THE TRADITION IS PRESERVED

While Elocution was the dominant means of teaching oral expression in American colleges and universities, the study of rhetoric and related matters had not disappeared from the curriculum. Much of the bellettristic material that had been part of the rhetoric courses was now maintained and expanded in the recently established departments of English. Many of the new English departments found themselves in a situation they had not encountered before. As a result of increased enrollment after the Civil War, a need for basic instruction in speaking and writing English became apparent. Faculty members at American colleges and universities were now engaged in an activity unknown to their European contemporaries—teaching college students to write and speak their native tongues. In part, this situation was due to the proliferation of colleges and universities in the United States. Private or religiously supported institutions were common here, and denominations built their colleges as they moved west. By the early nineteenth century, colleges were much more common and much less selective than in Europe. As a British traveler remarked, "What a magnificent country. France has four universities; England has two; and Ohio has 37." Clearly, many of the American students were different from students in European universities, or even in the elite American universities, where students were expected to be proficient in writing and speaking their own languages.

An additional factor which affected the teaching of English was a result of the enactment of the Morrill Act of 1863. That legislation changed the demography of American higher education by providing for the establishment of institutions now known as Land Grant Colleges. The intention of the legislation was not to develop colleges that resembled the elite universities of the East or even long established state universities such as Virginia and North Carolina. The function of the new institutions may still be seen in the few schools that continue to exist as A and M (Agricultural and Mechanical), A and T (Agricultural and Technical), A and I (Agricultural and Industrial).

These new students could, in no way, be called university students. They did not resemble European university students; nor were they like the students of the established American universities. It soon became clear that they were not really fluent in English. Thus the faculties found it necessary to establish courses which, at that time, were unique to American higher education. Thus, out of this need, courses in English composition were developed. As James A. Berlin has pointed out in "Writing Instruction in Nineteenth-Century American Colleges" the prevalent curriculum had been derived from eighteenth century British rhetorics or from their American adapters (1984).
The new academic settings, resulting from the turn to mass education, created new challenges for colleges. The texts, widely used during the early part of the century, were not suitable for the new academic clientele. No longer could faculties be confident that their pupils could master the works then in use... such as Blair’s *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*, Campbell’s *Philosophy of Rhetoric*, Adam’s *Lecture on Rhetoric and Oratory* and Whately’s *Elements of Rhetoric*. Nor were the appropriate texts found among the works by American adaptors and imitators, including Quackenbos’ *Course in Composition and Rhetoric*, Jamieson’s *Grammar of Rhetoric* and the books by Abraham Mills which were truncated versions of the British classics, in which Mills often inserted extraneous material from other authors. The books, however, always gave Mills the credit of authorship. James Boyd, another American adaptor, prepared an edition of Kames’ *Elements of Criticism*. The chapter on “Standard of Taste,” however, contains this head note.

The following chapter is taken from one of Dr. Blair’s lectures, being far superior to the one of Lord Kames, which is here omitted. (480)

No matter how adapted and abridged these texts were, they lacked the ability to respond to the needs of the new students; the books were didactic, and in some cases, theoretical and did not include specific instruction and exercises to assist the students in learning to write, speak and read their own language. Because of the inadequacies of their earlier education many of the sons of farmers and mechanics found the existing course material over their heads. The new students required more specific and applied instruction than had heretofore been offered.

Understandably, the new situation called for new instructional materials. After the Civil War the need was met by a very large number of textbooks representing a new genre... the English Composition book. Although the genre was new, it, nevertheless, was strongly influenced by the eighteenth century rhetorical tradition. Much of the theory underlying the instruction was derived from the works of Campbell, Blair, Whately and other earlier writers. In keeping with the tradition of belles lettres, no clear distinction was made in the new texts between modes of discourse. Although the primary emphasis was on writing, oral discourse was certainly not ignored and such rhetorical concerns as argumentation and persuasion were directly addressed. Not surprisingly, many of the new texts were produced by professors at Eastern universities, where the preservation of the rhetorical tradition was strongest. Thus the teachers at elite institutions became the teachers of students at inland colleges.

While departments of Elocution and schools and colleges of Oratory were dealing almost entirely with oral expression, departments of English had become responsible for teaching the rhetorical aspects of communication. The Elocutionists gave very little, if any, attention to the substantive aspects of communication. Their major concern was with delivery. Some critics said that the elocutionists were specialists in, “graceful gestures and pear shaped tones.” The only canon of ancient rhetoric to which they paid attention was “pronunciatio.” The treatment of the canons of “inventio,” “dispositio,” “elocutio” and even “memoria” were willingly granted to the teachers of English Composition. The teachers of composition became specialists in the new departments of English and were responsible for teaching their students to write and to speak. In due course, many departments instituted separate Oral English sections and the National Council of Teachers of English established an Oral English Division as an integral part of the discipline. In time, the professors of English not only produced English Composition textbooks, they also wrote more specialized texts, particularly those dealing with argumentation and with the general field of Oratory.

Examinations: the nature and characteristics of the English and American Reading. Much of the study was devoted to the art of reading, the sources debated the reading. Of special interest was the chapter entitled “Persuasion” in the

The material covered in Composition texts was obviously intended for style and almost exclusively consisted of quotations from speeches, essays, and novels.

Chapter 12 was the most important because it dealt with the principles. Foster believed that there was a distinction between the literature of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Convictions, grounds. Elocution was not only the work of the crowd, personal convictions; motives... the work of the individual.

Foster then expanded this theme in the next chapter. The Subject; III. The Manner; IV. The Attitude.

The attitude, sincerity, sympathy.

In his discussion of the attitude, “the man” that he described was not to be derived from the theories of Blair. The attributes of the speaker were analyzed. When Foster talked of “inventio” or invention, he did not mean a new idea, but because he had a personal conviction. Rather he employed composition “in a twentieth century sense” and followed in the tradition of Blair.

Foster devoted a chapter to each of the components about the condition of the individual gesture he presented.

In discussing the gesture, Foster noted a feeling of energy and power that is better, many faults, are quick to detect (Foster, 1924).
Examinations of some of the leading texts of the period give us a clearer picture of the nature and content of the works; especially we can see how the oral and rhetorical aspects of composition were treated. In 1908 William Trufant Foster, Professor of English and Argumentation at Bowdoin College published Argumentation and Debating. Much of the book would seem familiar to fairly recent students of the subject. He discussed propositions, analysis, the brief, evidence, argument, examples and refutation. Of special interest is his treatment of style in Chapter 11, "Arousing the Emotions: Persuasion" in Chapter 12 and "Debating" in Chapter 13.

The material on style was not altogether different from the standard English Composition texts of the time, except that more attention was given specifically to oral style and almost all of the examples of effective argumentative language were taken from speeches, some even from student debates.

Chapter 12 was an indication of the attention given to traditional rhetorical principles. Foster began that chapter with a quotation from Cicero; he then went on to make a distinction between conviction and persuasion, which mirrored the ancient and the eighteenth and nineteenth century rhetoricians.

Conviction addresses the understanding; it aims to establish belief on rational grounds. But so strong are the influence of inherited opinions, the pressure of the crowd, personal desires and feelings, that action is not often based on purely rational motives.... The volition must be secured through arousing the emotions. This the work of persuasion. (262)

Foster then explicated the sources of persuasion, which reside in "I. The Man; II. The Subject; III. The Occasion." The ancient canon of "ethos" was restated and only slightly modified by Foster.

The attributes of the man himself which are most effective in Persuasion are Sincerity, Earnestness, Simplicity, Fairness, Self-Control, Sense of Humor, Sympathy, and Personal Magnetism. (266)

In his discussion of the sources of persuasion, Foster devoted far more attention to "the man" than to "the subject" or "the occasion." His list and his explanations seem to be derived from the writings of eighteenth century rhetoricians, especially Hugh Blair. The attributes Foster chooses are, however, less numerous than those of Blair. When Foster talked about the subject, he did not devote much attention to the elements of "inventio" discussed by the ancient theorists. Such treatment was unnecessary because he had dealt with argument and evidence, in great detail, in earlier chapters. Rather he emphasized the relation between the speaker, the audience, and the subject in a twentieth century restatement of the Aristotelian triangle. A similar theme was followed in the discussion of the occasion.

Foster devoted Chapter 13 to "Debating" in which he offered detailed instructions about the conduct of debates and in which he treated delivery. In the discussion of gesture he presented a not very subtle attack on elocution.

In debating, no gestures are necessary. If any come in response to the thought or feeling of a man as he speaks, and if these appear natural to the audience, so much the better, even though they are not labelled and depicted in books on gesture. So many fantastic tricks have been performed in the name of elocution that audiences are quick to detect and ridicule anything which does not seem to be spontaneous. (Foster, 1908, 320)

In the chapter on debate, Foster issued a warning about the evil of debating against
the students’ convictions. He understood, with Aristotle, the need to understand both sides of a proposition but he surely did not favor speaking on both sides.

... we urge students to refuse—even for the sake of practice, even for supposed honor of a beloved institution—to speak against their convictions... This lack of sincerity and earnestness on the part of the speakers is due not only to the lifeless practices of elocution, but as well to the almost universal custom of ignoring the interests and beliefs of the individual speakers. (326)

To strengthen the pedagogical function of his book, Foster offered more than 150 pages of Appendix in which he presented the students with practical materials. Included in the Appendix were exercises based on each chapter, specimen analyses, specimen briefs, and instructions to judges. He concluded with a list of 275 propositions beginning with “The term of office of the President of the United States should be six years,” and ending with, “The Rhodes scholarships for the United States will accomplish the objectives of the founder” (486).

Foster was of course, only one of a number of examples of the maintenance of the rhetorical tradition in English textbooks in the pre-speech period. (It is interesting that, in his later years, Foster was a co-author with Lew SARRETT of a popular public speaking text.) Foster’s book, which was revised in 1917, was a textbook for students of argumentation and debate, a field with a strong oral component. The interest in rhetoric and orality was hardly limited to that genre, however. Most of the standard composition texts included rhetoric, and in some cases speech, in their treatment of composition. Indeed “rhetoric” was often contained in the titles of these works. Hart’s Composition and Rhetoric, written originally by John S. Hart in 1870 and revised by James Morgan Hart in 1897, is a particularly good example of the inclusive approach to the teaching of the management of discourse. The elder Hart was a member of the faculty at the State Normal School at Trenton, New Jersey; the younger Hart was Professor of English Philology and Rhetoric at Cornell. At the outset they offered a definition of rhetoric.

1. Rhetoric is the art which treats of discourse. 2. By discourse is meant any expression of thought by means of language. 3. Discourse may be either oral or written.

Note 1. The Greek phrase the ‘rhetoric art’ meant the art of the ‘rhetor or public speaker. Inasmuch as public speaking among the Greeks, and later among the Romans, was usually argumentative, the adjective ‘rhetoric’ was used as a noun, designated the art of argumentative discourse, persuasion. It has this meaning in Aristotle’s well-known treatise, and in Whately’s “Elements of Rhetoric,” based directly on Aristotle, but commonly in time the term Rhetoric has been so extended in meaning as to include everything connected with composition in all its forms.

Note 2. In treating of discourse, we divide the subject into two parts: that which considers the arrangement of the matter or thought to be expressed; and that which considers the manner and details of expression. The former of these is treated under the head of Invention, the latter under the head of Style. (1)

As part of Chapter VIII Hart presented a brief section on “discourse” in which he discussed orations, addresses, lectures, speeches, and the “general principles of constructing discourse.” All of Chapter XI is devoted to “Oratory and Debate.” Although the treatment consumed only twelve pages, it was clearly derived from classical rhetoric, including the taxonomy of deliberative, forensic and epidemic oratory. In the development of his approach, Whatley as well as Hill, who was also working in this area, which is quite different from the treatment of style in his “propriety,” and his development of the orator.

One of the most important of Rhetoric, a book of rhetoric, Harvard, published in 1835, had come to be understood as an historical artifact (e.g. chair, first occupant, English.) In the present way.

Logic simply the science of the subject-matter, is concerned with the principles that allow for the soundness of arguments. It is often contrasted with language, in the distinction between the speaker or the writer and the audience, or the audience’s point of view. Rhetoric, on the other hand, is the study of the art of persuasion, which applies to written and spoken language.

In keeping with this distinction, a clear line between reading and writing,

Part I of Rhetoric is concerned with written or spoken language, which applies to both kinds of discourse. Rhetoric is concerned with the principles that allow for the soundness of arguments. It is often contrasted with language, in the distinction between the speaker or the writer and the audience, or the audience’s point of view. Rhetoric, on the other hand, is the study of the art of persuasion, which applies to written and spoken language.

Interestingly, there are no known traces of early rhetoric, argumentation, and style, which require separate consideration.

Argumentation and style, the important divisions of rhetoric, are said to be persons, their beliefs and their actions. The study of these is not concerned with the construction of discourse. Rather, it is the study of the process that leads to the conviction in the mind of another person, or the intellect as it is known.

Given this, Hill’s concern with the argument is almost all of his concern with the content of the text or prose. Hill quote, for example, in addition to Aristotle, Cicero, George Pierce...
development of the text, Hart frequently cited the works of Blair, Campbell and Whately as well as Aristotle, Cicero and Quintilian, mostly in the section on style, which is quite dependent on eighteenth century writers, particularly Blair. In his treatment of style, Hart used the classification of style as possessing "purity," "propriety," and "precision." This taxonomy was identical with that used by Blair.

One of the more widely used textbooks of the Nineteenth century was The Principles of Rhetoric by Adam Sherman Hill, Boylston Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory at Harvard, published in 1878 and revised and enlarged in 1895. (By this time "rhetoric" had come to be understood as being synonymous with composition and Hill's title was an historical artifact, since oratory was no longer taught by the Boylston Professor. The chair, first occupied by John Quincy Adams, was entirely dedicated to the teaching of English.) In the preface to the 1878 edition Hill defined rhetoric in a distinctly classical way.

> Logic simply teaches the right use of reason, and may be practiced by the solitary inhabitant of a desert island; but Rhetoric, being the art of communication by language, implies the presence, in fact or imagination, of at least two persons, the speaker or the writer, and the person spoken or written to. Aristotle makes the very essence of Rhetoric to lie in the distinct recognition of a hearer. Hence, its rules are not absolute like those of logic, but relative to the character and circumstances of the person or persons addressed. . . . Being the art of communication by language, Rhetoric applies to any subject-matter that can be treated in words, but has no subject-matter peculiar to itself. (v-vi)

In keeping with the belletristic tradition of the eighteenth century, Hill did not draw a distinct line between oral and written discourse. In the pattern of writers such as Blair and Adam Smith, he viewed much of rhetoric as being equally applicable to speaking and writing.

> Part I of this treatise discusses and illustrates the general principles which apply to written or spoken discourse of every kind. Part II deals with those principles which apply exclusively or especially, to . . . kinds of prose writing which seem to require separate treatment. (vi)

Interestingly, Hill reserved his treatment of argument and persuasion, Part II. We detect traces of eighteenth century faculty psychology as Hill differentiated between exposition, argument and persuasion.

> Argument, like exposition, addresses the understanding; but there is an important difference between the two. Exposition achieves its purpose if it makes the persons addressed understand what is said, argument achieves its purpose if it makes them believe that what is maintained is true. . . . (327)

> Argument, if understood to mean merely the process of convincing, seldom occurs by itself; it is usually combined with PERSUASION, which includes all those processes that make the persons addressed willing to be convinced or ready to carry conviction into action. Unlike argument, persuasion is addressed not so much to the intellect as to the feelings. (386)

Given Hill's conception of persuasion, we should not be surprised to find that almost all of his illustrations were drawn from speeches, rather than from written prose. Hill quoted copiously from most of the earlier standard rhetorical texts, including Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, Bacon, Blair, Campbell, Whately, and DeQuincy.

George Pierce Baker, Professor of English at Harvard, and Henry Barrett Hun-
tington, Assistant Professor of English at Brown. In 1895 (revised 1905) they published *The Principles of Argumentation*, which they dedicated to Hill. The first four chapters of the work, dealing with argumentation, analysis, evidence and brief-drawing, resembled Foster's book. The most interesting part of the book is found in Chapter V, which is devoted to “presentation.” To the authors, presentation did not mean delivery. In a chapter of a bit over 100 pages Baker and Huntington really offered a small text on rhetoric, under the headings of 1. “Persuasion” and 2. “The Rhetoric of Argument.” In those sections the students learned about arrangement and style, as well as the elements of persuasion. In the treatment of persuasion Baker and Huntington devoted about 40 pages to that topic. The section on persuasion connected the elements in the rhetorical situation and showed their relationship to each other. In concluding their discussion, the authors indicated the value they gave to rhetoric.

*Persuasion may, then arise from the subject itself, the relation to it of speaker or audience, the relation of speaker to audience, and from pure excitation... It is not enough... to know how to analyze a case, select and value one’s evidence, and choose one’s means of persuasion: One must also be able to clothe thought and feelings in words as to get from one’s audience just the desired response... this essential part of argumentation, the rhetoric of argument, is often neglected by even careful students.* (340-341)

In addition to exercises at the end of each chapter, Baker, and Huntington presented an appendix of almost 250 pages (so long as to require its own table of contents). The appendix contained a variety of materials to assist students in developing their argumentative skills, including examples of argumentative speeches, specimens of matters discussed in the body of the text, and an assortment of exercises. Not surprisingly, the only traditional authority cited was Whately.

John Franklin Genung, Professor of English at Amherst, was one of the most prolific writers of composition textbooks. His *The Practical Elements of Rhetoric*, published in 1886 was his best known textbook and one which clearly showed the influence of traditional rhetoric, beginning with Genung’s definition of rhetoric, which included spoken as well as written discourse.

*Definition of Rhetoric... Rhetic is the art of adapting discourse in harmony with its subject and occasion, to the requirements of a reader or hearer. The word discourse, as it will be used in this treatise, is a general term denoting any coherent literary production, whether spoken or written. Rhetoric as Adaptation... Literary discourse, properly considered, does not exist for itself alone; it is not a soliloquy, but a determinant address to readers or hearers, seeking to impart to them some information or thought, with accompaniment, as occasion requires, of emotion or impulse. Hence, whatever is thus imparted must strive after such order and expression as is best fitted to have its proper power on men; consulting their capacities and susceptibilities. This idea of adaptation is the best modern representative of the original aim of the art. Having at first to deal only with hearers, rhetoric began as the art of oratory, that is, of convincing and persuading by speech; now, however, when the art of printing has greatly broadened its field of action, it must fit itself to readers as well. (1)*

Genung, like many of his contemporaries, divided the province of rhetoric into style and invention.

*The principles of rhetoric therefore group themselves naturally around two main
topics: style, which deals with the expression of discourse, and invention, which
deals with the thought. (7)

In Part II “Invention,” Genung devoted Chapters VII and VIII to “Invention dealing
with Truths: Argumentation” and “Invention dealing with Practical Issues: Per-
suasion.” Genung wished it be clearly understood that argumentation belonged to the
province of rhetoric and not to logic.

Reasoning as a science belongs to logic rather than rhetoric; we are here
concerned merely with reasoning as it appears in literature, that is, reasoning
contemplating readers and hearers, and adapting itself as an art to their capacities
and requirements. It is to this rhetorical art that we give the distinctive name
argumentation. (407)

Genung, in agreement with the thought of his time, accepted the distinction between
conviction and persuasion. He saw persuasion as almost an exclusively oral mode of
discourse “. . . the form that persuasion takes in literature, being almost altogether oral
address, is oratory.” . . . It is the type which, for success, calls for the largest resources,
being an address to the whole man—Intellect and feeling, culminating in an appeal to
the will and therefore utilizing most fully the highest powers of the rhetorical art
(469-70). Persuasion differed from argumentation not only in its purpose but also in
the faculties which were addressed.

Argument can demonstrate with all clearness what were good to do; it can convince
the intellect that the truth of a question is here or there; but when it comes to the
actual doing, argument alone supplies no impulse. To awaken feeling and interest,
and so inspire the will to embody the truth in action. To impart this impulse is the
business of persuasion. (447)

In a continuing recognition of faculty psychology, Genung stipulated that, in order
to attain, “The Speaker’s Achievement of his Object,” the student must address three
human faculties: “the Intellect,” “the Feelings,” and of “The Speaker’s Alliance with
his Audience,” in which he treated of, “Personal Character,” and “Sagacity and Tact”
(449-455). Of the traditional rhetorical writers, only Whately was cited with any
frequency. When Genung wrote about “The Speaker’s Achievement of his Object” he
was very specifically a faculty psychologist.

Now, in order to achieve such an object, the speaker must enlist the whole man on
his side; must make him at once see, feel, and will the truth. In discussing, therefore,
the procedures necessary to this end, we must take up each side of human nature in
turn, and consider what manner of address is most naturally adapted to it. (456)

Genung, therefore, devoted separate sections of the chapter to “Address to the
Intellect,” “Address to the Feelings,” and “Address to the Will.” He stipulated that
appeals to feelings must take into consideration the nature of the audience.

In addressing the feelings the speaker has to consult wisely the taste and culture of
the persons addressed. Uneducated people are more easily swayed by pathos and
humor; but at the same time more palpable and striking, more coarse-grained means,
have to be used. . . Educated people, on the other hand, act more from judgment than
from sympathy, and hence are less susceptible to emotional appeals; but when they
are moved, it is likelier to be by a pathetic touch, or by some stroke on the subtler
chords of human nature, than by a broad joke or a display of tears. (460-461)
The "Address to the Will" is also adaptive and is dependent on the orator’s use of motive appeals.

Hence the proposed action must be so placed before them as to coincide with their own desires and interests; not by itself but through certain intermediate active principles called motives. It is the skillful appeal to motives that the orator has the secret influence with his audience. For motives are the universally recognized springs of moral action, the causes of which the deeds are the effect. (464)

When Genung came to write about oratory proper, he reinvented the classical divisions of speeches as modified in the eighteenth century. He stipulated that all "oratorical discourses" are of two classes; Determinate Oratory, "oratory that contemplates direct and immediate action as its result" and Demonstrative Oratory, "that class of orations wherein no defined end is directly proposed." Under the heading of Determinate Oratory he placed "Oratory of the law, or forensic oratory, . . . Oratory of legislative assemblies or parliamentary oratory, . . . and Oratory of the pulpit, or sacred oratory . . . Demonstrative oratory was really Genung's version of epideictic oratory. . . . wherein. . . . the demands of persuasion are presented in a general impulsion toward noble, patriotic, and honorable sentiments, and toward a large and worthy life" (472-473). In 1895 Genung published a shorter text, Outlines of Rhetoric, which devoted less attention to traditional rhetoric and was more nearly a text in written composition.

One of the textbooks which did not come from a professor at an elite Eastern University was The Essentials of Argumentation by Elias J. MacEwan, published in 1899. Neither the publisher, D. C. Heath, nor the author indicated MacEwan’s institutional affiliation. In the preface, however, MacEwan wrote that, "No apology is offered for the appearance of this book. It is an outgrowth of a dozen years' experience with classes in one of the leading Agricultural Colleges of the country" (iii). One senses, in MacEwan’s description of his students, the differences between his college and the more traditional literary oriented older Eastern institutions.

In a school having but a single course of instruction for the first two years, and differing the last two years in only a few technical subjects, a school essentially scientific, the time for literary work was necessarily limited. That kind of literary training, therefore, had to be provided which was most helpful to those who, in spite of limited preparation, must go out to be leaders of their class. They had not time to study all the niceties of literary expression. They could, at best, master only the elementary principles of rhetoric, and make themselves familiar, in a general way, with the ordinary forms of prose composition. (iii)

Although MacEwan may have had reservations about his students, his treatment of argumentation does not differ substantially from that of Foster or Baker and Huntington. In Chapter III, in the section on persuasion, the author drew from traditional rhetorical sources. He accepts, as did his contemporaries, the division between conviction and persuasion.

In matters involving abstract truths, in mathematics, pure science, and in mere matters of historical fact, the work of argumentation is complete when proofs have been so presented as to induce the desired belief in those addressed. Such truths have little or nothing to do with human conduct. They are addressed to the intellect and their effect as only intellectual. In discussing matters involving the direction of human conduct, it is not usually sufficient to convince the understanding. Men accept a truth, and ignore it in their actions, or they act inconsistently with it, or even in defiance of it. To direct the conduct of those addressed, the speaker or writer must so
appeal to their emotions, so arouse feeling, as to induce a willingness to carry conviction into action. This is called Persuasion, and in argument upon human affairs is almost invariably combined with conviction. (214)

In the section dealing with persuasion, MacEwan treated “ethos,” which he called “personal appeal.” His rhetorical emphasis was shown when he wrote of the necessity of an audience in persuasion.

Persuasion was formerly confined, as it is now for the most part, to oral address. It presupposes an auditor or audience. The orator has before him those whom he is to persuade. He feels their pulse, reads their faces, endures their hisses or is inspired by their applause. While he is preparing his speech in advance, all this must be present to him; and even he who would persuade through the editorial column or the magazine article, must in imagination have before him the class addressed, and seem to look them in the eye, command their attention, work on their feelings, and use the expedients of one actually before them. (219)

Even though he was dealing with both oral and written composition, MacEwan placed great stress on “ethos” which he also referred to as “value of character.”

Nothing but the sterling qualities of manhood will give a speaker success in moving his audience through his own personality. Fervor must be sincere, sentiment genuine, eloquence spontaneous...He must be known as a man of industry as well as of sound judgment...The speaker must be known as honest, sincere, fair and frank;...Evident common sense and a modest friendly manner in a speaker will do much toward making an audience trust his revelation of himself or the management of his material...To have influence, the speaker must be known as a man of ability. (242)

MacEwan paid as much attention to “pathos” as to “ethos.” In his case, however, he had a more modern psychological approach than some of his contemporaries. MacEwan wrote of the “motives” which the speaker might use in attaining persuasion, and he discusses “classes of motives,” “appeal to the highest motive,” “low appeal” and “alliance with those addressed” among other topics.

The most common means of persuasion consists in placing before an audience some motive for action...In every case the speaker must know to what emotion he may successfully appeal, or what motive he may present. These motives are so numerous and diverse that to understand them is not easy matter...Other things being equal, it is best to offer the highest motive which will be effective. Men are induced...by various appeals to the brotherhood of man, to sympathy for those benefited, to a hope of reward, to mere vanity...A motive is more likely to be effective if it is in accord with the habitual state of mind of the audience...Alliance with those addressed is absolutely necessary so to move them as to stir their activities. (234-241)

As was not uncommon late in the nineteenth century, MacEwan’s text included an appendix of more than 125 pages. In the appendix were found texts of speeches by Webster, Brutus, Marc Antony, Burke, and Huxley, outlines and briefs of those speeches, a glossary of over 200 “Propositions for Argument or Debate” beginning with, “Self-made men are the strongest men,” and ending with “The practice of appointing literary men to diplomatic positions is a wise one.” In the book itself, MacEwan cited Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, Bacon and Whately. It is interesting to note that the book contained an advertisement for the publisher under the heading of “Higher English.” Included is O’Connor’s Rhetoric and Oratory.
As an example of a late nineteenth century textbook MacEwan showed that, at that time, rhetoric and oratory were evidently considered to be a part of “literary studies” and that no clear line was drawn between written and oral discourse.

The conviction-persuasion dualism was the starting point for J. H. Gardiner, a former Assistant Professor of English at Harvard, in *The Making of Argument*, published in 1913. Gardiner felt that this distinction must be understood before the students undertook the study of argument.

*This active purpose of making other people take your view of the case in hand, then, is the distinguished essence of argument. To accomplish this purpose you have two tools or weapons, or perhaps one should say two sides to the same weapon, “conviction” and “persuasion.” In an argument you aim in the first to make clear to your audience that your view of the case is the truer or sounder... and in most arguments you aim also to touch the practical and moral feelings of your readers... It would be a waste of breath to convince a man that the rascals ought to be turned out, if he will not on election day take the trouble to go out and vote; unless you have effectively stirred his feelings as well as convinced his reason you have gained nothing. In the latter case your argument would be almost wholly persuasive, in the former almost wholly a matter of convincing... These two sides of argument correspond to the two great faculties of the human mind, thought and feeling, and to the two ways in which, under the guidance of thought and feeling, man reacts to his experience.* (2-3)

Although Gardiner designated the consumer of argument as, “the reader,” his views seemed to be derived from the traditional precepts of rhetorical theory. His concerns were not much different from those of Blair or Whately. He accepted the conviction-persuasion dualism, and his writing was informed by faculty psychology, although he gave it a slightly modern psychological veneer. In the final chapter of his book Gardiner gave his “readers” specific instruction about debating.

Gardiner dealt with “pathos” and “ethos” in Chapter V, “The Argument Written Out.” In section 55 he wrote of the “The Power of Persuading,” and he tied persuasion closely to the emotions of the audience.

*Finally, we have to consider the question of how an argument can be made persuasive probably the most difficult subject in the range of rhetoric on which to give practical advice. The key to the whole matter lies in remembering that we are here dealing with feelings and that feelings are irrational and are the product of personal experience. (190-191)*

In sections 56 and 57 of Chapter V, Gardiner wrote of “The Practical Interests of the Audience,” and “The Appeal to Moral Interest.” In section 58, he summarized his perspective on persuasion.

*Finally, we have to consider the appeal to the emotions, which is the distinguishing essence of eloquence... This appeal is through the appeal to principles and associations which are close to the heart of the audience... Morality, so far as it is a coercive force in human conduct, is emotional; our moral standards lie beyond and above reason in that larger part of our nature that knows through feeling and intuition. (200)*

Gardiner treated “ethos” in section 59 under the heading of “Fairness and Sincerity.” He, essentially, reiterated the traditional rhetorical message about ethical proof, except for his reference to “readers.”
In the long run, however, nothing makes an argument appeal more to readers than air of fairness and sincerity. If it is evident in an argument of fact that you are seeking to establish the truth, or in argument of policy that your single aim is the greatest good of all concerned, your audience will listen with great favor. (208)

(Note that Gardiner now had the ‘readers’ listening.)

In spite of his ambivalence about “readers” and “listeners,” Gardiner actually devoted four pages in Chapter V to “Voice and Position.” In contrast to a number of his contemporaries, Gardiner advocated that his readers study with teachers of elocution or singing. Finally, however, he took a position not unlike that of Richard Whately’s advocacy of “natural delivery.”

What you are or should be aiming at is habit—the instinctive, spontaneous execution of rules which you have forgotten. When the habit is established you can let all these questions of voice, of attitude, of gesture, drop from your mind, and give your whole attention to the ideas you are developing, and the language in which you shall clothe them. (228-229)

Gardiner’s textbook furnished evidence that as late as 1913, only one year before the establishment of the National Association of Academic Teachers of Public Speaking and the founding of the present-day field of Speech Communication, teachers of English were devoting their attention to topics which became standard elements in speech curricula. These teachers of English were concerned with the entire domain of human communication and were willing to consider oratory and rhetoric as components of “literature.” Indeed, Gardiner’s ambivalence about “readers” and listeners was indicative of how broad and how rhetorical was the discipline of English. The time-binding between generations of writers on argumentation is shown by the dedications and acknowledgements in their text books. Baker and Huntington dedicated their work to Adam Sherman Hill, and Gardiner and Foster gratefully acknowledged the influence of George Pierce Baker.

A later composition text, and one which more closely resembled the later texts, was The New Composition and Rhetoric by Fred Newton Scott, Professor of Rhetoric in the University of Michigan, and Joseph Villiers Denny, Professor of English in Ohio State University. Nevertheless, in their 1911 edition, the authors were explicitly rhetorical in their preface, in which speaking, as well as writing, was considered as a component of composition.

Composition is regarded as a social act, and the student is therefore constantly led to think of himself as writing or speaking for a specific audience. Thus not mere expression but communication as well is made the business of composition. (iii)

(The use of the term “expression” may have been a pejorative reference since that term was often used in the titles of elocution texts.) The use of the term “communication” in Scott and Denney was one of the earliest appearances we have been able to find of the term in a rhetorical context. The Scott and Denney text showed its derivation from eighteenth century writers of the School of Belles Lettres in its emphasis on criticism as well as composition. “The aim is to keep the students’ powers of construction and criticism in proper adjustment” (iii). The objective of the book was reminiscent of Blair’s lectures, published more than 125 years earlier.

In the preface of their text Scott and Denney made obvious their inclusion of oral discourse, particularly in argumentation.
Especial attention is paid to oral argument, and explicit instructions are given for the conduct of debates, both formal and informal. (iv)

Indeed, the authors devoted more than 60 pages to their treatment of argument. In contrast to most writers of the period, Scott and Denney did not draw a clear distinction between argumentation and persuasion: their definition seemed to encompass both genres and to anticipate later writings in speech communication, notably from Charles Woolbert, who held that the "conviction-persuasion dualism" did not exist in real life.

By argumentation a person tries to convince others that they ought to believe or act as he wishes them to believe or act. (Scott and Denney, 1911, 353)

The interest in rhetoric and oral discourse was not, by any means, restricted to writers of English Composition textbooks. For example, Ralph Curtis Ringwalt, Professor of English at Columbia, published Modern American Oratory in 1898. The work consisted of seven examples of American speech-making under the traditional headings of deliberative, forensic and demonstrative oratory, with the addition of the standard eighteenth century category of pulpit oratory. Perhaps it was a sign of the times that Ringwalt chose to reprint four examples of demonstrative oratory and only one each of the other genres. The speeches were preceded by almost 90 pages of prefatory material which Ringwalt called "The Theory Of Oratory." It is this section which is of interest to us. The author in his discussion reviewed the historical definitions of oratory, which he found synonymous with rhetoric, from Aristotle to John Quincy Adams. Finally, he settled on a definition of his own which was consonant with other definitions of the time.

... Oratory is largely contingent on the character and condition of the minds of the hearers, and for this reason no absolute standards for it can reasonably be laid down. ... No oration can be judged finally from any other aspect than that of a hearer. Oratory (the true object of which is to produce an effect at the time of delivery) is composed of two elements, matter and manner; and for the purposes of ultimate criticism these two are inseparably connected. (6)

The section dealing with the theory of oratory was a summary of classical and eighteenth century rhetorical theory designed to provide students with criteria for the criticism of orations, but also as a guide for students in their own speech making. The work seemed to be both a later day condensed version of Blair's lectures and a precursor of Thonnensen and Baird's Speech Criticism. Ringwalt provided a bibliography which consists of "Treatises," including all the major works in rhetorical theory, "Histories" and "Collections of Speeches."

The inclusion of rhetoric and oral discourse as components of English was illustrated by the advertisements inserted in Ringwalt's book. Under the heading of "For the Study of English," the publisher, Henry Holt and Co., listed Baker's Specimens of Argumentation-Six Speeches, Wagner's Modern Political Oration, as well as Ringwalt's book. Under the heading Specimens of Prose Composition, we find Baker's Argumentation-Modern In "The Pamphlet Library," is listed a pamphlet version of Wagner's book.

In 1879 William Mathews published Oratory and Orators, which went through at least twelve editions. This work was an oratorical compendium. In the space of some 450 pages and fourteen chapters, Mathews covered such topics as the history of oratory, the qualifications of the orator, the tests of eloquence, political, forensic, and pulpit oratory, and a plea for oratorical culture.

In his work Mathews cited most of the traditional rhetorical sources, both classical
and modern. His conception of oratory was, as he acknowledges, drawn from Campbell.

It [eloquence] is, as Dr. Campbell has properly defined it, "the art by which a discourse is adapted to its end;" and therefore it is impossible to say of any discourse, abstractly considered, whether or not it is eloquent, any more than we can pronounce on the wholesomeness of a medicine without knowing for whom it is intended. While there are certain qualities which all discourses have in common, yet there are others which must vary with the varying capacities, degrees of intelligence, tastes, and affections of those who are addressed. The style of oratory that is fitted to kindle the enthusiasm of Frenchmen, would often provoke only the merriment of Englishmen. (212)

During his career Mathews also produced other communication-related books, such as The Great Conversers, Wit and Humor and Words: Their Use and Abuse.

Austin Phelps, Bartlett Professor of Sacred Rhetoric at Andover Theological Seminary, produced a volume titled English Style in Public Discourse in 1883. Perhaps because Phelps’s book was drawn from his lectures to future clergymen, he, together with other writers, did not distinguish explicitly between writing and speaking or between readers and listeners. Phelps presented a revealing portrait of college graduates of the time.

I have endeavored to meet what I have found to be the actual state of culture, on the subject of my instructions, among theological students, the large majority of whom have been graduates of American colleges. The chief features of that culture have been a limited knowledge of English literature, a more limited acquaintance with the philosophy of language, a still more partial familiarity with the English pulpit, and rather crude opinions, with some degree of indifference on the whole subject of the style of the pulpit. (16)

When Phelps delineated the qualities of style, he drew on the triumvirate of British rhetoric—Blair, Campbell, and Whately. He wrote that, “Four distinct things lie at the basis of these qualities. These are thought, language, the speaker, and the hearer” (6). Out of the relation of thought to language grow Purity and Precision, two of the three prime characteristics explicated by Blair. (Phelps omitted propriety.) The relation of thought and language to the speaker or writer produces Individuality.

It is that quality by which the speaker diffuses himself through his style; not merely that by which he lives and breathes within and throughout its every variation and sinuosity of expression. It is that which Buffon had in mind when he said, “Style is the man himself,” and which others have meant by saying that “style is character.” (6)

Although it was more romantically embellished, Phelp’s view of Individuality resembled Blair’s definition of style, “It is not easy to give a precise idea of what is meant by style. The best definition I can give of it is the peculiar manner which a man expresses his conceptions by means of language. It is different from mere language or words” (101-102).

The relation of “thought and language and the speaker to the hearer” . . . produces three qualities of a good style. They are perspicuity, energy, and elegance. Perspicuity expresses the clearness of thought to the perceptions of the hearer. Energy expresses the force of thought to the sensibilities of the hearer. Elegance expresses the beauty of thought to the taste of the hearer (7). These were, of course, terms used widely by the
British writers and were almost identical to the classification of Richard Whately, who wrote in Chapters I, II, and III of Part III of *Elements of Rhetoric*, “Of Perspicuity of Style,” “Of Energy, or Vivacity of Style,” and “Of Elegance or Beauty of Style” (167, 178, 213).

Although Phelps book was limited to the treatment of the canon of “elocution,” the work was clearly in the rhetorical tradition. It drew upon the ancient writers as well as more modern theorists. In the advertisements inserted by the publisher Scribner, other works by Phelps are listed, including *Men and Books; or, Studies in Homiletics*, and *My Portfolio: A Collection of Essays*.

Another religiously based work published during this period was *A System of Christian Rhetoric* by George Winfrev Hervey. Hervey sought in this book to create a synthesis of rhetoric based on scripture and that derived from traditional rhetorical sources. We are not concerned with the religious aspects of the work, but we should note the continuing rhetorical influence. In Book I, which he called “Inspiration in Preaching,” Hervey displayed his reliance on faculty psychology when he wrote of “Partial Inspiration, its Effect on the Will,” in Chapter I, “Sub-inspiration in its Actions on the Intellect” in Chapter II, and “Inspiration as Affecting Style and Delivery” in Chapter III. In Book II, which Hervey titled “Of Invention,” he dealt with such matters as “Of Political Subjects,” “Topics or Loci Communes,” and “Adaptation.” These categories are clearly restatements of traditional rhetoric. In Book III, “Style,” Hervey used a taxonomy which was almost identical with that of Whately. Hervey classified style as possessing perspicuity, energy and gracefulness (271). Hervey was also the author of a quaintly titled volume, *The Rhetoric of Conversation, or, Bridles and Spurs for the Management of the Tongue*, which I have been unable to locate.

The works we have discussed were written at a time when Elocution was flourishing, and many of the authors did not hide their opinions; usually disdainful, of that “science.” Hervey was both critical and eloquent in his description of Elocution.

*Elocution is theoretically a part of rhetoric, but practically it is now regarded by many as an independent art or science, demanding its own professors, text-books, and classes. This is all very well. But in order to an [sic] enlightened progress, elocution must ever remember that it is still a part of rhetoric, and that although the two may be prudently separated, yet they are never immersible. Words are deep-rooting, and they who occupy themselves chiefly with whatever appears above ground, with leaves, flowers, and fruits of vocables, run the hazard of forgetting the seeds whence they sprang, and what kind of soil and culture is the most friendly to their growth and fecundity. But, it may be said, is not the mere answer in this matter; all that we now ask is that elocution do not come imagine that rhetoric is part of itself, and so the handmaid be heir to the mistress.* (524)

Foster was more blunt and direct in his condemnation of Elocution. He wrote later than Hervey, at a time only six years before the formation of the discipline of “Public Speaking,” and at a time when the status and respectability of Elocution were being questioned at many colleges and universities. Nevertheless, Foster found it necessary to offer his critique.

*There seem to be abundant reasons why the old style “elocution” has been largely superseded in American colleges and schools by courses in argumentative writing and speaking. There is little place for special teachers of elocution. To maintain such teachers is to place the emphasis precisely where it does not belong. All training in spoken discourse—however its name may shift with the winds and tides of popular disapproval—should be subordinate to training in thinking. It should be the means to the end of clear and direct expression of the pupil’s own thoughts. Training in*
public speaking should be conducted by teachers who aim first to produce sound thinkers, second to train these thinkers in the clear, correct, straightforward, and effective expression of their own thoughts. (vi)

Mathews was more ambivalent in his comments concerning Elocution. Although he condemned the excesses of Elocution, he nonetheless, in his chapter “A Plea for Oratorical Culture,” criticized colleges for neglecting the teaching of expression.

We admit that an over-minute system of technical rules—especially if one is enslaved to them—may and almost always will, have the effect which has been complained of. The great fault of such systems is that they attempt to establish mathematical rules for utterance, when they are as much out of place here as they would be in a treatise on dancing. A proper system of oratory or elocution is not a system of artificial rules, but simply a digest of the methods adopted and practiced by all the great orators who have ever lived. (418, 421)

Earlier in the chapter, however, Mathews made a case against the deficiencies of the teaching of elocution.

Not a year passes but we see hundreds of young men turned out of our colleges whose failure in public life is assured in advance, because they have acquired and probably will acquire no mastery of the arts of expression... Skill in oratory is identified with intellectual shallowness... A leading New York journal stated a year or two ago, that it knew of a college, the speaking of its students at one of its commencements ought to have been felt by its officers as a burning disgrace, whose trustees, nevertheless, rejected the application of a teacher of reputation and experience to give gratuitous instruction in that branch of education—For what reason do you think, candid reader? Not because they questioned the competency of the teacher, but because they “didn’t believe in teaching of elocution at all!”
(409-410)

---

CONCLUSION

During the later part of the nineteenth century and the early part of the twentieth century the rhetorical tradition was kept alive in the newly established Departments of English in American colleges and universities. The departments, in a changing academic atmosphere, undertook the responsibility of teaching their students to communicate in English. Although most of the work in the new departments gave primary emphasis to instruction in writing, the courses in English Composition did not slight instruction in speaking. Some departments even created Oral English sections. At the same time the departments undertook responsibility for instruction in belletristic rhetoric, with special emphasis given to Blair, Campbell, Whately and the classical theorists.

The text-books written to meet the new demand were reflective of the situation in American colleges. Although first priority was given to writing instruction, most of the new books integrated a good deal of modern and classical rhetoric. Indeed many of them were written with a rhetorical perspective and included “rhetoric” in their titles.

Most of the text-books paid at least passing attention to oral discourse, and many
of them devoted substantial space to speech. In keeping with the tradition from which they sprang, the Composition texts made no clear distinction between writing and speaking. When they stipulated the objectives of their work, the authors, almost always, spoke of improvement in both modes of discourse. The Composition books, which presumably were reflective of the instructing offered, treated the classical proof of “logos,” “ethos” and “pathos.” They treated all of the canons of ancient rhetoric although most attention was given to “logos,” “elocutio” and “dispositio.” The authors, by and large, adhered to the faculty psychology influenced rhetorics of the eighteenth century and their conception of rhetoric was remarkably similar to those of Blair and Campbell. In their treatment of style, the writers relied on classifications developed by Blair and Campbell and refined by Whately. Overall, however, these were, in no way, theoretical works; they were books designed specifically to meet a demand and they had as their objective the training of not completely literate students in the effective use of their language.

We can classify most of the texts of this period into two categories—those which treated English Composition as a subject concerning written and oral discourse in general and those which were devoted to the more specific application to argumentative discourse. The argumentation texts were closer to being speech texts and when the schism between oral and written communication occurred, argumentation was a sub-field which the new discipline sought to acquire.

The teachers of elocution were not well treated in the writings of the professors of composition. They saw themselves as being concerned with the substance of communication—with logical thinking, clear use of language, cogent organization and purposeful discourse. They saw the elocutionists not only as superficial and trivial but as perverters of rhetoric who stressed all that was offensive to rational discourse.

In all of these texts we find an awareness of the triangularity of rhetoric as propounded by Aristotle. The relations among the subject, the “rhetor” and the audience was made clear. The idea that rhetoric was intended for particular audiences at particular times and places was stated explicitly. As part of the concern with audience the authors were careful to distinguish between conviction and persuasion, a distinction which, by then had become traditional in rhetorical theory.

Thus in the period immediately preceding the foundation of the field of speech, the traditional precepts of rhetoric were nurtured and preserved by departments of English. They helped set the stage for and they provided some of the material for their new rival.

### 3

**THE NEW COLLEGE**

The first organization of a national association was the Eastern Communicative Literature Conference in 1551, and the founding in 1637 of the Puritan Press, which was to tell the story, Pennsylvania, in 1642, and in 1682, when southern New York, in his efforts by. Jefferson College, a group of colleges was attended by the students of the universities, including Universities of New York, Bucknell, Delegating to note how.
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