "good man skilled in speaking." An orator must have moral and religious character and goodness. He needs knowledge. Elocution is good but not as lasting as acquaintance with the sciences. He must have dignity of character. He must have consistency because versatility of conduct (changing his mind) hurts the speaker. He must be at ease, have confidence. An audience may sympathise with a speaker's embarrassment but they cannot give undivided attention. He must have a modest estimate of self and a regard for the audience. McKean had a summary here.

XVIII CHARACTER AND ADDRESS OF AN ORATOR
(February 12, 1819, July 15, 1814, March 10, 1815)

McKean stated, "Young gentlemen - the lectures for the present term are now completed. Accept my acknowledgments of your attention."

McKean gave one last counsel - "That the fear of the Lord as it is the beginning so is it the consummation of true wisdom."

"From among you I fondly believe are to proceed some to guide and cheer, and bless society, in stations of public influence." They must set an example. He asked ministers, lawyers and politicians to be good.

XIX EXCITATION OF THE PASSIONS
(February 10, 1813, March 10, 1815, June 6, 1817.) (Pgs. 225-237.)

This is the last portion of Rhetorical invention, proving understanding, painting the imagination and affecting the will. Campbell
says there is no persuasion without appeal to passions. Aristotle did this beautifully. McKean states,

"Professor Lawson says, without reserve, that though imitated by innumerable writers, this part of his [Aristotle's] work has 'never been equaled.'"

Aristotle says there are thirteen principal emotions. Vossius follows Aristotle. A detailed analysis of emotions belongs to other sciences. Hutcheson, Grove and Price are good. Malebranche, Hartley, Morgan and Crichlon, Burke and Kaems all cover aspects of the work.

From passions result emotions. Passion is a powerful agitation or commotion. Emotions when indulged, cherished and nurtured then give a complexion to character. The speaker engages the habitual temper and disposition of the listener. But violent commotions of the mind should not be appealed to through either necessity or utility. They are hard to control.

A. Diligent observation of the conduct of others will furnish the best clue to emotions along with reflection on the operation of our own minds. McKean went on to state,

"The writer who expects to move his readers - the speaker who hopes to rouse the passions, and excite to purpose the emotion of his audience, must not only understand well their nature, but also the best means of regulating, controlling and calming these powerful agents." (Pg. 231.)

General principles to follow in the use of emotion.
1. To move others we must ourselves be moved. Not "much effect can be produced by one who is suspected or believed to have no confidence in the truth of what he advances or urges." (Pg. 231.)
2. An orator should accommodate his efforts to age, disposition, circumstances, etc. of those whom he advises.
3. The feelings, habits and prejudices must be considered. Feelings toward the specific subject must be considered.
4. The environment of the listeners must be considered - the different countries they come from, etc. McKean used an example from the ancients.
5. The place, the occasion and the subject must be considered as well as the audience.
6. Discretion is a prerequisite. Too abrupt a demand will put an audience on guard. The speaker proceeds by gradations. He should take the outposts before leveling artillery against the citadel.

Demonstrative and deliberative oratory excites some of the passions. Forensics does little to do this. In pulpit oratory some or most of the
passions are called upon occasionally. Paul of Tarsus is an example of an orator of most irresistible pathos.

XX DISPOSITION, PROPERTIES AND USES OF THE INTRODUCTION
(February 26, 1813, March 17, 1815, June 13, 1817.) (Pgs. 238-249.)

McKean had here a summary of invention.

Disposition is the "correct and pleasing arrangement of the stores furnished or suggested by invention." The requisites for organisation are "clearness, judgment, delicacy and taste." (Pgs. 239.) McKean used an analogy (architecture to speech) to explain organisation. He also used Adams' analogy to explain confusion in organisation. He compared speech to an army. Ward notes Aristotle, Cicero and Quintilian in his discussion of organisation. He prefers Cicero. A speech is divided into six parts, 1. Introduction, 2. Narration, 3. Proposition, 4. Confirmation, 5. Confutation and 6. Conclusion. The Statutes follow Ward.

There are two parts of a speech that are indispensable, the proposition and the proof.

A. The introduction is used for three purposes.
   1. The introduction concerns what is to be treated in the speech. The speaker may want to surprise or amuse for variety. The speaker should use the direct approach if the speech is reasoning. The best introduction in the forensic form is the repetition of the question to be discussed. The best introduction in the pulpit is scripture. Too many introductions of the ancients seem artificial.

   2. The introduction gets good will. This matter is to be handled with great care. Several techniques are mentioned here. "An orator may advantageously caution men against the indulgence of any bias, unfavorable to the sober exercise of their judgment." (Pg. 246.)

   3. The introduction is used to get attention. The speaker should consider time, place, circumstances, the occasion, the hearers and the object in view. Interest can be helped by gestures, countenance, use of words and voice. An introduction should be natural and moderate. "Too violent an assault on attention may produce resistance." (Pg. 249.)

XXI PROPERTIES, USES OF NARRATION AND PROPOSITION
(September 27, 1811, September 24, 1813, October 5, 1815.)

This chapter was blank.
McKean's students wanted to know about the founder of the Chair. The purpose of this lecture was to furnish a history of the origin, progress and existing rules of this foundation. McKean hoped it would be of interest. He outlined the rest of his lectures. As acknowledgment of the founder, the University calls the Chair in his name - The Boylston Professorship. All professorships are worked in the same manner. "Although the endowments of none of them be not only not equal to the support but do not furnish what is the actual allowance of the incumbents" - still we honor the donors. Two chairs furnish less than one-sixth of the compensation. In others the proportion has not been correctly ascertained. The accumulation of the fund has rendered it nearly sufficient.

A. Nicholas Boylston was born in 1715. McKean stated about Boylston, that his,

"name is famous not merely in New England, or our country, but throughout Europe and the civilized world, as connected with a distinguished benefactor to his country and his kind. To Zabdiel Boylston - a relative of our founder - goes the distinction of adopting the practice of inoculating against smallpox.

Nicholas died at the age of fifty-six. In the Boston Gazette August 26, 1771, Dr. Cooper stated,

"Died here in the 56 yr. of his age, N. B. Esquire a noted merchant of this town. He was a man of good understanding and sound judgment; diligent in his business though not a slave to it; upright in his dealings and sincere in all his professions." (Pg. 253.)

When Boylston was thinking about retirement, he died. "Equivocal as newspaper panegyric must be regarded, yet the rational estimate here given is confirmed by the united testimony of those who knew him."

Reverend Dr. Tom Cooper thought that Boylston was a good fellow. Boylston did nothing astonishingly brilliant but in his work he held the "noiseless tenor of his way." He was a respectable and correct merchant. He had integrity, perseverance and a religious nature. Boylston was a partner in business to Joseph Green who was celebrated among the wits and poets of New England.
Joseph Green and Nicholas Boylston were two totally different people and yet they were good friends. The originality and humor of the one complimented the solid judgment and prudent wisdom of the other. This fact made mutual admiration possible. In his will Boylston left his friend Green $1,100 and his pastor and religious instructor $100.

He willed on the first of August, 1771 $1500 to Harvard. He died on the 18th of August. The sum was paid to Thomas Hubbard, Esquire - Treasurer, on the 11th of February of the following year. Harvard held off to let the funds develop so that a professor would consider it worth his while to accept the chair. The Revolution intervened. The chair of instruction might have been established in 1780 had it not been for the Revolution.

Willard was made President in 1781.

His [Boylston's] manner of giving donation was generous. There was no test of a political or religious kind imposed. Boylston committed his benefaction to the corporation to be managed, in all respects, according to their judgment and conscience. The rules were subject to the feelings of the Overseers.

B. By 1804 the capital increased to the sum of 23,000 dollars.

"The rules, directions and Statutes of the Professorship are believed to have been the result of the reflections and labors of President Willard and Professor Pearson." (Pg. 257.)

We owe these men a great deal.

"In the profound erudition of both, and the long practical experience of one of them, in the course of instruction which this department embraces, entire confidence was reposed that they would devise the best practicable scheme for rendering, to use their own words in their report, the Institution most extensively and permanently "useful, and thus to accomplish the benevolent and patriotic designs of the Founder." (Pg. 257.)

The rules were communicated to the Overseers on May 1 and adopted July 26 of 1804. The death of the former (Willard) on September the 25, 1804 delayed proceedings. On the 26th of June, 1805, the choice of a professor was made and confirmed by the Overseers on July 25.

C. John Quincy Adams was appointed and he accepted conditionally. He asked for dispensation from all private instruction and exception from half of the public instruction. These exceptions were granted
on May 22, 1806. His public inauguration was June 12. On July 11, 1809, Adams resigned. The courses of Adams were over on August 26.

On the same day that Adams resigned a successor was chosen. McKean had dispensation for a time of part of the public lectures but "... all the other duties contemplated by the original foundation having been enjoined and undertaken."

XXII CONFIRMATION AND CONFRUTATION
(May 3, 1811, March 19, 1813.) (Pgs. 262-273.)

The divisions of proof are two in number. They are confirmation or establishing a fact or allegation and confutation or combating of something which may be advanced. McKean gave a summary of what he had said before about proof. At this point he stated that the mode of using arguments claims attention.

A. Argumentation is the inferring of one truth from two or more which are premised. (Syllogism). The rules for performing this with facility and correctness belong to another department of collegiate instruction. The syllogism finds little place in oral discourse "but it is not infrequently employed."

B. The kinds of proof other than reason are testimony, probability and [not clear]. The order of argument should be as Homer described the ordering of an army in the Iliad. The excellent soldiers should be first. The indifferent soldiers should be placed in the middle. The choicest for bravery and skill should be last. Cicero indicates that weight rather than number should be regarded. Introductions involve examples and authorities. Refutation follows the same principles as confirmation but with negative ends in mind. Confirmation is like inflicting a wound. Refutation is like healing it.

XXIII PROPERTIES AND USES OF THE CONCLUSION
(May 31, 1811, March 26, 1813, March 31, 1815, June 20, 1817.) (Pgs. 274-285.)

The purposes of the conclusion are much the same as an introduction. They are a favorable hearing and recapitulation. Enumeration and pathos are the two divisions of a conclusion. In judicial trials the conclusion may be a comparison.

It is easier to rail than to reason. Don't appeal to prejudice and passion alone.

The application of foreign, remote circumstances to local, temporary affairs may be powerful. But if these circumstances are not comparable the technique is the vehicle of "bigotry or of spleen." A plain
and perspicuous style is necessary.

Examples of powerful perorations are the song of Moses at the close of the Pentateuch, and Burke's speech on Conciliation.

Pathos should be used especially in the conclusion. The Archbishop of Canbray emphasised emotion. Campbell (Principal) also emphasised emotion. Tully's perorations are unequalled.

**XXIV REMARKS ON DIGRESSION, TRANSITION AND AMPLIFICATION**

(June 14, 1811, April 2, 1813, March 31, 1815, June 20, 1817.)

(Pgs. 286-300.)

A. Digression. Digression is a passage deviating from the main subject and an auxiliary to the general purpose of the discourse. Quintilian says they are not always allowable. Cicero is known for his excellent digressions. Ward points to the account of the death of Metullus in the Oration for Callius as an example of worth. Burke is another example of a speaker who used digression well. Its characteristics are that it must naturally stem from the subject and be subservient to the main design. Episodes of the Muse or Poet correspond to the digression of the orator. "Criticism must denounce ... disconnected and protracted episodes ... in the drama." (Pg. 292.)

B. Transition. Transition is passing from one division to another. The transition in oratory compares to the Greek chorus in drama. The characteristics of transition are distinctions, perspicuity, precision and succinctness.

C. Amplification. This point must also be covered since the Statutes followed the Plan of Professor Ward. Amplification is the enlargement of an idea. Aristotle says in demonstrative speaking, praise is heightened in eight ways; 1. make the point that the man being praised was alone and accomplished great things, 2. he was the first to do a thing, 3. he was among few against many, 4. he was conspicuous for virtue, 5. or references could be made to the occasion, 6. repetition could be used, 7. the fact that the man being praised is receiving a new honor and 8. a comparison could be made.

In Argument amplification is achieved by ascending from the specific to the general. Causes, effects, adjuncts, similars et cetera could be used. Figurative language can be used to amplify.

The next subject is elocution. McKean recommended the reading of Bishop Lowth's Selections from Sacred Hebrew Poems and Blackwall's sacred classics.
A. Elocution. Elocution is the "cloathing [sic] of thoughts in language. It teaches to choose and adapt words and sentences to the things or sentiments to be described or expressed."

"It may be worth of remark that the two valuable authors in delivery, Sheridan and Walker, who from a natural and not very reprehensible partiality for their favorite [Elocution], have dignified their treatises with the title Elocution, still have not ventured to give a definition of the word in their Dictionaries which can authorize or support such a use of it." (Pg. 300.)

The latter, Walker, points to French examples and Mr. Addison (a writer of elegant taste; not distinguished for philosophical exactness) to support his definition of rhetoric as elocution. According to Crevier, elocution is to speech as colouring is to painting. Logic shares disposition and invention. Elocution is all rhetoric. There are universal principles governing style in any writing. There are particular or special styles as a result of a distinction in types of Communication.

B. Elegance. "Elegance in general is that agreeable quality ... which arises rather from a graceful and engaging propriety and beauty, rather than from overpowering grandeur and sublimity." Elegance should be intelligible and agreeable. Intelligibility is perspicuity, perspicuity is essential, agreeableness is purity, purity is desirable.

1. Perspicuity. McKean quotes Quintilian and Cicero in Latin. He draws heavily from these two men. To obtain perspicuity the speaker must attend to single words and their combination into phrases and sentences. The attention to selection of words is covered by Blair. The speaker must pick the word that best expresses his meaning. Pedantry is to be avoided.

"The terms of particular pursuits; the phraseology of separate associations of men, technical language, and many appellations derived from the ancient tongues, are of this description [pedantry]."

A lack of perspicuity is caused by wrong arrangement, too long or too short sentences and bad figures. The natural order is best
but inversions add interest and variety. Beauty is secondary to utility. Sound is subordinate to sense. Too many parenthetical phrases and faulty metaphors also hinder perspicuity.

2. Purity. To obtain purity words should be neither vulgar nor obsolete. They should be of legitimate origin and reputable use. Purity of speech is like purity of behavior. Public letters lend their aid to keep high the tone of public morals.

Avoid sordid expressions. The converse conversation of improved minds should bear the stamp of their higher advantages ... "The ... phrases of the dockyard and the shambles, or the far more obnoxious jargon of the turf, the pit or the main, are intolerable in polished company or composition."

Words should be up to date. "The complexion and drapery which charm one age and country shock the ideas of another." In some cases words may be borrowed from the past with good effect. This practice gives dignity and worth.

A medium is best between the least and the most familiar terms. Pope said, "Be not the first by whom the new are tried. Be not the last to lay the old aside." McKeans offers grand praise for Campbell's Philosophy of Rhetoric.

XXVI COMPOSITION AND ITS CONSTITUENT PARTS (November 1, 1611, October 8, 1613, October 13, 1615, July 19, 1617.) (Pgs. 316-331.)

The second part of Elocution is Composition. Composition involves harmony and arrangement. Arrangement is defined as follows:

"The business of composition is to dispose of single words appropriately and to give to the colons (the clauses or members of sentences) the harmony which becomes them, and to dispose of the whole discourse in proper periods."

The four factors of arrangement are period, order, juncture and number. The period means sentences. Order involves phrases and words. Juncture means the connection of syllables and letters. Number means quantity of words.

Dionysius, Cicero and Quintilian all indicate that sounds should produce harmony and emotion. Walker goes into the sounds of the letters
of the alphabet. Consonants are harsh. Vowels are smooth. The speaker should avoid unnecessary combinations of consonants.

A. Order. The best order is generally the order of nature. The natural order is as follows: Man is Mortal; A good man is happy. The reversed order is as follows: Mortal is Man, happy is a Good Man. Blair has said some good things about order but for a more thorough treatment look to Dr. Campbell’s work.

B. Harmony. A repetition of the same initial syllables in words or alliteration should be avoided. McKean criticizes Cicero for too much alliteration.

C. Juncture. When a word ends in a vowel, the next word should begin with a consonant. When a word ends in a consonant, the next should begin with a vowel, or a consonant agreeing in sound.

D. Oratorical numbers. There should be a variety of long and short words in a sentence.

In summary, Elegance is a combination of Composition and Dignity.

XXVII  OF DIGNITY AND OF FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE GENERALLY, ITS ORIGIN, USES AND LAWS
(November 15, 1811, October 15, 1813, October 20, 1815, August 1, 1817.) (Pgs. 332-343.)

Dignity involves all that enlivens and beautifies discourse. Several lectures on this subject are needed. The general species of figurative language is the metaphor. Metaphor is a result of necessity, emphasis and ornament. Tropes and figures are basically metaphors. A trope is a term converted to a meaning different from common usage.

A. A figure is a phrase or sentence converted to a meaning different from common usage. The reasons for these are as follows: 1. new terms are continually needed for new concepts, ideas and things, 2. imagination of men, 3. not enough words or good enough memories to remember them all, 4. tropes are more significant, emphatical [sic] than common terms (examples given from Washington’s speeches), 5. decorum and ornament and 6. understanding.

These are mistakes to avoid. Don’t misuse figures. Don’t borrow from the noble to describe the poor. Don’t strain figures.
"Rhetorical dignity is to a Composition, what personal dignity is to a character. It presumes intrinsic worth, but is principally conversant with the exterior indications and expressions of it, which are chiefly included under the comprehensive phrase figurative language."

The origin of any kind of figurative language is necessity. Avoid the artificial or extravagant in figurative language.

Quintilian was referred to. McKean listed all of the tropes according to Quintilian. Vossius and Ward listed primary tropes as metaphor, synecdoche, metonymy and irony.

"The most natural order of considering these seems to be first that relation which is external, as the whole and a part which is the foundation of Synecdoche where the tropical word trope is of the same essence with that which it represents. The external relations which are most obvious and close are those of cause and effect, subject and adjunct, in which usually exists some such near connection that the one readily suggests the other, whence arise metonymies. Next to these are the relations which have not necessary or natural affinity, such as those of similitude between one subject and are always distinct and often very remote from its and hence are deemed metaphors. Controvery [sic] between objects of opposite natures and properties furnish the trope termed Irony."

A. Metaphor is the most beautiful and common of the lot. All things furnish materials for the metaphor. An example is, "He rushed like a lion." The metaphor is based on a resemblance which one object has for another.

Avoid excesses in the use of metaphors. Audiences limit and direct a man's use of metaphor. An example is the Duke of Bedford. A Catachresis is an excess or abuse of tropical language, such as "blood of grape" - wine. An Allegory is a protracted metaphor.

Avoid incongruities of metaphors. A hyperbole exaggerates or diminishes. Examples are taken from Virgil and the Bible. Jael said the "mountains shall drop down new wine and the hills shall flow with milk." A personification is giving the inanimate animate qualities.
B. **Synecdoche.** A synecdoche is a substituted term that contains the same essence of the thing described. The relation is external. The part is given for the whole. ("Admiral, General lost a battle."\(^{2}\)) The species is given for the genus (sword—all military weapons.) The antecedents are given for the consequents (no example.)

An **Antonomasia** is the substitution of a famous name for a common name. One can eulogise a favorite by calling him by a Saint's name. A **Suphemism** is the using of a softer term than the real.

C. **Metonymy.** A Metonymy is founded on relations extrinsic from the thing to which they are applied, such as the cause for the effect or the inventor for invention.

D. **Irony.** An Irony means the contrary of what words ordinarily signify. It is used for vivacity, invective and sarcasm.

McKean refers his students to Ward and Campbell for further study.

**XXIX LECTURE SOURCES OF TROPES:** ASPECIALY FROM SACRED TOPICS
(December 20, 1811, October 29, 1813, November 3, 1815, August 15, 1817.) (Pgs. 356-368.)

The third constituent of general elocution is termed by rhetoricians as "dignity." McKean summarised briefly. Quintilian furnished most of the modern writers with their principles and rules. "Synecdoche arises from the intrinsic and essential relations of the whole and its parts." "Metonymy is founded on the closest external relations such as cause and effect." "Metaphor regards remote correspondencies and results from any apt resemblance." "Irony operates by contraries." (Pg. 356.)

The following are tropes on very important occasions and for solemn purposes.

A. **Likening men to God.**

1. Some are derived from the Supreme Being. Jehovah to Moses: "Thou shalt be to Aaron instead of God." "See I had made thee a God to Pharaoh."

2. Idols are thus denominated. This is generally the use of irony.

3. Princes, magistrates. Be careful about using tropes in references to Idols and Princes.

4. There are other tropes like "omnipotent architect" et cetera. These don't cause objections. Dr. Young's description of man's nature is good.
"Dim miniature of greatness absolute! An heir of glory! a frail child of dust! Helpless immortal! Insect infinite! A worm! A God!

B. **Figurative use of heathen mythology.**
   Pope, Dryden, Addison and Milton all use heathen mythology as a basis for tropes. McKean's opinion is against this practice. Allusions to mythology are trite and tedious. "The epithets, godlike, divine, heavenly, inspired are figures subject to great caution - Allowable if occasion and audience are suitable." If overused these tropes lose force. (Pg. 360.) If lightly used they are irreverent.

C. **Spiritual beings who people heaven.**
   These are sometimes used to advantage. "angels of the churches." "the guardian Angel." They are appropriate and significative if discretely introduced.

D. **Figures from the Scriptures.**
   Milton and Young are examples. McKean praises a woman (Miss Moore) for her use of figures from scriptures. Bishop Sherlock is an example of a writer who makes good use of this kind of figure.
   "The attempt to make natural religion destroy the gospel is a kind of parricide - for this only could and has restored the religion of nature. Ought the withered head which has been made whole, to be lifted up against him; or should the dumb man's tongue just loosened from the bonds of silence, blaspheme the power that let it free." [sic] (Pg. 312.) McKean lashed out against those who profane or burlesque the names of those in the Bible.

E. **Figures derived from nature.**
   These furnish practically all of the material for figurative language. Campbell uses a figure from nature. "Obediency of feeling is a stony heart. "Petulance is waspish." There is a material difference between the figures of poetry and prose.

CHAPTER XXX

CHAPTER XXX DIVISIONS OF STYLE
(Febraury 28, 1812, February 25, 1814, November 10, 1815.)

McKean stated,
   "In commencing the subject of particular or special Elocution, the almost infinite varieties of style, with some of the most obvious and influential causes of this
diversity, were considered. The respective intellectual and moral endowments and attainments of men, are almost as various as their features of countenance or constitution of body; and those faculties of mind and qualities of heart, together with their different tempers, modes of education, habits of life, all tend to produce the diversified coloring and shading, with which thought is dressed and decorated. (Pg. 385.)

A. The requisites for a forceful style are: vigorous intellect, active imagination, lively sensibility and acute discernment. Add to these qualities retentive memory, profound and extensive knowledge, virtue and piety, diligence and observation and competent experience and you have nothing wanting "in the qualifications for high literary reputation, and valuable literary labours."

B. The kinds of style vary according to time, countries, societies and individuals. Quintilian divides style into three kinds, Asiatick sic, Attick and Rhodian. The Greeks (Athenians) guarded against luxury and effeminacy and cultivated dignity. The Asiatics stressed ease, and voluptuousness. This corresponded with the gaiety and looseness of their principles. The Rhodians combined both. Aeschines introduced it to them (the Rhodians). This style blended smoothness and strength.

The style of Lysias, Isocrates, Aeschines and Demosthenes differed greatly.

C. The style of speaking is affected by the character of change as a language. Cicero makes the point that styles change as a language or nation progresses.

A History of English from Alfred to Elisabeth is prefixed to the Standard Dictionary of Johnson. Robertson's notes to the translation of Claude provide a clear view of the progressive improvement of the style of English preaching.

The subject treated will effect an individual's style. Demetrius Phalereus adopts the following divisions: simple, elevated, ornamented and nervous. These differences result from sentiment, language and ornament. Dionysius of Halicarnassus discusses the austere, florid and middle styles.

Cicero categorizes styles as the magnificent, simple and middle.
According to Quintilian the simple style is used for conveying, the elevated style is used to make an impression and the middle style is used to afford gratification.

The Moderns, among them Keckerman, Vossius and Ward, speak of the low or humble or plain, the middle or temperate and the lofty or sublime styles. Lawson speaks of the concise and nervous, the copious and sweet and the vehement and sublime styles.

Ogilvie, whose philosophical and critical observations had for a time a high and deserved popularity, categorized styles into the following heads: simplicity, perspicuity, elegance, strength, grandeur or sublimity and propriety.

Campbell bases his consideration of purity on grammar. He discusses perspicuity, vivacity, elegance, animation and music in language.

Blair approaches rhetoric from two points of view. They are thought and ornament which is broken down in the dry, plain, neat, elegant and flowery styles. Barron lists styles under five heads following the precepts of Phalereus. They are as follows: nervous and concise, the diffuse, the simple, plain and neat, the elegant and the vehement. There is a Great Variety in Styles.

The low style is diminutive in nature. Cicero calls the low style "conversation." "Simplicity seems so unaffected that it appears easy of imitation;" "but nothing is found on trial more difficult." Simplicity is the hardest to be copied. Quintilian states that the simple style is to be used for style and information.

There are two matters to keep in mind in determining style.

A. Object. In the informational speech you don't try to conceal thought. You try to make thought clear and lucid. In convincing, an appeal to the agreeable is one of the speaker's devices. Lively thoughts and good sense must be introduced to keep the speech moving. Sallies of wit can be entertained. Goldsmith is a good example of sprightliness.

B. Language. Language must be suitable to this style. McKean stated, "The general rule that words should ever have a near and ultimate correspondence, with the ideas they convey, - that thoughts should ever be cloathes [sic] in a garb
suitable to their nature, carefully considered, will furnish hints for most that is necessary to be remarked under this head."
(Pg. 345.)

There is little solicitude for musical cadence here. Use terms of current usage.

Purity and precision are needed here. Terms against which the unlettered object are those which the taste of the learned will condemn. Common sense and rhetoric go hand in hand. In the low style, the usual order of construction is the best. Inversions will be avoided. Gorgeous figures are to be avoided. The low style is not mean or vulgar. The low is a negative rather than a positive attribute easier described by what it avoids than what it possesses. The low style is used in dialogues and epistles, didactic of a speculative and philosophical nature, scientific disquisitions, academic lectures, literary journals, historical annals and narrative and argumentative parts of oratorical discourse. Further, Locke and Swift are cited as examples. Other examples of this style are Ward, Crevier, Voltaire and Fleuri. Rollin's Belles Lettres ranks high.

XXXIII THE MIDDLE STYLE
(April 24, 1612, March 11, 1814, November 24, 1815.) (Pgs. 416-431.)

The middle style embraces all between simplicity and plainness and grandeur and sublimity. Some writers who fail at the middle could have done well with the simple style. McKean stated, "The apprehended difficulty of reaching the sublime, conspires also with the proneness to contend [sic] the low style to increase the solicitude and efforts of most to rank in the intermediate." (Pg. 416.)

The outline of this lecture was the same as XXXII. McKean breaks down his discussion into "thoughts and words."

Cicero is an example of the middle style. He used neither the plainness of the humble style nor the splendor of the sublime. This style is the best adapted for the greatest number and variety of purposes.

A. To achieve perspicuity, an abstract science and elementary principles, the low style is desired. Perspicuity is necessary but lively images are also helpful in this style.

The middle style is used specifically in explaining and enforcing moral and religious truth, discussion of taste and polite literature, many kinds of history and oratorical discourse. This style is recommended by concurrent voice of the best standard critics.
B. The properties distinguishing the style between low and sublime thoughts are dignity, delicacy and novelty.

1. Dignity. The dignity of subject is important.
2. Delicacy (combination of grace and purity.) Delicacy helps in panegyrics. Bald praise embarrasses. Ward's examples of delicacy are stated.
3. Novelty. The love of novelty is strong in man. It is very difficult to pin down plagiarism. What is new? A thought not necessarily novel can be put in a novel way. The art or fashion may be new.

C. The language of the middle style requires purity and propriety. The kind and degree of ornament, vivacity and force depend on the nature of the occasion and the audience. A free and copious manner of expression is sought. The boldest and most impassioned tropes should be avoided. Everything else in this "garden" can be used.

D. Harmony should be sought. Avoid harsh inversions and abrupt conclusions. The faults of the middle style are too great a brilliancy or affectation. Writers of fancy and little judgment display figures in the most gay and conspicuous positions. This is affectation. Great men are usually imitated but their faults are imitated before their strengths. Artificial and extravagant manner is characteristic of the modern writer of our tongue. Johnson may be in part responsible.

E. Elegance can be found in Plato, Cicero, Corneille, Racine, Raynal, Fenelon, Sir William Temple, Shaftesbury, Bolinbroke, Pope, Goldsmith and Addison.

XXXIV THE SUBLIME STYLE
(May 13, 1912, March 13, 1812, December 8, 1815.) (Pgs. 432-445.)

McKean follows Longinus in his consideration of the productive sources of sublimity. They are grandeur of thought, the pathetic, just and elevated figures, dignified and graceful diction, proper and magnificent composition of periods.

Blair's definition of the sublime is as follows: it is "such a description of magnificent objects, or exhibition of sentiments in themselves important or affecting as shall give strong impressions of them." This definition is too broad according to McKean.

A. McKean elaborated on Longinus' five points.

1. Grandeur of thought. Sublimity is an echo of true dignity of soul. Grand thoughts are necessary for a grand style.
Some examples are Ajax in the Iliad, the introduction to the Pentateuch, Corneille and Racine, Pompey, Horace and, more recently, Ames, Hamilton and Washington.

2. Pathetic. Emotion is a characteristic of the sublime. Examples are Sappho, Homer, Demosthenes, Cicero. Demosthenes was sublime in the concise. He was thunder. Cicero was sublime in the diffuse. He was slow fire.

3. Just and elevated figures. Tropes lend to a grand style. The use of the Metaphor, Interrogation, Apostrophe, Personification and Hyperbole is a part of the grand style. Pope's works offer examples of personification. Shakespeare was a master of the hyperbole.

4. Dignified and graceful diction. Terms should be proper, magnificent and dignified.

5. Proper and magnificent composition of periods. The Ancients insisted on periods. Great thoughts grandly decorated equal the sublime. Trivial thoughts grandly decorated are silly and ridiculous.

XXXVI STY L E OF HISTORY
(June 10, 1814, June 11, 1816.) (Pgs. 453-469.)

McKean stated, "this kind of writing embraces the relation of whatever is memorable, respecting nature, society and man."

The great purpose of history is the investigation of truth - to, in turn, communicate instruction. The historian best employs the low or plain style. McKean stated,

"The narrative of events, connected with the rise, progress, state and improvement of men, combined in social and political bonds - is denominated civil history; while the detail of the character, circumstances, and exploits of an individual, is named personal history, or, more usually, biography." (Pg. 458.)

A. Sacred history is not a description of the 1. external state of religion or the 2. annals of various associations of Christians or 3. the accounts of saints, martyrs or divines, but the narrative of lives and events in the volume of inspiration the Bible. This includes the matter of the Bible, its importance and the manner in which it is expressed.
B. General history covers the whole of the civilised world. Particular history covers individual countries. Priestly presents many useful considerations in his sketches and lectures on History and General Policy. Our concern is style. Dionysius of Halicarnassus comments on Thucydides. Cicero has guided us however. He urges that the rhetorician have a working knowledge of history and vice versa. Herodotus first injected elegance into historical writing. Before it was a dry series of annals.

Tully stated a comprehensive law - That a writer, on no consideration, advance what is not true. McKean stated that "... little satisfaction can be derived from statements, which are mutilated from timidity of offending the powerful or reluctance to blame a favorite." McKean stressed objectivity again.

It is not possible, practicable or desirable to forego all comments of judgment or impressions by the writer but you would want no statement of the author concerning his views toward tyranny or freedom when recording their development - lessons rather than history would result. The historian will assert nothing doubtful for fact. Narratives include dates, places, events and the introduction of character.

XXXVI THE STYLE OF POETRY
(Pgs. 471-473.)

Poetry deserves consideration under rhetoric. Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, Horace, Vida, Boilean and Pope all consider poetry. Vossius gave attention to the essential character, the principal varieties and the peculiar properties of poetics. McKean raises the question, what constitutes poetry? There are three styles of poetry, the epic, the dramatic and the lyric. These all differ more from prose than they do from each other.

Aristotle has settled the question so often since raised: Is verse essential to poetry?

XXXVII THE STYLE OF ORATIONS
(June 21, 1816.) (Pgs. 474-480.)

The style of an oration depends on the nature of the subject and the audience. An oration is generally "a speech publically pronounced before a number of persons on some occasion of considerable importance." That we need a different style in public speaking is axiomatic.

A. Speaking should have the following characteristics.

1. It should be "instantly intelligible." Amplification, repetition and exhuberance in spoken language are allowed if not required.
2. Animation is necessary. In speech short and broken sentences can be powerful.

3. Good sense is necessary in speech. Sound opinions and taste dictate against extremes. Rant and rhapsody are the natural consequences of affected emotion.

XXXIX. PRONUNCIATION
(June 24, 1814, June 21, 1816, June 11, 1813.) (Pgs. 491-502.)

The importance of the management of the voice is obvious. Ward devotes half of his book to elocution. Vossius defined pronunciation.

A. He said pronunciation is "the adaptation of the voice and of the motions of the body to the subject and the language of a discourse." Demosthenes said that the first, second and third requisites of speech are all "delivery." Demosthenes had an impediment in his speech but developed his talent. Cicero said that action in delivery is the crowning excellence of oratory. Whitefield was one of the most impressive speakers the world has ever known. McKean gives descriptions of the sermons of Whitefield. They were "great" when delivered, according to McKean. The modulation of the voice should be the modulation used in ordinary, familiar conversation.

How is it some can express themselves with force in conversation and not in front of an audience? There may be a difference in degree between public and private speech. Public speaking requires a more forceful exertion of the voice. The difference is in degree not nature.

B. How should a speaker manage his voice? Follow Nature, said McKean. Defects should be remedied. Some can't be overcome. Diligence and perseverance can effect much. No exercises are mentioned here. Nature and cultivation are important to developing the voice. Use that pitch which you employ in conversation. Merely loudness will not make you understood. McKean allowed for free and various modulations of accent, emphasis and cadence. A higher pitch will soon wear out. Abrupt and violent emphasis is to be avoided. A more common error is too little emphasis.

Quintilian says that modulation of voice is geared to several emotions.

XL ON SERMONS
(Pgs. 503-511.)

McKean quoted the rules of his office. He felt that he should not only attempt to,

"... Accommodate the principles and precepts of Ancient Rhetoric to this new species of
A. What is a sermon? It is not an essay on some great principle of natural religion. It is not abstract dissertation on some general head of manners or morals. It is not a recommendation of human action. But these can be done in pulpit speaking. However they do not comprise "solemnity of worship." McKean stated,

"They are not adapted in the best way and highest degree to interest and benefit the greater part of those for whom this novel mode of instruction is designed." (Pg. 505.)

B. Christianity does furnish instructions to all classes. The Church is designed to permit people to adore Christ. McKean preferred simplicity and purity of service as opposed to ceremony and the "shocking rites." of pagans. The Reason for preaching is to make clear the character of the Deity to all. There are no races, classes or distinctions in the brotherhood of man. McKean stated,

"A Sermon, then, as a distinctive species of discourse is an exposition of some scripture truth or precept with a reference to exciting attention, engaging an interest, securing an influence, in the great majority of human beings." (Pg. 507.)

C. There are special occasions in the pulpit. These are 1. to prove great truths of the Divine Being, 2. to defend particular articles of doctrine or discipline and to defend general ecclesiastical policy.

An inspiring preacher should take pains to see that his views are prevalingly benevolent and pious. His worldly powers are not necessarily a criteria for establishing his ability as a preacher.

There are two cautions which McKean offered. 1. Don't expect great rewards for Preachers don't deserve the things they sometimes get, namely, vexation and wearisomeness, 2. Don't look for leisure and a chance to display your talents in the pulpit. You won't have much time to prepare your sermons. Your great job is to teach...
"the children of transgression the way and meaning of recovery, and obedience and happiness." You don't work with the holy — but the wanderers. You must preach submission to God and the love of men.

Always work from the Scripture. Only fanatics and visionaries declare against study and preparation. This is obviously false.

D. In pulpit oratory the introduction, proposition, confirmation and conclusion should appear. Narration and confutation may but don't necessarily have to be used. McKean may have been the first to list these divisions for preachers. There are four types of sermons, exposition, reasoning, exhortation and application.

1. Exposition. The greatest design for the ministry is exposition. The Text is not only a motto but a guide to all remarks given. Unfolding a great and glorious message is the preacher's job. Too many Presbyterian brethren feel that a paragraph or a chapter from the Bible should be made the basis of historical commentary or practical exhortation. Practical exhortation is not as useful as deemed. It may be interesting but is not a sermon. The preacher needs unity and precision in style.

2. Reasoning. Paul caused Felix to tremble by reason. Reason out of the scripture to set forth law and doctrine. Most people believe in church — so don't overdo convincing an audience in the truth and authority of the Bible. Abstract metaphysical argumentation should not be used before mixed assemblies. The preacher must convince the mind in order to influence the will.

3. Exhortation. Exhortation makes use of the motives and the fears of man. Use divine "economy" as revealed in the Sacred Volume. The instruments of ancient persuasion are weak to those supplied by the armory of God. The power of eternity is far greater than this life. Use simplicity in your style.

McKean's conclusion emphasised the ascendancy of God over the principles of public speaking.

NON POSSE ORATORVM ESSÈ, NISI BONUM VIVUM
(July 15, 1814, July 5, 1816.) (Pgs. 515-517.)

Many fall in love with their subject and claim for it "exclusive honors." Quintilian and Cicero did this. McKean said,
"It is preferable to set the standard too high rather than too low." "The model exhibited is such as it is desired rather than expected to imitate; constant efforts to reach to ideal perfection will lead to a nearer approach to the standard of attainable beauty." (Pg. 515.)

A. What is goodness? This is another department’s subject. None but a good man can be a good orator. But McKean stated,

"Nor does it seem requisite to insist that in no possible case, in no individual instance, can a man be eloquent without immaculate or even a predominant goodness of character."

B. Thinking is not necessarily connected with goodness. Goodness is of benefit because virtue gives manly assurance and confidence. Hypocrisy is usually sooner or later detected. Secondly, goodness has ethical appeal. We like a good man.

There are three principle theatres for public speaking, the bar, the legislature and the pulpit. Support virtue in all cases. Particularly if you lack virtue in the pulpit you may have everything else - and fail. McKean concluded,

"Tho he spake in accents of melody and with all the graces of gesture; tho in strains of purest language ... yet lacked this crowning requisite ... the universal suffrage would indignantly refuse the name and praise of a good pulpit orator."
EXHIBIT 9

Lectures Read to the Seniors in Harvard College, Edward T. Channing (Boston: Ticknor and Fields, 1856) pp. 298. This book was registered by Henrietta A. S. Channing.

PREFACE

"I have not attempted a systematic view of rhetoric, either in compliance with the statutes of the professorship, or according to any idea of my own." (Pg. vi.)

These are "essays upon subjects suggested by rhetoric rather than orderly treatises upon its proper topics." ETC did not use the lectures for the whole course of rhetoric at Harvard for this book.

"... I have been traveling, in my own way, over old ground." He makes the point that many obligations have been forgotten. There are few footnotes. (Pg. vi.)

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTICE

Edward Tyrrel Channing was born in Newport, R.I., on December 12, 1790. His most famous brother was William Ellery Channing. His father was the Attorney General for R.I. and District Attorney for the U. S. His father died as a young man leaving nine children.

Edward entered Harvard in 1804 at the age of 13. He was involved in the student rebellion of 1807. He received his degree a few years later. In 1851 ETC got his Doctor of Laws degree. He was admitted to the Boston Bar. He studied law, history, Greek and Roman. He devoted himself to literary pursuits.

Channing was active in the early organisation of the North American Review. In 1817 he became editor.

In 1819 at the age of 26 Channing took over the Boylston Chair. Mr. Edward Everett replaced Channing as editor of the North American Review. In 1851 Channing retired from the chair at the age of 60. The students he taught number into the thousands. He had a reputation for pure style. He was especially noted for his sound judgment and taste in dealing with English literature.

His personality as a teacher is discussed. "The department of themes, forensics and elocution has not usually, in our colleges, held a high position, compared with the other departments, as respects the determining of academic rank, and the attention to it has been less exact and
obligatory. But Mr. Channing carried his department forward until its relative influence was so great that excellence in it became essential to honors and high rank, and neglect of it incompatible with continuance in college at all." (Pg. xli.)

He was a student of Shakespeare, Milton, Burke, Johnson, Goldsmith, Fielding, Richardson, Scott and Chaucer. Among the theologians, Channing studied Barrow, Taylor, Smith, Young, Cowper and Bunyan. Channing read Wordsworth, Coleridge, Byron, Campbell and Lamb. He also read Irving, Cooper, Bryant and Dickens. He had a preference for the philosophy of Reid.

He was not an orator. He was a conservative, a Unitarian and married his cousin. He was educated in the "school of Washington" and adopted the policies of the Federal party. He had wit, was a conversationalist, but (above all) "he was best in the pursuit of the serious or contemplative in life." He liked solitude.

He wrote a series of lectures on English literature.

THE ORATOR AND HIS TIMES
(Dec. 8, 1819 Inaugural Address.) (Pgs. 1-25.)

This lecture deals with the "circumstances in the state of society, which distinguish the modern from the ancient orator."

A. In the ancient Republics rhetoric was a part of all education and oratory was extremely important. These are some of the reasons why oratory was so vital:
1. The people were ignorant.
2. Ancient Republics were not spread out as today.
3. The orator had greater freedom in the courts of law.
4. The orators used imagination and passion more freely than today.
5. Emphasis on false estimates of national grandeur and happiness. Genius has thrown splendor over the ancients.
6. The orator was the leader to use his power to the worthiest or vilest ends. People used and needed him. He appealed to anything that proved effective. It was a rugged time. Nations sought power rather than internal security. Oratory was the result.

The rules left behind by the ancients (the rhetoricians) are to be applied with regard to the altered condition of society.

B. These are the reasons why we study the ancients today:
1. rhetorical instruction
2. literature
3. examples of great men
4. understanding history
5. understanding human nature

We hear today that oratory is a lost art. This is not true. Only the setting has changed. "Still I think it unquestionable, that the oratory of modern free countries is, in character, as precisely formed by and suited to our state of society, as that of the ancients was accommodated to theirs; and that it would be scarcely less ridiculous to lament over the decline of their oratory amongst us, than it would be to lament over the decline of good government, morals, and philosophy since the days of the triumvirate." (Pg. 12.)

C. The object of eloquence is the same. "... to bring men, by whatever modes of address, to our way of thinking, and thus make them act according to our wishes." (Pg. 13.)

What are the characteristics of speech today?
1. The importance of one man is lessened.
3. Audiences are more learned.
   Ancient speaker controlled audience.
   Today it's vice versa.
4. The subject is more thought of than the speaker.
   "The splendor that surrounds him [the speaker] must be the natural light of truth, not the false brilliancy that startles and blinds."

The superficial observer would say that oratory is lost because the results are not obvious. Truth will prevail. Speech means little. According to Channing persuasion and the emotional appeal are still of importance. Today the importance of character predominates. Character is more important than all the attributes of delivery. Sincerity and conviction are important. Oratory still has dignity.

GENERAL VIEW OF RHETORIC
(Pgs. 26-45.)

Rhetoric has been through the proverbial "mill." Great philosophers have discussed it and certain questions arise.
1. Shall the orator be instructed?
2. Shall he be specifically instructed to be an orator?
3. Is the rhetorician a universal school teacher?
4. Will the art make men wiser judges?

The word "rhetoric" has come to be a reproachful description of a certain type of style. What does the art truly undertake to teach? Originally rhetoric was intended to instruct men in the composition and delivery of orations. The preparation of an orator includes a lot that is equally appropriate for writers. Drama is a luxury. Speech is a necessary accomplishment in life. Speech is like architecture - practical.
A. Rhetoric, when reduced to a system in books, is "a body of rules derived from experience and observation, extending to all communication by language and designed to make it efficient." (Pg. 31) In thus extending the meaning of rhetoric beyond orators and speakers, the orator gains. Rhetoric analyzes methods of persuasion. The qualities in man's nature are the same for speaker and writer alike. Both must use the same approach. "I cannot see how a liberal and philosophical rhetoric can overlook any form of composition, any use of language that aims at power over the heart." (Pg. 33.) Community among the arts makes limiting rhetoric to speech unwise.

1. The reason for making any course exclusive is to perfect the pupil. It will shut out anything that will interfere, but certainly not that which involves the same principle of that which the student pursues.

2. A person will not understand as much about rhetoric as when he studies it in its various modes, "and even with the faintest differences that may naturally exist between the manner of the speaker and the writer."

3. This liberal concept of rhetoric eliminates the idea that persuasion is a vulgar instrument.

Rhetoric finds, arranges and proves argument. This idea has restored rhetoric. It's hard to separate persuasion and argument.

Instruction in actual speaking should be general. The principles of composition involve style or the means of powerful expression.

B. There are objections aimed at rhetoric. There are three in number.

1. It is an arbitrary device of sophists to make men orators. ETC says this is no different than philosophy which is respected.

2. It offers the same prescription for all. ETC This is true. There are universal principles.

3. It serves a mischievous purpose. ETC calls this a result of a lack of knowledge.

When light comes rhetoric will be recognised as a "humble assistant of nature and friend of truth."

ELOCUTION A STUDY
(Pgs. 46-59.)

Some say speech need not be taught. We should just let nature take the speaker where it will. ETC disagrees.

A. We must teach rhetoric. These are the reasons:

1. The principles of rhetoric cultivate natural abilities.

2. Nature has been ill-used by many. Whately has given us the ideal relationship between speaker, audience and occasion.
We must reach a balance between nature and acquired skills. Skill with the voice is used as an example.

3. Education is important to point up the fact that ardor, sincerity and devotion are all important to the orator's purpose.

4. The naked passion (of the uneducated man) doesn't fit a cultivated audience. The uneducated need restraint and moderation.

**DEMONSTRATIVE ORATORY**
(Pgs. 60-71.)

A. The purpose of demonstrative oratory is to please. "It may exercise no small moral and intellectual influence; but it proposes to itself no [small or] special practical results." (Pg. 60.)

This kind of speech addresses itself to opinion, taste and feeling. The ancients used this speech for praise or dispraise, panegyric or invective. It is still very much in use.

commemorations, funerals and eulogies.

B. The common faults were or are:

undue family pride
biographies by friends
too much praise.

Literary orators are best for this type of speech. "In a social view, the mere bringing people together to have their minds refreshed by truth and their tastes gratified by simple, intellectual pleasures, is of itself civilising." (Pg. 67.)

Interest in this type of speech depends entirely on the speaker. The Occasions are the same each year. Don't read your address. It would be better to stay at home and write.

"To answer these demands the speaker needs

perfect mastery of subject
sustained interest in what he is saying
points fixed and always visible
statements almost laboriously distinct to keep
up a gentle, steady, cheering flame from
the opening to the close." (Pg. 71.)

**DELIBERATIVE ORATORY**
(Pgs. 72-89.)

This type of oratory was well known in Greek times. It is the type of oratory used in assemblies concerning the adoption or rejection of measures. The speaker advises and persuades. Legislative bodies are the most important type of assembly. ETC gives the chief characteristics of modern legislative assemblies. Legislatures are composed of individuals who represent groups of people. Our legislature is divided into branches for checks and balances. The character of the Greek
legislature was different in this respect. The Greeks "justly con-
sidered themselves as in a state of perpetual pupilage; where they
had an authority, after they came to the use of reason, not only
to retract and control whatever had been determined, but to punish
any guardian for measures which they had embraced by his persuasion."
In other words the orator of Athens was always on trial for his life.
We have too many views represented in the legislature for a speaker
to "sweep" the entire audience.

A. What are the characteristics of deliberative oratory today?
1. It is marked by a spirit of independence.
2. It is intellectual and moral in character. There are less
violent changes in points of view. Burke is an example.

Some peculiarities are:
1. Deliberative oratory may sometimes be only conversation.
   Speakers may address equals in a casual manner.
2. It is sometimes more like discussion than persuasion.
   If a question is in doubt, an individual may change his
   mind.

Persuasion is necessary for changes that are of benefit to society.

JUDICIAL ORATORY THE PROFESSION AND THE TRIBUNAL
(Pgs. 90-97.)

"A lawyer is an officer of a court of justice, who publicly
professes that he will take upon him to give advice in all matters
of a legal nature, and to maintain and defend such rights and in-
terests as may be contested before the courts." (Pg. 70.)

We welcome ministers and doctors. We reject the lawyer.

The lawyer speaks to courts and juries. When a lawyer speaks
to the court he needs certainty in the law and its interpretation.
His whole inquiry is, "What saith the law?" He concludes (ETC)
by asking the question, "In law what place is there for eloquence?

JUDICIAL ORATORY
(Pgs. 98-112.)

Eloquence is defined as that "which can with propriety come under
the notice of rhetoric, (is eloquent,) if it be adapted to our pur-
pose."

A. The eloquence of law is didactic or argumentative eloquence. It
   is marked by:
1. calmness, mastery and gravity.
2. distinct order.
3. force.
4. warmth and beauty.

Warmth and beauty are not exclusively the property of those dealing with the passions.

The lawyer above all should seek clearness. The use of "picture-painting" helps especially with the jury. When speaking to a jury oratorical power is needed. ETC discusses the jury making the point that the men on the jury are human beings and subject to persuasion. The sagacity of the juror is based on feeling as well as reason. The lawyer must win sympathy as well as conviction. Style when dealing with a jury should be various and popular. The lawyer aims at personal influence.

THE ADVOCATE AND THE DEBATER
(Pgs. 113-119.)

ETC deals in this chapter with the differences between the lawyer and the politician. Lawyers have a special education. This is not the case with the politician.

A. These are the distinctions between argument in courts and political debate:
   1. Political debate allows more freedom than the bench.
   2. In debate you are involved in changing laws. In law you stick to them.
   3. Debaters use many sources of proof. This is not true in law.
   4. The political speaker speaks to crowds. The lawyer generally speaks to a select group or judge. The lawyer does not have generally the versatility to meet the needs of a legislative body.

ELOQUENCE OF THE PULPIT REASONS FOR PREACHING
(Pgs. 120-132.)

ETC spends a few pages in discussing the general outline of a (or the) history of preaching.

The Greeks and Romans preached through instructors of ethics. The prophets of Old Testament days preached. It was an extremely important type of speaking from the days of Christ through the Middle Ages. Preaching is of tremendous importance today. The special importance of preaching today is true because as civilisation advances, man's life becomes more complex.

A. There are two chief reasons for preaching. They are:
   1. Religion is intended to apply to human conduct.
   2. The preacher's subjects need impressive inculcation.
Repetition is important. If man is to live a better life, he must be continually helped.

ELOQUENCE OF THE PULPIT, THE PREACHER AND HIS AUDIENCE
(Pgs. 133-142.)

A. What are the peculiarities of pulpit oratory?
   1. The church or place of speaking is sacred.
   2. The day is sacred.
   3. The audience is silent and respectful.
   4. There is no applause.
   5. The audience is the same each time.
   6. The audience is the only assembly that is consistently of good size. This generalization includes theater.

ELOQUENCE OF THE PULPIT THE PREACHER'S RESOURCES
(Pgs. 143-146.)

In limiting his consideration of the preacher's resources to the mind of the preacher, ETC does not mean to imply that God does not play a part. None the less he does not include the resources through God in his lecture.

A. How far may the preacher go in using his own powers in delivering a message from God?
   1. He can use his own learning and ingenuity.
      He gives vent to deep human feeling in warm speech.
   2. He can use affectionate persuasion, encouragement and counsel.

Let us give the preacher a free exercise of his own powers to achieve the eloquence that comes from common nature. Let us hope that he draws our desires into his thinking.

LITERARY TRIBUNALS
(Pgs. 149-165.)

A. Who establishes whether literature is permanent or shortlived?
   1. authorities (critics)
   2. common readers

These two groups must appreciate literature if it is to last. A work of literary excellence is universal. The simple man likes it. Yet those with greater sensitivity study it. In works of a scientific nature we generally rely on the expert. We also leave the man who contemplates deeply and sets down his ideas with little care for a general audience to the individual critics.
If there is a decision to be made between over emphasis of the audience or over emphasis on the speaker, ETC would pick the speaker. "All hope and love of the ideal must perish if the author or any artist measures himself and his work by the world without, and determines whether an object is attainable or desirable, by the number of those who will be likely to understand or care about it. Probably no readers, however humble, whose attention has been drawn to literature would thank him for the condescension; so much more agreeable is it to feel one's self growing stronger by exposure to difficulties, and to the influence of grand thoughts intrepidly uttered, than to be nursed into a life-long imbecility." (Pg. 165.)

FORMS OF CRITICISM
(Pgs. 166-167.)

For what purposes do we have different forms of criticism?

A. These are the forms of criticism which the writer should seek.

1. Private criticism. This is much preferred over public criticism. Sometimes a writer loses himself in his work. He can then turn his work over to a friend or a teacher. When giving advice be careful. Some people want praise not advice. The big advantage to this form of criticism is that it admits detailed criticism or minutest strictures. This is the most irksome form of criticism that a young writer can receive. Sometimes the writer must ignore criticism and stick to his guns. The detailed sort of criticism can sometimes involve words themselves. This sort of criticism should not be looked down upon. The philologist is a diligent worker of service to writers. What is of more importance than words? Do we not think in words?

2. Office of annotators. This is the type of criticism that enlarges on old standard works. A little more prudence and learning is necessary for this job. Generally the annotator illustrates literary productions, analyzes the author's genius, studies the author's temper, object he aimed for, opportunities, circumstances, etc. A man of this type lives with other people of other times. Too often a critic of this type goes into detail before he catches the spirit of the author.

3. Accounts of times. These consist of collections of materials indicating something about details of an era.

4. A mixed historical and critical study of a body of literature from a given age or era. In this type of criticism the obscure
are dealt with as well as the eminent.

5. Philosophical discussions such as Burke's "Inquiry." This type of criticism results in the production of principles of a given subject.

6. Literary reviews. This type is more or less a catch all for everything mentioned above.

ETC concludes by pointing out that a critic is not above criticism.

A WRITER'S PREPARATION
(Pgs. 185-201.)

What makes a writer? It is difficult to explain what really changes a vigorous mishap ridden struggler in paper and pen into a "writer." This change is not sudden.

A. To start with the student should accept long tried methods.
   There are two general methods.
   1. Some writers ease along according to a predetermined plan or pattern.
   2. Others change as they move along, catching unexpected relationships as they spring up.

   What use can be made of reading? Reading can engender a "spirit of independence and self reliance."

B. There are criticisms of reading books. They are:
   1. Books are said to make us indolent.
   2. They create a love of plodding accumulation.
   3. They create a morbid taste for bibliographical curiosities.
   4. Reading creates self complacency.

ETC doesn't refute these criticisms. He asks the question, "Does reading hurt originality?" First Channing defines originality as a quality of a "mind which, from its constitution and natural action, - not from weak and random eccentricity, but from sound, inherent activity, - takes its own view of things and makes its own use of them." (Pg. 194.)

Channing bases his answer to the charge that reading hinders originality on the definition above. Reading doesn't hinder originality for the original mind doesn't hoard borrowed treasures. It turns everything to gold. "Originality never works more fruitfully than in a soil rich and deep with the foliage of ages." (Pg. 195.) Isolation tends to narrow the soul. A book may be the source of originality. But in the final analysis, all will depend on what is the writer's own from his own resources or barreness.
HABITS OF READING
(Pgs. 202-207.)

Too many students indulge in superficial reading. A light, indolent, heedless inspection of books is simply literary foppery. Some books should be skimmed. The professor may skim but not the student. The student must discipline his powers of attention. "But the moment he loses sight of duties and advantages, and begins to trifle miscellaneous with books, and crave variety, and talk of general knowledge and of keeping pace with the age, there is reason to fear that he is losing all control of himself, and all perception of the useful in reading." (P. 205.)

Rather than wanting to know something about a lot of books, read everything of one man of an era or age. You'll end up knowing more about an era or reading and writing in the long run.

A WRITER'S HABITS
(Pgs. 208-217.)

The writer must give his whole attention to his subject. A writer's self control must be equal to temptation. The writer must write when writing is irksome, when he is physically exhausted, and when his mind is vacant. It means self-denial, close study and industry.

A. Writing is difficult because
1. One tiresome position must be kept.
2. You aim at one point instead of letting thoughts roam.
3. When new thoughts pour in we lose track of them.

Self-imposed duty soon becomes a pleasure and the mind moves on with an impulse of its own.

B. Here are some general rules to follow.
1. When warned to a subject don't stop.
2. The first fresh impression will be the liveliest if preserved. If we wait the fire is lost. The best writers will write with all the impetuosity of ideas when they occur to him. He will be sincere and exact. "One of the worst habits a writer can fall into is that of stopping to rectify his style at the moment of composing." (P. 214.) This results in a conscious style. The work of correcting should not begin until all else is done.

3. Some may like to write in the morning, others at night. It makes little difference. About general approaches to writing,
   Some prefer that the principal part of meditation precede writing.
   Others cannot think without pen in hand.
THE STUDY OF OUR OWN LANGUAGE
(Pgs. 218-232.)

Our own language deserves study. Grammar is learned unconsciously.

A. The growth of a language is uncertain. It is affected by many factors. Some factors are:
1. the historic multitudes.
2. human caprice.
3. different feelings and associations that accompany different ages in history.

We must try to be vivid and concrete in our use of words.

A person must be aware of the tradition of his language. If a person is aware of tradition then alterations that are needed in language are made in "the spirit of the old institutions."

B. In using words,
1. We must not look to any one man as an authority.
2. We must not simply conform to the standards of our time.
3. In using new expressions, we should follow the golden mean.

"My object, a moment ago, was to recommend prudence, and now I am again vindicating liberty. In leaving the subject, I may express a hope that my young friends will feel some pride in doing their part to keep the old landmarks distinct, - the ancient wells pure." (Pg. 232.)

CLARITY OF EXPRESSION AND THOUGHT
(Pgs. 233-245.)

A. Words are representations of thought. In studying words we must observe;
1. observe great writers and speakers.
2. know the history of words.
3. analyze terms.

"Ideas cannot be well-defined in our minds, unless they are already wrapped in appropriate terms." (Pg. 235.) Some think that if we think clearly, we speak clearly. There are too many examples to the contrary.

B. What is precision? It involves appropriateness of diction and definiteness of ideas.

Being plain, simple and neat doesn't give precision. On the other hand being free, graceful and inclined to amplification doesn't mean that a speaker is "muddying the waters." Precision consists in the
using of such words only as our ideas demand of right and necessity.

C. How does one achieve precision?
1. Put thoughts on paper
2. Avoid single words as carriers of an entire thought.

USING WORDS FOR ORNAMENT
(Pgs. 246-258.)

Students take most offense to criticism of their figurative language. "We are trying to learn the law and the principle, not the glorious dispensations which are allowed to great men. The teacher gives the pupil what he holds to be a good and safe rule; but he cannot undertake to instruct him in those licenses which are sometimes conceded to mature and commanding genius." (Pg. 247.)

A. Figurative language is sometimes defined as a characteristic of a fanciful man. Some say that fanciful language is used to give visibility to ideas. ETC defines figurative language as a trope which means "some well-defined form or shape of language, in which there is commonly a departure, more or less striking, from the original or proper use." (Pg. 250.)

B. There is more thought put into figures by youth than by older people. There are two common misapprehensions about figures of speech.
1. Some purposely attach figures to their composition for beauty.
2. Some purposely stack them up in writing instead of thought.

Temper your use of figures with taste.

PERMANENT LITERARY FAME
(Pgs. 259-298.)

A. There are some qualities in a work that lead people to consider it permanent.
1. "Works published in this age must take root in it to flourish in the next."
2. The writer must live life around him.
3. The writer must understand people around him.
4. A piece of work must have universal qualities but to get these universal qualities a man must write for his time and country in his language.
5. The writer's tone and spirit must be comprehensive but he may aim at a specific audience.
6. "It is little better than repetition to say that a book, well-established in public favor by impression or opinion, is also established by the often unobserved yet unvarying principles of taste." (Pg. 290.)
Let us as writers strive to be great.

"If we should bring into one view the fortunes of still other writers, who are considered as the most prosperous among the immortals, the lowly might be brought to think it better for a man to sleep quietly when he has no more to do with the earth in the body. But they will not persuade the soaring spirit that it is not worth ambition to be a great power in the world, ages after one's burial." (Pg. 298.)
The Principles of Rhetoric, Adams Sherman Hill (New York: Harpers and Brothers Publishers, 1898) pp. 341. This is a revised version of the edition of 1678. These are not lectures but chapters in what would be considered a text book for college students.

Preface - The purpose of which is definition.

"Rhetoric may be defined as the art of efficient communication by language." (Pgs. v-vii.)

"It is an art, not a science: for it neither observes, nor discovers, nor classifies; but it shows how to convey from one mind to another the results of observation, discovery or classification; it uses knowledge not as knowledge, but as power."

Rhetoric implies two parties. Hill refers to Aristotle when making this point. Since rhetoric recognises the hearer, its rules are not absolute but rather relative to the persons addressed. Logic and truth are one. The ways of communication are many.

Rhetoric applies to any subject matter that can be treated in words. Rhetoric does not undertake to furnish a person with something to say; but it does undertake to tell him how best to say it. ASH uses Coleridge's definition of style as a definition of rhetoric. "Style," says Coleridge, "is an art of conveying the meaning appropriately and with perspicuity, whatever that meaning may be; ..."

The purposes of Part 1 and Part 2 of the book are stated. Part 1 discusses and illustrates "general principles which apply to written or spoken discourse of every kind." Part 2 applies to special kinds of prose writing.

"While engaged in revising this book, I have seen no occasion to modify in any important respect what was said in the preface to the first edition. I still believe that the function of rhetoric is not to provide the student of composition with materials for thought, nor yet to lead him to cultivate style for style's sake, but to stimulate and train his powers of expression, - to enable him to say what he has to say in appropriate language."

A few changes (deletions and enlargements) were made in the pages to follow.

ASH profited from criticisms given by LBR Briggs and GL Kittredge.
The foundations of rhetoric rest upon grammar; for grammatical purity is a requisite for good writing. Grammatical inaccuracy is a demerit of substance. There are few who achieve constant accuracy.

A. Purity in grammar involves three things.
   1. Writing should contain nothing but English words and phrases.
   2. These words and phrases should be used in their English meaning.
   3. Words should be combined according to the English idiom.

What determines whether an expression is English? One does not inquire into the origin, history or tendencies of a language. We must check into the English being used today. We must not be too over fastidious. We can use words like "pell-mell," "topsy-turvy," etc. Burke uses them. Campbell is too fastidious in his principles on the use of words.

B. There is only one sound principle governing the use of words. A writer's language must be the kind that people can understand. This was Macaulay's idea. A writer should avoid pedantry and vulgarity. There are three criteria for understanding.

1. present use. This criteria is opposed to the obsolete or ephemeral. Time is the main factor. Campbell (1750 or so) held that any word which had not appeared in any book since 1668 or which was to be found in the works of living authors only, should not be deemed in present use. Today according to Hill words come and go more quickly. He briefly considers the stages through which words go.

2. national use. This criteria is opposed to local, professional or foreign words. The judges are national writers for national writers set national use. Hill gives examples of provincialisms and expressions which have come from professional into general use. Foreign words should be used with care. Words are passing back and forth from England to the U. S. all the time. "One way is for the most part as good as the other; let each side of the ocean stick to its own way, if only to keep up those little picturesque differences which are really a gain when the substance is essentially the same." (Pg. 13.)

3. reputable use. This means that the words that are used uniformly by writers that the world deems best are reputable. ASH listed words that are not reputable.
C. There are three rules to follow in the actual practice of choosing words. They are:
1. precision - using a word subject to only one interpretation.
2. simplicity - pick the simpler of two expressions.
3. euphony - agreeable to the ear.

But good use is primary. Many like Milton, Smith, Johnson and Campbell have failed to justify these rules in actual practice at specific times. "These marked failures should warn the student of language, whether he fills a professor's chair or sits at a pupil's desk, not to try to stem the current of usage when it strongly sets one way." (Pg. 24.)

CHAPTER II VIOLATIONS OF GOOD USE

A. Barbarisms. The following should be avoided.
1. obsolete.
2. novelties.
3. words of foreign origin.
4. borrowed finery - generally oomp.
5. foreign spelling.
6. slang.
7. new formations.
8. vulgarisms.
   "a steal," "tasty," etc.
9. abbreviated forms.
   "cab," "co-ed," etc.

B. Great writers determine good use. Improperities or using an English word in a sense that is not English.
1. resemblance in sound misleads.
2. resemblance in sense misleads.
3. others noted by Hill.
4. English words with foreign meanings.
5. improperities in phrases.

C. Solecisms or constructions not English. In conversation a slight inaccuracy is to be pardoned. In oratory fire is more important than correctness. But a writer can take all the time he needs.
1. errors in the use of foreign nouns.
2. possessive case is not distinguished from the genitive.
3. object of the verb is sometimes put in the nominative case.
4. the emphatic pronoun "self" is sometimes confounded with the reflexive.
5. pronoun without grammatical antecedent.
6. misuse of "either," "neither" and "former" and "latter."
7. singular or plural verbs.
8. can or may.
9. shall and will.
10. indicative or subjective.
11. incorrect tenses. Blair makes this mistake in lecture 17.
12. adverb or adjective.
13. wrong prepositions.
14. split infinitives.
15. double negatives.
16. omissions.

There is difficulty in applying the principles of good use due to the ravages of time and the differences between and among experts.

BOOK II  RHETORICAL EXCELLENCE
CHAPTER 1  CHOICE OF WORDS

We suffer from poverty of language. If we have just a few words we overwork them. The result is triteness.

A. How can a man enrich his vocabulary?
1. Gather words from the dictionary as Chatham and Browning.
2. Translate from the ancient classics as Choate.
3. Become familiar with the classics of your own native tongue as Stevenson and Franklin.
4. Most of us simply absorb.

B. The choice of words depends on:

1. clearness.

The writer should use words that can be understood. Reading should be effortless. Macaulay is used as an example of perspicuity. He would write a rough draft of an incident at one sitting; then fill it in on six pages of foolscap per day. He used the same word over again. It is better to repeat a noun than to substitute for it a pronoun. He made judicious use of connective particles.

Clearness is relative. Words that are effective in one situation are not so in another. "Eloquence is the power to translate a truth into language perfectly intelligible to the person to whom you speak." (Pg. 91.) Clearness differs from precision. Precision applies to scientific jargon. General terms like "nature" have different meanings to different people. Anglo-Saxon words are not the only words to be used. Spencer, a champion of Anglo-Saxon words, used Latin derivatives in the defense of the Anglo-Saxon. We should eliminate "fine writing" or "verbal wardrobes." Be specific not general in your choice of words.
C. force.

Information requires clarity. Other purposes require "force." Campbell calls this vivacity. Whately calls it energy. Bain calls it strength. The characteristics of force are the univocal, the short, the specific and the familiar.

Campbell is an example of forceful writing. The trope is the most used device to get force. "The substitution of a less general for a more general term is the simplest kind of trope, or figure of speech, - the word being "turned" from its usual meaning and employed in a figurative, as distinguished from a literal, sense." (Pg. 114.)

D. There are several kinds of tropes.
1. Words with both a literal and figurative meaning.
2. Synecdoche and Metonymy between which there is no practical value.
3. Simile or metaphor. The simile expresses distinctly what the metaphor implies. The metaphor is more forceful than the simile. This idea came from Whately who got it from Aristotle. Spencer gives economy for the reason why the metaphor is forceful. Use the simile until the meaning is plain and then use the metaphor.

Sustained metaphors are especially useful. Avoid mixed metaphors.
4. Personification gives life to the inanimate. The value of tropes rests in ornamentation as well as force.

E. ease.

At times this is called euphony, beauty, harmony, smoothness, grace and elegance. When writing has ease the reader goes from one word to another without a jar. How may ease be acquired?
1. Train your ear.
2. Ease springs out of the character of the writer. It is a gift rather than an acquisition. This gift must be developed by persistent labor.
3. Avoid excessive alliteration and affected euphony.
4. Avoid two words alike in sound standing near each other.
5. Avoid the substitution of one word for another that has the same meaning.
6. Eliminate "and which" from sentence structure.
7. Avoid trivial expressions.

Both ease and force are means to an end. "A writer who manifestly strives after vigor is justly called bombastic or sensational; one who manifestly strives after beauty is justly called affected or sentimental."
CHAPTER II  NUMBER OF WORDS

A. A great many considerations effect the number of words to be used in a sentence. If the subject is familiar to the audience use fewer words. If the audience is intelligent use fewer words. The best rule of thumb is to avoid extremes.

1. Clearness - The biggest problems in clearness are: 1. Too few words and 2. including too many words. Interest is the criteria here.

2. Force - Too many words hinder force. The two big hindrances are 1. unskillful repetition and 2. redundancy. Unskillful repetition may be a result of a poverty of thought. Burke and DeQuincey represent skillful repetition. There are several kinds of redundancy.
   a. Tautology which is the repetition of an idea in the same or different words.
   b. Pleonasm which is the addition of words that can be omitted without affecting the construction or meaning of a sentence. Overuse of adjectives is a common source of this problem.
   c. Verbosity the causes of which are paraphrases, circumlocution and prolixity.

3. The answer to this unnecessary repetition is
   a. selectivity or saying much in little. My Last Duchess by Browning is an example of selectivity.
   b. power in reserve helps. This is a matter of reserve in composition. Examples are Bright, Mark Anthony, Lincoln and Webster.

4. Ease - Ease suffers from excessive conciseness. Authors noted for force are concise. Authors noted for ease are copious.

CHAPTER III  ARRANGEMENT

This is the most important of the three topics under rhetorical excellence.

A. In the ideal arrangement "the order of the language would distinctly indicate the relative importance of each constituent part of the composition." (Pg. 177.) This is impossible but a goal to strive toward.

1. Clearness - The writer should give to each word the proper relation. This is best done by placing pronouns, correspondents and subordinate expressions correctly. DeQuincey and Blair make the mistake of misplacing these elements.

2. Force - Important words should be put at the beginning or at the end of a sentence. Generally the subject is first but there are plenty of examples to the contrary. "Nearest the heart nearest the mouth." There is a difference between Latin and
English. Antithesis helps in force as well as clearness. ASH praises Burke for moderate use of antithesis. ASH hits Johnson, Gibbon, Junius and Macaulay for excesses. Force favors climactic order. Cicero and Demosthenes are good examples. Spencer in his Philosophy of Style indicates that the simile should precede the literal assertion. This is not always true.

3. Ease - It is difficult to prescribe rules to help the student achieve ease in writing. It is sometimes necessary to break the rules. You may even end a sentence with a preposition to achieve ease. The chief offenses to ease are:
   a. out-of-place parenthetical expressions.
   b. imitation of foreign arrangements.
   The natural order is best.

4. Unity - Every sentence should be a unit.
   a. ideas should be unified.
   b. expression should be unified.
A lack of unity is caused by a confusion of thought. Blair is used as a poor example of arrangement.

5. Kinds of sentences - Some favor short and some favor long sentences. Coleridge favored the long sentence. The short sentence is favored by most today. De Quincey uses Kant as the extreme example in the employment of long sentences.

"Kant was a great man, but he was obtuse and deaf as an antediluvian boulder with regard to language and its capacities. He has sentences which have been measured by a carpenter, and some of them run two feet eight by six inches. Now a sentence with that enormous span is fit only for the use of a megatherium or a pre-Adamite. Parts so remote as the beginning and the end of such a sentence can have no sensible relation to each other."

Both long and short sentences have advantages. The long sentence has the advantage of showing the relation of a word with its context. The short sentence avoids
   a. obscurity
   b. weakness and clumsiness and
   c. scattering our shot
Alternate sentences. Use the long to unfold thought and the short to enforce it. The best example is Burke.

6. There are two kinds of sentences.
   a. Periodic - In this type the meaning is suspended until the very end of the sentence.
   b. Loose - This type of sentence can be cut off almost at any point and still have meaning. ASH uses good examples of this type of sentence as compared with the periodic.
There is also the balanced sentence "that is, the sentence in which the words and phrases of one part correspond in form and position with those of another part."

In summary each kind of sentence has its use. Good writers use all kinds of sentences.

7. Paragraphs - These divisions have two purposes.
   1. Broken texts rest the eye.
   2. The paragraph marks a change in thought.

   ASH gives examples of paragraphs that have clearness, force, ease and unity. Unity is absolutely necessary. The other criteria mentioned may be fulfilled in part or by degree.

8. Whole composition - The general principles for the whole composition should be the same for a paper of two pages as they are for a book of several volumes. A composition should have ease, force, clearness and unity. Keep an eye on the "whole." Have a picture of your finished work in mind. Try to get unity with variety. A writer above all else has to interest his reader. The highest praise a student can get from a teacher is "I enjoyed reading your essay."

PART II KINDS OF COMPOSITION

A. There are four kinds of composition.
   1. Description involving persons or things.
   2. Narration involving acts or events.
   3. Exposition or explaining anything which requires explanation.
   4. Argument which deals with anything involving conviction. This involves opinion or action or both.

CHAPTER I DESCRIPTION

ASH discusses painting, sculpture and drama as examples of description. "Whatever painting and sculpture can suggest to the imagination, language can fully recount. ... No gallery of pictures, however large, can tell a story as words can; ..." (Pg. 250.)

A. There are two ways to observe.
   1. Scientific analysis (study)
      Scientific description is for the purpose of analysis and information through comparison. ASH gives examples from science.
   2. Artistic viewing of the whole (enjoyment)
      Artistic description gives pleasure by affecting the imagination or producing an illusion. It is suggestive. This kind of description should not dwell on a part unless it is
representative of the whole. Stick to fact. Don't give anything but emotion. If emotion is the only thing expressed, it is better to use the vehicle of music. Don't fall into the Pathetic Fallacy or the transferring of emotions to inanimate objects.

The writer should not try to make language do more than it can do. He should make the most of advantages which language has over the other arts.

B. How does one make the best of language in description?
   1. Set down telling characteristics.
   2. By making use of one happy phrase.
   3. Use one well chosen word.
   4. Describe the effect of the object in question.
   5. Use words that suggest motion.
   6. Make use of narration.

CHAPTER II NARRATION

Narration deals with acts or events. Words tell a story better than the chisel or the trumpet. Maupassant is held up as the unsurpassable story teller.

A. In narration movement and method are the essentials.
   1. Movement - This can be either slow or rapid.
      Movement should not be obstructed. ASH gives an especially good comparison of two stories of a bear as an illustration. (Pgs. 286-7.)
   2. Method is needed in movement.
      a. Aphorisms or tangents should be avoided.
      b. Make changes in point of view clear.
      c. Keep your central idea in mind. Biography is easy in this respect. History is a little more difficult. Fiction is very difficult.

   Vision is a product of nature. Method however can be learned.

CHAPTER III EXPOSITION

Exposition is explanation. The difference between description or narration and exposition is that exposition does not appeal to the emotions. Its function is to make the obscure clear. Exposition can be used in definition. It can deal with the general or the specific.

A. Exposition must have the quality of clearness. How is this obtained?
   1. repetition
   2. organisation
CHAPTER IV ARGUMENTATION

A. Argument aims at conviction

1. Proposition and Proof - There are two types of proof.
   a. direct - openly attempts to establish the proposition
   b. indirect - shows opposite of the proposition absurd
   Have your proposition well in mind.
   The burden of proof rests with the one who seeks to change the established order.

   The presumption is in favor of the person standing against change. This is sometimes reversed by a counter-preservation. Always take advantage of the presumption. ASH gives an example from Whately.

2. Evidence - It is the material of proof.
   There are two general types.
   a. direct which involves our own senses or consciousness.
   b. indirect which means testimony, tradition or the senses of others.
   There is a difference between fact and opinion. Fact is based on fact. Opinion is based on inference. One must test testimony.
   There are several kinds of testimony.
   a. expert
   b. authority
   c. unwilling testimony
   d. undesigned testimony
   e. testimony of silence
   f. concurrent testimony
   In law there is a difference between direct and circumstantial testimony. ASH uses a quotation at this point from Shaw.

3. Deduction and induction -
   Deduction moves from general to specific.
   Induction moves from specific to general.
   An example from Aristotle of the deductive form of reasoning is:
   All men are mortal. Socrates is a man. Socrates is mortal.
   In the enthymeme one premise is suppressed.
   The fallacies of deduction are:
   a. Begging the question or arguing in circles. This is deducing a conclusion and then using the conclusion to prove the original assumption.
b. Arguing beside the point.
The fallacies of induction are:
   a. Overgeneralization.
   b. Post hoc ergo propter hoc.
Induction and deduction work hand in hand, almost simultaneously.

4. Antecedent Probability, example and sign.
   a. Antecedent Probability - This is arguing from cause to effect. This is arguing from past to present or future and present to future. This is used in science fiction. When antecedent probability is used it may be necessary to compare conflicting arguments. We have to determine the preponderance of probability.

   b. Example - This argument is based on a resemblance which persons or things bear to one another in certain particulars or under certain aspects. ASH gives an example which is used by Whately. There are two kinds of example: a. illustrative and b. argumentative. An argumentative example is much like an analogy. The example that ASH uses to make this point clear is the argument from the comparison of Earth and Mars that there is life on the planet Mars.

   Overgeneralisation is a fallacious use of an example. False analogies are a product of a lack of enough relationship between objects being compared.

   c. Argument from sign is based on an association of ideas. Macaulay and Junius are examples of this kind of argument. A sign may be outweighed by antecedent probability.

   All three types of arguments are extended in force when combined.

5. Arrangement - Arrangement is needed in argument. "You shall find," says John Quincy Adams, "hundreds of persons able to produce a crowd of good ideas upon any subject, for one that can marshall them to the best advantage. Disposition (methodical arrangement) is to the orator what tactics, or the discipline of armies, is to the military art. And as the balance of victory has almost always been turned by the superiority of tactics and of discipline, so the great effects of eloquence are always produced by the excellency of disposition. There is no part of the science, in which the consummate orator will be so decidedly marked out, as by the perfection of his disposition." (Pg. 380.)
Should the proposition or proof come first? If the proposition is familiar, it is an advantage if you use the novel proof first. If the proposition is hostile, use the proof first. State the proposition and prove it. How should proof be arranged? Place argument from antecedent probability first. Follow with the example and finally the sign. Put the antecedent probability first because it helps to explain and secondly because it gives you the presumption.

Refutation should be fairly met. Don't neglect, emphasize or mis-state arguments of your opponent. Refutation should be placed in the middle of the argument.

6. Persuasion - This is a useful adjunct to argument. Persuasion is carrying argument into action. It's the "instilment of conviction." Persuasion is addressed to feelings.

To substitute an appeal to feelings for argument is, of course, never justifiable. Persuasion is more difficult than conviction. "Such a triumph [persuasion] was achieved by Whitefield over Benjamin Franklin." (Pg. 388.)

Study Webster for exordiums and Burke for perorations. Sometimes it is hard to disassociate argument from persuasion. Of the methods of persuasion very little that is of practical value can be said. Good sense, right feeling and the knowledge of human nature avail more than rules. Here are a few suggestions:

- Be concrete
- The fewer words the better.
- Climax should be carried through.
- Use variety in content and method.
- Adapt to the audience. The educated are more difficult to move than the ignorant.

In persuasion a bookish style tells far less than a simple expression of truth. "If a writer or an orator is thinking of his own style, he may please his readers or his hearers with well-turned periods or sounding phrases, but he will not move them; for he will inevitably betray the fact that manner is more to him than matter. If his mind is full of his purpose, he will express himself simply. (Pg. 398.)

Sincerity is of utmost importance. Argument involves intelligence. Persuasion requires heat.

People in general hold their opinions so loosely that a man who believes anything with his whole heart is sure to make converts. Study the speeches of Burke, Webster, Cobden and Bright.
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