72-9019

BAILEY, Dennis Lee, 1941-
RHETORICAL GENRES IN EARLY AMERICAN
PUBLIC ADDRESS, 1652-1700.

The University of Oklahoma, Ph.D., 1971
Speech

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFLIMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/3169

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

RHETORICAL GENRES IN EARLY AMERICAN PUBLIC ADDRESS, 1652-1700

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

DENNIS LEE BAILEY

Norman, Oklahoma

1971

RHETORICAL GENRES IN EARLY AMERICAN

PUBLIC ADDRESS, 1652-1700

APPROVED BY

Paul A Bunzel

Leslie Brooks Hill

Wm R Carmack

Bruce Granger

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

PLEASE NOTE:

Some Pages have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank Professor Paul A. Barefield, director of the dissertation committee, for the guidance that led to this study and continued until its completion. I am grateful to the other members of the committee, Professors William R. Carmack and L. Brooks Hill, of the Department of Speech Communication, and Bruce I. Granger, of the Department of English, for their advice and assistance. I also appreciate the encouragement received from Professors William R. Brown and David W. Levy.

To my wife, Ann, I shall always be grateful for the patience, encouragement, and assistance continually given me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	PUBLIC SPEAKING IN EARLY AMERICA.	1
	Introduction	1
	Significance of Colonial Period.	3
	Prior Research	6
	Rationale for Study.	10
	Sources.	16
	Plan of Study.	21
	Summary.	23
II.	PROBLEMS OF CRITICAL METHODOLOGY.	25
	Introduction	25
	Search for a Critical Methodology. . . .	26
	Moving toward Genre Criticism.	32
	Inadequacy of Occasion	40
	Summary.	47
III.	GENRE AS A METHODOLOGICAL CONCEPT FOR CRITICISM	49
	Introduction	49
	Aristotelian Perspective to Genres . . .	50
	An Equivocal Genre Tradition	58
	Contemporary Genre Theory.	63
	Summary.	73
IV.	A DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF THREE RHETORICAL GENRES.	75
	Introduction	75
	Background	76
	Expository Genre	82
	Imprecatory Genre.	95
	Hortatory Genre.	112
	Summary.	123

Chapter Page

V. GENRE CRITICISM AND EARLY AMERICAN PUBLIC ADDRESS. 124

Introduction. 124
Relation of Method to Criticism 126
Results of Generic Analysis 128
Further Research. 132
Summary 132

BIBLIOGRAPHY 134

Selected Seventeenth-Century Public Addresses. 134
Sources on Seventeenth-Century Old and New England. 138
Sources on Rhetoric and Public Address. . 143
Sources on Critical Methodology 148
Bibliographical Guides. 153

RHETORICAL GENRES IN EARLY AMERICAN PUBLIC ADDRESS, 1652-1700

CHAPTER I

PUBLIC SPEAKING IN EARLY AMERICA

Introduction

The Puritan settlers of the Massachusetts Bay Colony demonstrated a remarkable affinity for spoken discourse at all levels of daily life. When they departed from England in 1630, John Cotton joined them at seaside to provide an appropriate farewell address. On the decks of the flagship Arbella, in the middle of the Atlantic, John Winthrop spoke to the assembled voyagers about justice in a godly society.[1] During the six-week crossing, they assembled daily for a two-hour sermon. After reaching the New World, forests were cleared, settlements established, and the newly envisioned society of saints began to take shape.

---

[1]John Cotton, "God's Promise to His Plantation," in Old South Leaflets, III (Boston: Directors of the Old South Work, n.d.), 15; and John Winthrop, "A Modell of Christian Charity," in The Puritans, ed. by Perry Miller and Thomas H. Johnson (2 vols.; rev. ed.; New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1965), I, 194.

The settlers of Massachusetts gave spoken discourse a preeminent role in maintaining the objectives of a Puritan society. Although they prided themselves for abandoning the frivolous anniversary days of Old World religion, these colonists appointed their own special occasions for repentance or thanksgiving. Once a day of fasting was announced, the community assembled at the meetinghouse for psalms, prayer, and preaching. Puritans also met at regularly scheduled times for public teaching and admonishing, usually once during the week and twice on Sunday.

As the decades passed, colonial public address acquired new significance. Samuel Green, Marmaduke Johnson, and others began after 1652 to set speeches to type in the crude presses of Boston and Cambridge. Massachusetts colonists often passed wintry evenings before the fireplaces, reading aloud a timely sermon. On occasions, the widowed Mrs. Winthrop entertained Judge Samuel Sewell with wine and marmalade; the widower returned affections by placing in her hands a copy of sermons by some notable divine.[2] Once the printers began their work, public discourses from pulpit, court, gallows, and garrison weighed heavily among the almanacs, civil laws, and divers other items that came from the presses.

---

[2]Samuel Sewell, "Diary," in The Puritans, ed. by Perry Miller and Thomas H. Johnson (2 vols.; rev. ed.; New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1965), pp. 518-527, passim.

Significance of Colonial Period

Research activities in America's colonial era have intensified, and the increased activities may be accounted for in several ways. The availability of source materials through microform publication no longer restricts investigations to a few libraries. But perhaps a greater factor is a changing attitude toward the significance of prerevolutionary history. Perry Miller, foremost among revisionist historians, began his own colonial studies at a time when the Puritan tradition was considered "the source of everything that had proved wrong, frustrating, inhibiting, crippling to American culture." Resisting criticism from colleagues, Miller continued his research, ultimately presenting evidence "that Puritanism was one of the major expressions of the Western intellect," exerting an extraordinary positive influence in American thought, education, politics, morals, religion, and economics.[3]

Since Miller's first publication in 1932, others have followed his lead, examining those aspects of New England's early culture found relevant to contemporary scholarship. In City on a Hill, historian Loren Baritz traced the prominent qualities of contemporary American thought to their origins. While capable of drawing upon

---

[3]Perry Miller, The New England Mind, Vol. II: From Colony to Province (Boston: Beacon Press, 1966), pp. vii-viii.

a multiplicity of personalities and ideas emerging in the past three centuries, Baritz devoted a third of his book to consider the intellectual milieu of America's first one hundred years, when New England's Puritan theocracy emerged and flourished.[4] That many American values lie within this Puritan tradition also was recognized by Alan Heimert, for in a study to relate "ideology and political commitments to modes of persuasion," he found America's early national period to be an inadequate retreat into the past.

> After pursuing nearly every utterance of this "Golden Age of American oratory," I was, quite frankly, perplexed. For this discourse reflected--in its forms as well as substance--assumptions that could not be comprehended in terms of what I at that time understood as the intellectual universe of the early nineteenth century.[5]

As Heimert moved further backward through American thought and discourse, he found political literature to have its "coordinates" primarily in the Puritan religious tradition--"its homiletics as well as its doctrines"--rather than in the attitudes of the Enlightenment or Romanticism. Both Baritz and Heimert confirmed what Merle Curti first said of Puritanism two decades before: "The Christian tradition, introduced by the first comers, . . . and perpetu-

---

[4]Loren Baritz, City on a Hill: A History of Ideas and Myths in America (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964), pp. viii, 3-89.

[5]Alan Heimert, Religion and the American Mind: From the Great Awakening to the Revolution (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966), p. vii.

uated by conscious effort, was the chief foundation stone of American intellectual development."[6] Sounding an increasingly vibrant theme, Jerome S. Kerwin wrote, "The Puritan laid the foundation of enduring American institutions, and today his influence still penetrates our society."[7] Baritz, Heimert, Curti, Kerwin--these as well as others--have all reiterated what Perry Miller first announced in 1938: "Without an understanding of Puritanism . . . there is no understanding of America."[8]

The past generation has given rise to a growing inquisitiveness within academia over America's colonial origins. Historical and literary studies have proliferated to an extent that the study of early America has in its own right produced a small publishing industry to handle the flow of information. Along with the activities of scholarly specialists, Americans generally are developing greater concern about a national heritage, in anticipation of the country's two-hundredth birthday.[9] Consequently, a steady

---

[6]Merle Curti, The Growth of American Thought (3rd ed.; New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1964), p. 3.

[7]Alan Simpson, Puritanism in Old and New England (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966), p. v.

[8]Miller and Johnson, eds., The Puritans, I, 1.

[9]Perhaps popular sentiment is partially reflected by two books, both enduring well on the best-seller list, and both by the noted New England historian Samuel Eliot Morison: The European Discovery of America (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971), and The Oxford History of the American People (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965).

flow of popular and scholarly books on the colonial period will continue to come from the press.

Prior Research

Miller's claim for the essentiality of understanding Puritanism produces the interesting corollary that without some understanding of Puritan discourse there is no understanding of the history of American public address. Be that as it may, some progress has been achieved. Concern among rhetorical critics for the colonial period first centered upon the elementary need to sketch a history of the subject. Two opening essays in the historical-critical works edited by William Norwood Brigance mark the first efforts, and a history of speech education includes additional monographs, one on rhetorical theory in colonial America and another on its practice.[10] A recently published history of American preaching contains three more essays that carefully explore problems of biblical authority, governmental power, and revivalism in colonial discourse.[11] A monograph by

---

[10]George V. Bohman, "The Historical Background of American Public Address: The Colonial Period," and Orville A. Hitchcock, "Jonathan Edwards," in A History and Criticism of American Public Address, ed. by William Norwood Brigance (2 vols.; New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1943), I, 3-54, 213-237; Warren Guthrie, "Rhetorical Theory in Colonial America," and George V. Bohman, "Rhetorical Practices in Colonial America," in History of Speech Education in America: Background Studies, ed. by Karl R. Wallace (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954), pp. 48-59 and 60-79.

[11]Eugene E. White, "Puritan Preaching and the Authority of God," Leon Ray Camp, "Man and His Government:

Wayne Minnick surveys execution addresses to 1800, and another by Harry Kerr examines the effects of election sermons near the Revolutionary era in popularizing radical ideas.[12]

Several dissertations examine public address during the colonial period, primarily focusing on speeches given at special religious, political, social, and legal occasions. George V. Bohman, for example, studied secular speaking at popular legislative assemblies, in the courts, and on days of public celebration.[13] J. W. Reed focused on an earlier period encompassing the controversy between Roger Williams and John Cotton.[14] Though giving emphasis to the prerevolutionary years, Harold Mixon offered some insights into the artillery election sermons that began in seventeenth-

---

Roger Williams vs. the Massachusetts Oligarchy," and Edward M. Collins, Jr., "The Rhetoric of Sensation Challenges the Rhetoric of Intellect: An Eighteenth-Century Controversy," in Preaching in American History: Selected Issues in the American Pulpit, 1630-1967, ed. by DeWitte Holland (Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1969), pp. 36-73, 74-97, 98-117.

[12]Wayne C. Minnick, "The New England Execution Sermon, 1639-1800," Speech Monographs, XXXV (March, 1968), 77-89; and Harry P. Kerr, "The Election Sermon: Primer for Revolutionaries," Speech Monographs, XXIX (March, 1962), 13-22.

[13]George V. Bohman, "The Development of Secular American Public Address to 1787" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1947).

[14]Roger William Reed, "The Rhetoric of a Colonial Controversy: Roger Williams Versus the Massachusetts Bay Colony" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1966).

century Massachusetts.[15] And in a study of a historical rather than a critical nature, W. F. Terris explored the question of free speech during the early years of the Puritan oligarchy.[16]

Significantly, specialists outside the field of speech communication have demonstrated an interest in colonial rhetoric. Miller's analysis is substantive, especially his writings on Ramus' influence in seventeenth-century rhetorical theory, and on the jeremiad sermons.[17] The Early American Literature Group of the Modern Language Association occasionally focuses on public address, specifically as related to literary personalities or to problems of typology.[18] As a contribution from the field of literature, Plumstead's anthology, The Wall and the Garden, seeks to reveal the aesthetic, literary merits in the prose

---

[15]Harold Dean Mixon, "The Artillery Election Sermon in New England, 1672-1774" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Florida State University, 1964).

[16]Walter Franklin Terris, "The Right to Speak: Massachusetts, 1628-1685" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1962).

[17]Perry Miller, "Declension in a Bible Commonwealth," Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society, LXXXVIII (April, 1941), 3-60; reprinted in Nature's Nation (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1967), pp. 14-50.

[18]See, for example, William D. Andrews, "The Printed Funeral Sermons of Cotton Mather," Early American Literature, V (Fall, 1970), 24-44; and Thomas M. Davis, "Edward Taylor and the Traditions of Puritan Typology," Early American Literature, IV (Winter, 1970), 27-47. Davis' essay examines Taylor's knowledge of typological traditions in twenty-two extant sermons.

of selected colonial election sermons.[19] Prepared as a dissertation over three decades ago, Babette Levy's historical-literary study has since become a standard source for many people wanting an overview of early colonial preachers and their work.[20]

For the present a descriptive summary of prior research is sufficient to determine the status of work on colonial speaking among literary and speech-communication scholars. These studies and others will later be evaluated in detail for their contribution toward providing a method for critical judgment.

In a recent anthology of colonial public address, David Potter and Gordon L. Thomas urge further research, suggesting that although there is no lack of scholarly interpretation, there is a surplus of oversimplification. To really develop a keen appreciation of the germinant colonial period, they recommend giving more attention to "reading the original speeches."[21] The study of colonial public speaking

---

[19]A. W. Plumstead, ed., The Wall and the Garden: Selected Massachusetts Election Sermons, 1670-1775 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1968).

[20]Babette May Levy, Preaching in the First Half Century of New England History (New York: Russell & Russell, 1967). This study was originally published in 1945. Traditional in point of view, Levy is concerned with the role of preachers in society, habits of sermon preparation, descriptions of sermons, and effects of preaching.

[21]David Potter and Gordon L. Thomas, ed., The Colonial Idiom (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1970), p. xii.

should be undertaken in the spirit of their fundamental suggestion.

Rationale for Study

The rhetorical critic engages himself in a two-fold occupation. For reasons that he alone determines, he chooses among alternatives a significant body of speeches to make inquiry. But he also selects a method of investigation, not merely a means of historical discovery but a means of analyzing, understanding, and evaluating rhetorical discourse. In this dual concern for speeches and method, the critic ordinarily veils his method as it functions to enhance the critical understanding of speeches. Occasionally, however, the need may arise to bring into the open both speeches and method, that they may be scrutinized in their interaction with one another, especially if the method bears uniquely upon gaining information about discourse that would otherwise not be accessible. The public speeches of seventeenth-century America and an appropriate critical approach for their study are the dual concerns that prompt this investigation.

Although the American colonial era is fruitful for many kinds of research, public address of the period has received relatively little attention. The history and criticism of colonial speaking appears but thinly sketched when compared with the large volume of rhetorical studies

covering the early national period to the present. This inequity is more apparent when one realizes that America's colonial era is equal in years to its national era. That rhetorical critics have neglected virtually two centuries of America's past should prompt a search of records from Boston to Charleston to find speeches that emerged from the crises of colonial development.[22] An extensive record of speeches from the Massachusetts Bay Colony is already accessible, and these speeches have been examined only in piecemeal fashion.[23] This shortcoming in our present knowledge points to the need for a comprehensive study.

The fact that much of colonial speaking has been overlooked is due perhaps in part to unfavorable preconceptions. The colonial era need not be viewed as culturally inferior or irrelevant to subsequent American life. For one who knows colonial literature, Roy Harvey Pearce seems removed from the subject when, in his anthology Colonial American Writing, he remarks that "there is perhaps not enough of what we may, properly speaking, call 'literature' in this collection, as there was little of the sustained

---

[22]Merrill S. Christophersen offers a few hints about the volume of unexplored documents from the colonial period in "The Unfinished Work of the Research Scholar in the Carolinas," North Carolina Journal of Speech, II (Fall, 1968), 2-6.

[23]Only two of the dissertations cited as previous research, those by Reed and Terris, relate especially to public speaking in the seventeenth century.

esthetic attitude in colonial America."[24] Larzer Ziff reveals greater sensitivity in a subsequent publication, where he says that

> in a period of uncertain beginnings, colonial dependency, alienation from the established way, and anxious searching for ideals that would sustain the spirit in the face of these conditions[,] the literature that speaks most eloquently . . . is the literature that is rooted most firmly in its cultural environment.[25]

Like the literature, the public speaking of colonial America is unique to the times and circumstances, and its inherent relation with the realities of wilderness life and the ecstasies of Puritan thought infuse within the speeches a humaneness that can be appreciated for its historical rarity.

In addition, a generic approach to public address brings forth for contemporary reevaluation a method of analysis that has ancient origins. Modern use of genres for criticism has received little consideration, except for the ancient rubrics of forensic, deliberative, and demonstrative speaking. A generic approach suited especially to colonial public address not only informs the critic about discourse, but perhaps more significantly, it also contributes toward developing genres as a flexible concept in methodology for other areas of critical study.

---

[24]Roy Harvey Pearce, ed., Colonial American Writing (2nd ed.; New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969), pp. v-vi.

[25]Larzer Ziff, The Literature of America: Colonial Period (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970), p. 15.

While rhetorical critics have often concentrated on measuring effect, a generic approach emphasizes the speech itself as a product of the rhetorical transaction. A full history of public address partially concerns itself with socio-cultural elements, but a speech can be appreciated for its own intrinsic worth, in a way perhaps, like the esteem one might have for a work of literature. Richard Murphy once expressed dismay because "that aspect of our work which for centuries justified speech as a humane subject, speech as a literary form, receives less and less attention, and seems on its way to extinction."[26] Several years before, in 1953, Barnet Baskerville reported an investigation into literary histories and anthologies, where he found the English field had progressively abandoned the speech text in the study of literature.[27] Murphy suggested the explanation for this unfortunate trend "is not that the speech has lost its significance but that the attention of literary critics has been directed to other areas."[28] Literary critics have occasionally turned to colonial public address, more so to the colonial area than any other, but their interest has primarily been that of

---

[26]Richard Murphy, "The Speech as a Literary Genre," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLIV (April, 1958), 117.

[27]Barnet Baskerville, "The Place of Oratory in American Literature," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXIX (December, 1953), 459-464.

[28]Murphy, "The Speech as a Literary Genre," p. 127.

searching out speeches with the elevated stylistic qualities of literary prose. Without negating the impact of socio-cultural factors on a rhetorical transaction, nor depreciating the merits of a felicitous style, a generic approach elevates the speech to a renewed level of significance for critical evaluation.

Finally, a generic approach assists in clarifying misconceptions that may arise through undue emphasis upon any one rhetorical element when studying speeches of a period. Frequent comments on the plain style of seventeenth-century rhetoric may leave the impression that Puritan preaching was a discourse of harsh logic and cold abstractions. William Haller contrasts the artful style of Anglicans to the plain and spiritual language of Puritans.[29] And Perry Miller describes the Anglican sermon as an "oration," whereas he says the Puritan sermon "appears on the printed page more like a lawyer's brief than a work of art."[30] Both Haller and Miller have a broad conception of Puritan rhetoric, but in view of such descriptions it is not surprising that Norman Grabo, when introducing Edward Taylor's sermons, exclaims, "Seventeenth-century passions could be reached legitimately only by the often circuitous

---

[29]William Haller, The Rise of Puritanism (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1957), p. 129.

[30]Perry Miller, The New England Mind, Vol. I: The Seventeenth Century (Boston: Beacon Press, 1965), p. 332.

and labyrinthine paths of the reason."[31] To study seventeenth-century sermons from a generic perspective reveals that Grabo is correct in his assessment--but only in part. The study also reveals there was much of what Grabo might choose to call "illegitimate" preaching, by some of the foremost divines of New England.

A generic approach provides an advantageous perspective from which to examine discourse. Thus, for this study of early colonial public address, several questions have been posited: (1) Does any significant diversity exist? (2) Within the diversity, what rhetorical types or genres can be recognized? (3) In delineating these types, what rhetorical elements are significant? What differences exist in form, substance, language, and strategy? (4) What insights are gained when a speech is examined within the context of its own genre, and in relation to other genres of the period?

Although rhetorical critics have sometimes employed a notion of types as identified by occasion, a genre study perceives the speech so as to transcend the categorical limits of occasion.[32] The study reflects an inductive frame

---

[31]Edward Taylor, Christographia, ed. by Norman S. Grabo (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962), p. xx.

[32]Studies defining speech types according to occasion include Kerr, "The Election Sermon"; Mixon, "The Artillery Election Sermon"; and Minnick, "The New England Execution Sermon."

of mind for the investigation, to determine what inherent qualities emerging from the whole uniquely characterize the various parts. By this means, the study reveals that genres, and individual speeches within them, can confidently be discerned only when a critic is aware of how any one type of discourse relates and contrasts with the unique qualities of other contemporary speeches. Through a generic approach, the study achieves a methodological flexibility that enables a critic to speak reliably about the essential rhetorical elements of a speech, to recognize those elements lacking significance, and if he chooses, to explore socio-cultural dimensions relating to the total rhetorical transaction.

Sources

As with much of the history of public address, the speeches of seventeenth-century America survive only in part through printed manuscripts. Most of the extant addresses were delivered and published within the limits of a single geographical region, because English investors and royal governors maintained rigid control over other settlements along the Atlantic seaboard. Although social and religious records indicate that ministers preached as regularly as in New England, few Southern colonial sermons of the seventeenth century have survived. There was no printing within the area until the next century and speakers were unable to publish their sermons and addresses without submitting them

to printers in England. Apparently few attempted to do so. R. B. Davis published only recently the manuscript of a single sermon preached at James City, Virginia, in 1686.[33] After the first Massachusetts colonists arrived, documents were occasionally forwarded to England for publication, but within two decades printing presses were set up at Cambridge and Boston. By the end of the century Boston claimed eight booksellers offering not only imported books but numerous titles flowing from the local printshops.

A glance at the titles from seventeenth-century New England presses reveals that almost one-third of over 900 publications were sermons. With almanacs placing second and laws of the General Court third, sermons made up the largest single item coming from the presses. Assuming that published sermons, generally speaking, represent the more popularly acclaimed achievement of New England preachers, the total volume of addresses which never reached publication was remarkable.

Because of the time which has elapsed, evidence describing any one occasion when a sermon was preached is severely limited. Newspapers were not published until the turn of the century, and any observations from auditors can be found only in a limited number of surviving diaries,

---

[33]Richard Beale Davis, "A Sermon Preached at James City in Virginia the 23d of April 1686 by Davel Pead," William and Mary Quarterly, XVII (July, 1960), 371-394.

journals, and church records. Often the speaking occasion is identified on the title page of a sermon, or in a preface written by the speaker or by one of his admiring colleagues. As can be determined from the published records, the nature of sermons varied in relation to numerous factors. Obviously, the largest number of addresses would have been given at regular Sunday and weekday meetings, but a surprising large number of the published titles, about one-fourth, were delivered at special events. Eighteen sermons appearing before 1700 were preached on occasions of public humiliation, prayer, or fasting. Elections to various legislative assemblies in Connecticut and Massachusetts account for another 29, and 12 more were presented at elections of officers in militia companies. That speeches on these occasion were published so often was no doubt due to the extraordinary efforts put forth by ministers who were honored to speak by special invitations. From the sermons that went to press, a fair representation is found among ministers of the region. Remarkably, however, three men--Increase Mather, Samuel Willard, and Cotton Mather--receive credit for almost two-thirds of the titles, or 163 sermons. Of a total of approximately 258 sermons published, 95 were preached by 51 different preachers.

To determine an exact relationship between a published manuscript and what was actually spoken is difficult and often impossible. Some of the materials described in

publication titles as sermons hardly have the style and form that would be expected. Ministers sometimes revised their messages for publication to an extent that the material no longer appeared in the traditional form of a sermon. In such instances a whole series of sermons were lumped together, with divisions hardly perceivable, the whole work appearing as one long extended treatise.[34]

Fortunately, preachers as a rule made intensive preparation, not for publication but for the actual delivery of their sermons. Although Richard Mather once expressed dismay that "such plain stuff" was going to press without his having occasion to revise it, a manuscript that was not revised did not bear the marks of prematurity.[35] Preachers would view critically an impromptu homily, unless it came from a rare pulpiteer who could impress hearers even without deliberate preparation. While visiting back in England, John Wilson, pastor of the Boston church where John Cotton was teacher, was asked to comment on a chapter from Canticles which had been read at worship. Cotton Mather reported that from a paragraph of proper names which seemed totally

---

[34]See, for example, James Allin, Serious Advice to Delivered Ones from Sickness (Boston: John Foster, 1679). The volume supposedly contains five sermons, but the structure and organization are not apparent. According to the preface, the sermons were "written out by some pious hearers from their own notes," and Allin did not revise them.

[35]Richard Mather, The Summe of Certain Sermons (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Samuel Green, 1652), p. i.

barren of edification, "he raised so many fruitful and useful notes, that a pious person then present, amazed thereat, could not rest without going over to America after him."[36]

Such occasions were rare, however. John Davenport had the reputation for writing out greater amplification than anyone for his sermons, and Samuel Danforth meticulously prepared two full drafts before presentation.[37] Those sermons published from the preacher's manuscript, of course, approached most accurately the delivered sermon.

Sometimes the minister had little control over what went into print, as when a sermon was published posthumously, or when a listener recorded the sermon by hand. Babette Levy describes how some of Thomas Hooker's sermons "were taken down by an unskilled hand and published without their author's consent." She observes that in another book by Hooker, the writer of the preface explained that "as a result of this mischance Hooker's normally clear thinking had been on occasion 'utterly deformed and misrepresented in multitudes of passages, and in the rest, but imperfectly and crudely set forth.'"[38]

---

[36]Cotton Mather, Magnalia Christi Americana; or, The Ecclesiastical History of New England, from Its First Planting, in the Year 1620, unto the Year of Our Lord 1698 (2 vols.; New York: Russell & Russell, 1967), I, 310.

[37]Levy, Preaching, p. 82.

[38]Ibid., p. 84.

In spite of such remarks, seldom was anyone compelled to denounce a publication as not being in any way representative of what was originally spoken. Though all manuscripts may not give any suggestions of their validity, preachers tended to reveal a concern for accuracy to the effect that the publication represent the delivered speech. On special occasions the preachers prepared their addresses knowing that a well spoken message would routinely be published. Interestingly, sermons tended to come in either one or two lengths--approximately 20 to 25 pages, or else 40 to 50 pages--suggesting a delivery time of either one or two hours. And finally, the fact that a full manuscript was prepared tends to establish a degree of reliability between what might actually have been said and what ultimately reached print.

Plan of Study

As suggested earlier, this study pursues two lines of inquiry: classification of public address and critical methodology. Since a preformulated and conveniently sketched critical method has not been brought to the study from another source, responsibility was assumed to explore methodological backgrounds in the field of speech communication, to identify resulting problems of critical analysis, and finally, to demonstrate their resolution through a genre alternative. Once a functional conception of genres

was established, a search was made in manuscripts of seventeenth-century American public speeches that are accessible through microform reproduction of original colonial publications.[39] These manuscripts having been examined, genres were then determined through a procedure of identifying significant clusters of rhetorical elements from individual speeches within the period. This procedure of inquiry is reflected in the following chapters.

Chapter Two examines the evolution of methodology in rhetorical criticism among twentieth-century speech communication scholars, giving special emphasis to Edwin Black's assault on traditional criticism and his suggestions for an alternative frame of reference. Critical studies relating specifically to this dissertation are examined to demonstrate the limitations of past critical methods, especially in the study of colonial public address.

To provide a basis for genre criticism, Chapter Three explores genre as a concept in the theories of rhetoric and poetics in past and present times. The notion of kinds, types, classes, or genres is apparent in Aristotle's works, but successive theorists and commentators lost sight of his premises for classification. Among contemporary

---

[39]For the original imprints in microform reproductions, see Clifford K. Shipton, ed., Early American Imprints, 1639-1800 (New York: Readex Microprint Corporation and American Antiquarian Society, 1965). Entries are correlated to Charles Evans' American Bibliography. The survey for this study includes the first 902 entries.

genre theorists, Austin Warren rejects prescriptive and regulative qualities of traditional genre theory and contends that any modern concept of literary types must be descriptive. Drawing upon Aristotelian and contemporary theories, the chapter establishes some premises to develop a functional notion of genre for rhetorical criticism.

Taking a generic perspective to the study of public address, Chapter Four presents the results of a comprehensive survey of speeches delivered and published in the Massachusetts Bay Colony between 1652 and 1700. Identifying three rhetorical genres, the chapter provides a descriptive analysis of each, including materials from speeches to exemplify qualities of expository, imprecatory, and hortatory discourse.

Finally, Chapter Five brings together the results of genre theory's application to rhetorical criticism. The findings of a generic approach to colonial discourse are considered in terms of varieties, constituents, and relationships. Included are some suggestions for genre criticism in other areas of research in speech communication.

Summary

New England Puritans found no more vital medium for conveying their spiritual mentality to fellow colonists and to posterity than through public address. From pulpits and rostrums alike, they articulated the ideals and fears that

pervaded the entire society. Their vitality of mind and rugged individualism were amply demonstrated when they established the first college and operated the first printing presses in British America. But these were only token evidence of Puritan influences that would pervade subsequent generations, not the least of which was the Puritan delight for provocative discourse.

In the clash of religious ideologies, human frailties, and wilderness realities, public discourse came forth in rapid sequence. A substantive record was left, but speech communication scholars have only begun to explore the era. Their efforts have been valuable in a field where labor has been rare.

This study contends that prior research is both narrow in scope and restricted in methodology, with the result that it has produced only limited conclusions and a piecemeal image of a surprisingly variegated body of discourse. As an alternative means of inquiry, the study advances a generic methodology, to develop and apply it, and thus to gain a holistic perspective of American public address within the seventeenth century.

But first comes the problem of method.

CHAPTER II

PROBLEMS OF CRITICAL METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Although speech communication scholars have not concerned themselves with colonial studies as much as have scholars in history and literature, they have nonetheless been intensively active in efforts to develop appropriate methods for examining rhetorical discourse. In the study of seventeenth-century public address, a method of inquiry must inevitably be assumed, and moreover, the choice of method will determine the nature of the entire study, including the results that can be derived from it.

This chapter considers the problems of critical methodology, with the purpose of ultimately building a rationale for genre criticism. Among its concerns are the theoretical statements of speech critics since Herbert Wichelns' definitive essay. Wichelns pointed the direction for a substantive move in methodological development, but when discontent developed among second-generation colleagues, new approaches were forthcoming. Having noted

Edwin Black's summons for an alternative frame of reference, the chapter proceeds to examine some traditionally oriented studies that develop various notions of speech types. The most significant of these studies examine speeches according to occasion, and in a final section of the chapter, the inadequacy of occasion as the defining criterion for a critical approach to colonial discourse will be demonstrated, in a brief analysis of two seventeenth-century speeches by Joshua Moodey and Urian Oakes.

Search for a Critical Methodology

The Wichelns School

Professors of speech were struggling after 1920 to establish themselves as scholars in a field of inquiry dissociated from departments of English. They set in motion a critical method that dominated their field for over forty years. With the famous 1925 essay on the "Literary Criticism of Oratory," Herbert Wichelns rejected the traditional biographical, historical, and literary approaches to public address, and asserted that rhetorical criticism is not concerned with permanence or beauty, but with effect. "It regards a speech as a communication to a specific audience, and holds its business to be the analysis and appreciation of the orator's method of imparting his ideas to his hearers."[1] The essay suggested a need for critical

---

[1]Herbert A. Wichelns, "The Literary Criticism of

analysis based on the speaker, the speech, and the audience.

Wichelns pointed out the unfortunate results of applying narrow literary standards to rhetorical productions, and in doing so, he freed speech scholars from restraints imposed by a literary methodology. His essay received a phenomenal response, as was realized when, in 1958, Donald C. Bryant claimed that it

> set the pattern and determined the direction of rhetorical criticism for more than a quarter of a century and has had a greater and more continuous influence upon the development of the scholarship of rhetoric and public address than any other single work published in this century.[2]

Wichelns' influence was clearly evident in subsequent studies which mark the advance of rhetorical criticism. Brigance recognized, in 1943, that the speaking examined in the two volumes under his editorship may have permanence and aesthetic excellence, "but final judgment is here based on effect instead of beauty, on influence instead of appeal to the imagination."[3] While suggesting the possibility of literary values, Brigance minimized their significance, as

---

Oratory," in The Rhetorical Idiom, ed. by Donald C. Bryant (New York: Russell & Russell, 1966), p. 35. The Wichelns essay originally appeared in Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of James Albert Winans (New York: Century Company, 1925), pp. 181-216.

[2]From the editor's introduction to Wichelns, "The Literary Criticism of Oratory," in The Rhetorical Idiom, ed. by Donald C. Bryant, p. 5.

[3]William Norwood Brigance, ed., A History and Criticism of American Public Address (2 vols.; New York: McGraw-Hill, 1942), I, viii.

did Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird when, in 1948, they said, "The success of a speech lies not in its well-turned phrases, but in its achieving a desired effect upon its hearers." Thonssen and Baird claimed the primary concern of rhetorical criticism "is that of the speech as communication, i.e., the degree to which it achieves an end consistent with the speaker's intention."[4]

For the appraisal of speeches, Wichelns and his successors developed a monistic approach that employs techniques derived from Aristotle's Rhetoric. Its identifying ideas are

> the classification of rhetorical discourse into forensic, deliberative, and epideictic; the classification of "proofs" or "means of persuasion" into logical, pathetic, and ethical; the assessment of discourse in the categories of invention, arrangement, delivery, and style; and the evaluation of rhetorical discourse in terms of its effects on its immediate audience.[5]

This Aristotelian analysis is by far the dominant method employed in recent speech criticism. In fact, through the years it has virtually constituted the whole of rhetorical criticism.

Dissatisfaction

The preeminence given the Aristotelian analysis, exclaimed Mark S. Klyn, is "largely the fault of the timid-

---

[4]Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, Speech Criticism: The Development of Standards for Rhetorical Appraisal (New York: Ronald Press Company, 1948), p. vi.

[5]Edwin Black, Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method (New York: Macmillan Company, 1965), p. 31.

ity and conformity of succeeding generations of rhetorical critics."[6] But not everyone has been satisfied with conformity. Marie H. Nichols observed, in 1957, that "an occasional critic has broken through the conventional pattern of criticism to make use of methods deriving from the social psychologists, or again to apply recommendations deriving from anthropologists or sociologists."[7] Nichols, however, was quite aware of the record when she said, "A glance at our critical works would indicate an overwhelming number solidly established in conventional aspects of the Aristotelian tradition, with stress upon the functional and dynamic character of rhetoric."[8] The preponderance of these Aristotelian studies has led to what Klyn described as "an oppressive and insular critical orthodoxy."[9]

As critics became aware of the limitations encountered in an Aristotelian analysis, they raised further objections to its use as a critical method. In a summary of their dissent, Baskerville began with Albert Croft's 1950 essay and proceeded to describe at least a half-dozen subsequent attacks on traditional methodology. "All this,

---

[6]Mark S. Klyn, "Toward a Pluralistic Criticism," in Essays on Rhetorical Criticism, ed. by Thomas R. Nilsen (New York: Random House, 1968), p. 154.

[7]Marie Hochmuth Nichols, "Burkeian Criticism," in Essays on Rhetorical Criticism, ed. by Thomas R. Nilsen (New York: Random House, 1968), pp. 75-76.

[8]Ibid., p. 75.

[9]Klyn, "Toward a Pluralistic Criticism," p. 155.

however, was relatively minor skirmishing," said Baskerville. "In 1965, in Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method, Edwin Black rolled out the big guns for a devastating blast at traditional or as he called it, 'neo-Aristotelian criticism.'" Baskerville noted one reviewer who remarked that if Wichelns' 1925 essay gave neo-Aristotelianism its birth, Black's book perhaps would deal such criticism a death blow.[10]

An Alternative Frame of Reference

This overview of methodology makes clear the limited direction many rhetorical critics have pursued. In an enthusiasm to escape literary criticism and establish a critical method of their own, they abandoned a tradition oriented in Aristotle's Poetics, and built another from the Rhetoric. One may question whether Aristotle ever realized a dissonance between the two expressions to the extent some have implied. Perhaps critics are recognizing that such alienation is artificial and in itself restrictive. Nichols' essays describing the "new rhetoric" of I. A. Richards and

---

[10]Barnet Baskerville, "Addendum 1967," to "Selected Writings on the Criticism of Public Address," in Essays on Rhetorical Criticism, ed. by Nilsen, p. 195. Among recent attacks on traditional methodology, Baskerville cited Albert J. Croft, "The Functions of Rhetorical Criticism," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLII (October, 1956), 283-291, Anthony Hillbruner, "Creativity and Contemporary Criticism," Western Speech, XXIV (Winter, 1960), 5-11, and Jon M. Ericson, "A Critique of Rhetorical Criticism," Quarterly Journal of Speech, L (October, 1964), 313-315.

Kenneth Burke, for example, are suggestive of the rapprochement critics can experience from each field.[11] Black's notion of a generic approach stimulates thought in a similar direction.

After his broadside against traditional speech criticism, Black was chided by reviewers for not offering a constructive alternative. Nonetheless, he did ask for an appraisal of rhetorical discourse in terms other than its effect upon an immediate audience. He charged that too many critics have had "little disposition to comprehend the discourse in a larger context."[12] Black did not reject traditional criticism without at least speculating on "an alternative frame of reference."

Whereas traditional criticism tends to define any discourse on a deductive basis, according to the Aristotelian genres of forensic, deliberative, and epideictic speaking, Black proposed to identify discourse along a scale by studying the constituents of a rhetorical

---

[11]Marie Hochmuth [Nichols], "Kenneth Burke and the 'New Rhetoric,'" Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXVIII (April, 1952), 133-144, and "I. A. Richards and the 'New Rhetoric,'" Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLIV (February, 1958), 1-16. Klyn declared in his essay, "Toward a Pluralistic Rhetorical Criticism," p. 147, "The position for which I wish to argue is, in essence, that 'literary criticism' and 'rhetorical criticism' should be taken as truly parallel, and thus that the term 'rhetorical criticism' delimits only a genre, an area of concentration; that it does not define a methodology, as rhetorical critics seem conventionally to have supposed."

[12]Black, Rhetorical Criticism, p. 33.

transaction--strategies, situations, or effects. As clusters of information are acquired at points along the continuum, the characteristics of discourse within a definable genre can be described with greater candor. "In this general direction, at any rate," said Black, "may lie the methods of a productive rhetorical criticism."[13]

Moving toward Genre Criticism

Although studies in American public address have focused on legislative and forensic speaking, political stumping and campaigning, inaugural speaking, and preaching, the scope of many studies has been to examine an individual speaker and his effect upon a limited audience. Robert L. Scott observed, after having read Black's treatise, that "the bulk of criticism which Black studies is the analysis of the speaking of various men; the men give the critics their centers of interest." In response, Scott remarked that

> speeches are only one means of fueling the machine which might stamp out conclusions about persons. The selection of vis oratoris as a tool may be eminently suited to the end, but it might be argued that the end is not speech criticism at all. Although Black does not draw such a conclusion explicitly, he is obviously much less interested in biography and history than most of the critics with whom he deals. In part, his work calls for us to shift the center of our interest as rhetorical critics.[14]

---

[13]Ibid., pp. 132-137.

[14]Review of Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method, by Edwin Black, in Quarterly Journal of Speech, LI (October, 1965), 335-338.

The pervasive influence of what Black called "neo-Aristotelian" criticism would seem apparent, but Scott noted earlier currents of change, saying that "there are signs . . . that Black is riding more on the crest of a wave than he may realize."[15]

Movements, Regions, and an Inductive Approach

Along with Black, Scott concluded that one problem with traditional criticism is that it limits the critic severely: "he either cannot deal with a sizeable body of discourse or must deal with it improperly."[16] Before 1965, however, critical discussion had already begun about broader methodological approaches. Leland M. Griffin, for example, wanted the critic to isolate the rhetorical movement within the matrix of a historical movement. The study of a movement, perhaps involving many speakers, focuses on the total dispute over a single program or policy, from the beginning of public discussion until the time it ceases.[17] Anthony Hillbruner argued more recently that in spite of their traditional approach, many investigators in American public address have also tended to be regional in nature. He cited studies of New England during the colonial period, the Middle South in the early national era, and so on,

---

[15] Ibid., p. 336. [16] Ibid., p. 337.

[17] Leland M. Griffin, "The Rhetoric of Historical Movements," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXVIII (April, 1952), 184-188.

arguing that criteria peculiar to a region's social, economic, political, and intellectual milieu should characterize the critic's methodological approach.[18] Having for a decade promoted a study in regional public address, Waldo W. Braden recently concluded that (as he had earlier suspected) no intrinsic qualities of Southern discourse ever existed to distinguish it from other regions, and that any notion of Southern oratory is more myth than reality.[19]

These studies point less toward providing answers about genres, and more toward confirming the need for further study of critical methods in public address. To the extent that he was concerned with identifying a unique genre, Braden defined the concept solely in terms of geographical region, and from that point sought to delineate unique qualities of all oratory within the region. Hillbruner's concern was not genres but interpretive adaptations from the social sciences which might be applied to critical studies within a region. Significantly, Hillbruner confirmed that the value of a critic's work may be more fruitful if his method of approach stems from the material itself. Concerning a methodology which gleans from intrinsic factors within the work, he remarked that "the so-called

---

[18]Anthony Hillbruner, "Rhetoric, Region and Social Science," Central States Speech Journal, XXI (Fall, 1970), 172-174.

[19]Waldo W. Braden, ed. Oratory in the Old South, 1828-1860 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1970), p. 17.

inductive approach in rhetorical criticism is evocative of the most interesting results."[20]

Speech Types in Prior Criticism

Studies in colonial public address have unfortunately demonstrated a less satisfactory approach than induction. George V. Bohman studied the development of colonial secular discourse, and although he might with less orthodoxy have given more insight into rhetorical genres, he nonetheless invoked the ancient speech types of traditional criticism--forensic, deliberative, and epideictic oratory. In the end he remarked that, generally, "the colonists seemed to limit secular speaking to the needs of forensic and deliberative processes."[21] Though faring better in ability to adapt to the materials, Babette M. Levy's study of seventeenth-century preaching falls naturally within the first three parts of the ancient qualitative canon, an approach prompted by her earlier classical studies. After developing in seven chapters such matters as pertaining to invention, arrangement, and style, she devoted a final chapter to audience reception.[22] Perhaps no study

---

[20]Hillbruner, "Rhetoric, Region and Social Science," p. 174.

[21]George V. Bohman, "The Development of Secular American Public Address to 1787"; "Abstracts," Speech Monographs, XV (1948), 189.

[22]In Levy, Preaching, the traditional approach is especially apparent in titles to Chapter II, "The Doctrine

of colonial rhetoric does more to distort than does J. W. Reed's analysis of the controversy between Roger Williams and John Cotton. The critic literally forces the structure of an intercollegiate debate upon a sequence of varied exchanges through court, press, pulpit, and letters.[23] Black's suggestion regarding an argumentative genre no doubt has potential for more illuminating criticism.

But not all studies of colonial discourse have been so rigid in approach, and the investigative rewards are apparent. Within the traditional rubrics of occasion, audience, speaker, and speech, Harry P. Kerr analyzed as a genre the New England election sermons dating from 1763 to 1783. Unlike some studies, his occasionally ventured beyond limiting canons. Kerr claimed that the annual sermons followed a distinct pattern, and in doing so, they popularized and reinforced a major philosophical rationale for the Revolution, namely, that reason and revelation sanctioned the compact theory of government. He suggested that "adherence to form is evident in such minor matters as length and arrangement, as well as in the limited number of ideas which appear in the sermons."[24] Significantly, Kerr thought

---

as It Was Preached"; Chapter V, "The Form of the Sermons"; Chapter VII, "The Plain Style and Its Variations"; and Chapter VIII, "The Reception of the Sermons."

[23]Reed, "The Rhetoric of a Colonial Controversy,"

[24]Kerr, "The Election Sermon," p. 18.

the organization of sermons was less than traditional, representing what he considered to be a slight modification of the exposition-application pattern commonly used by ministers of dissenting sects. But Kerr's notion of speech types was obviously determined by occasion, and his foremost critical objective was to evaluate the effect of election sermons in precipitating the Revolution.

In another study that gives only partial attention to seventeenth-century speaking, Harold Mixon examined election sermons delivered before the "Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company of Boston" between 1672 and 1774. With greater awareness of genres than most critics reveal, Mixon first observed that these sermons resemble in many respects those preached on any other occasion. He wrote specifically about the organization, arguments, and themes of the sermons, and only when considering themes did he note any unique qualities. Generally, he said the sermons concern the role of a Christian as a temporal warrior. More specifically, they reveal variations upon four distinct themes, which he identified as the qualities of a good soldier, the justifications of war under certain conditions, the commendable and legitimate role of a churchman in the military profession, and finally, the need for military preparedness.[25] Mixon did not find these themes peculiar to the

---

[25]Mixon, "The Artillery Election Sermons," pp. 14-50.

seventeenth-century and he joined Kerr with a concern for their effect in the eighteenth century. Mixon concluded that one must be cautious in declaring these thematic developments as provocative factors for the Revolutionary War, because they appeared decades before a conscious movement toward independence. Nonetheless, said Mixon, the themes did contribute to "a larger stream of discourse prompting patterns of thought which prepared the colonies for the ideas of the revolutionist."[26]

In an essay on the social changes in seventeenth-century Massachusetts, Perry Miller identified still another variation in sermons. The notes taken by listeners reveal that most preachers ordinarily devoted themselves to speaking about doctrines of theology and morality. "Yet the fact remains," said Miller, that the most significant sort of sermon

> was not an exposition of doctrine, not a description of holiness or of grace, not a discourse on what had once been the preoccupation of New England, the reformation of polity, but instead was a jeremiad in which the sins of New England were tabulated over and over again, wherein the outward judgments which God already had inflicted were held to presage what He would increase in violence unless New England hastened to restore the model of holiness.[27]

These lamentations over the decline of religion and the increase in sin were "the most polished, thoughtful, and

---

[26]Ibid., p. 208.

[27]Perry Miller, "Declension in a Bible Commonwealth," in Nature's Nation (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1967), pp. 23-24.

impressive creations" to come from colonial society in the years between 1660 and 1690. Miller added that jeremiads preached during the 1670s were "the literary triumphs of the decade and deserve to rank among the achievements of the New England mind; some of them made so deep an impression that they were cited and quoted down to the eve of the Revolution."[28]

In another essay, Wayne Minnick offered a critical study of early New England execution sermons.[29] The essay bore close resemblance to Bower Aly's previous study of gallows speeches on the frontier in the early nineteenth century.[30] Minnick joined Aly in a concern for the occasion and the social context, but Minnick gave greater emphasis to these factors, noting in detail the social attitudes toward crime, the convicted, and capital punishment. When turning to the sermon text, he provided an analysis of its structure and themes that carefully adhered to a traditional perspective. Minnick filled the essay with descriptions of the speaker's qualifications, biblical and secular authorities in the sermon, and emotional appeals and responses.

---

[28]Ibid.

[29]Minnick, "The New England Execution Sermon," pp. 77-89.

[30]Bower Aly, "The Gallows Speech: A Lost Genre," Southern Speech Journal, XXXIV (Spring, 1969), 204-213.

Several of the studies reviewed here have demonstrated some awareness of types or genres in rhetorical discourse. Unfortunately, Bohman approached the colonial period in search of speeches fitting a classical mold, and Reed fared worse when he attempted to view a seventeenth-century controversy in terms of a twentieth-century intercollegiate debate. More appropriately, Levy, Kerr, Mixon, and Minnick approached their subjects with some attention focused on distinguishing qualities imposed by the occasion--a fast, election, or execution day. Miller identified addresses from varying occasions which nonetheless possess similar socio-political themes. Although recognizing differences in kinds of speeches, these studies appear traditional in method. Each of the studies consists of a narrative on social context, occasion, speakers, form and context of speech, audience response, and frequently, an ethical evaluation in light of standards contemporary to the critic. But no critic, with the possible exception of Miller, attempted to integrate these factors and relate them to the language of the discourse itself. And Miller alone perceived a distinctive kind of speech beyond what may be defined by the occasion.

Inadequacy of Occasion

Studies such as these offer helpful interpretations to some aspects of public address, but to understand

seventeenth-century discourse within its rhetorical context, the studies are limited. One problem with these is that an occasion in itself may not fully delineate the uniqueness of discourse. An address given at the election of provincial representatives may be profitably considered along with other addresses delivered on similar occasions, and moreover, it may well possess similar qualities with those speeches; but it may also be dissimilar in more respects than it is alike. In fact, although the occasion can give a speech a specific definition, that speech may possess more substantive qualities which cause it to bear resemblance with other addresses given on occasions other than elections.

Deviations from Type

Identifying themes within speech types as they are defined by occasion may present a problem in handling variations among speeches. The problem is suggested, for example, in two representative seventeenth-century addresses by Joshua Moodey and Urian Oakes. Both speeches were delivered on similar occasions but one differs significantly in conventions of theme and development.

Joshua Moodey preached in 1674 one of the earliest extant artillery-election sermons. Mixon's thematic description serves well to project the substance of Moodey's message. The text, from I Corinthians 9:26, reads, "So

fight I, not as one that beats the air." From this curt expression Moodey sets forth the doctrine: "To be in the equipage or capacity, and to perform the work of a souldier, and that vigorously, stoutly, strongly, strenuously, is the duty incumbent upon every Christian."[31] Of the themes Mixon specifies, two emerge from Moodey's sermon. One concerns the role of the Christian in the military, and the other calls for military preparedness. "Times of peace are Time to prepare for Warr," says Moodey.[32] He charges some men with making training days to appear like recreation days. And for any others who see no value in drilling, he remarks:

> Perhaps your Exercises may look like beating the Air, because you are not called forth to real Service, but know that Preparation for real Service is real Service, and if you do nothing but beat the Air now, you will be like to do little toward beating your Enemy then.[33]

"If Warr comes," he continues, "the comfort of having done our duty, and the profit of being in a readiness, will more amend for the trouble." In view of these remarks, it is significant that Moodey devotes only a part of his sermon to military matters, because he is interested in teaching about spiritual warfare. His development is primarily allegorical with a strong biblical orientation. The organization is lax when compared to some other highly structured sermons of the day.

---

[31]Joshua Moodey, Souldiery Spiritualized (Cambridge, Mass.: Samuel Green, 1674), pp. 1, 5.

[32]Ibid., p. 40. [33]Ibid., p. 38.

The sermon by Urian Oakes, also published in 1674 but preached two years earlier, is even more interesting, primarily because it does not fit Mixon's thematic mold. It is clearly an artillery-election sermon. The text comes from Romans 8:37, which reads, "Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerers, through Him that loved us." And from the doctrine, Oakes claims "that all true believers have a transcendent, and incomparably glorious conquest and victory in all their severe engagement with the enemies of their peace and happiness."[34] Both text and doctrine potentially lend themselves to military oratory, but Oakes preaches a different sort of sermon, one that deals exclusively with spiritual matters in the warfare of Christian living. Unlike Moodey, he has no concern whatever for carnal enemies; Papists, Antinomians, and other sectaries were a greater danger. In the first exhortation, he says, "Let all true Believers be greatly encouraged to fight against their Spiritual Enemies; & that both in their private and public Capacities."[35] Oakes later says his purpose, in imitation of the Savior, is "to make a Spiritual Use and Advantage of Common Things, and to improve obvious Occasions and Occurrences in a Parabolical, Allegorical, and Spiritual way."[36] He explains further, saying, "I have

---

[34]Urian Oakes, The Unconquerable (Cambridge, Mass.: Samuel Green, 1674), pp. 1, 7.

[35]Ibid., p. 31. [36]Ibid., p. 38.

taken Rise and Advantage from the Military occasions of this Day to discourse (as the Lord hath enabled) of the Spiritual and Christian Warfare.[37]

Significantly, Oakes addresses himself to the military audience only in the closing moments of the sermon. Even these comments are devoted in part to disclaiming any knowledge of military science. Moreover, he declares himself an opponent to war. Labeling the existence of warfare as "this Iron-Age," he says, "I am no Friend to warre, but an unfeigned lover of Peace. I long for an End of the warres."[38] Oakes then disavows any intention of making a military oration, "which is more proper for some Gentleman of that Profession." He declares his purpose is "but to preach a Sermon, on a Military occasion, that might be of Use (if the Lord please) to the whole Assembly."[39]

As suggested earlier, these two artillery-election sermons help point to a problem in criticism. Approaching the manuscript of an address from the perspective of occasion may reveal little more about the speech than the occasion itself. Critics have at best generalized about themes. Mixon's analysis of themes adequately relates to the Moodey sermon, but it proves to be of little relevance in suggesting the substance of the sermon by Oakes. Mixon intends

---

[37]Ibid., p. 37. [38]Ibid., p. 38.

[39]Ibid.

only to say that many, or perhaps most, artillery-election sermons previous to the Revolutionary War touch upon one or more of four themes. In a similar manner, Miller points to a group of sermons and broadly defines the jeremiad, suggesting that they were ordinarily delivered on ceremonial occasions, and that they condemned backsliding among the colonists. Miller's purpose is not so much to analyze the addresses as it is to extract data concerning social and religious problems. Levy's approach, aimed toward seeking out the "great men" from a host of seventeenth-century preachers, serves its purpose well, is interesting, will continue to be useful, but still provides little basis for handling the full body of seventeenth-century discourse.

Studies that focus upon individual speakers are as pluralistic as there are personalities available to study, and the same is perhaps as obviously true of studies that base a critical analysis on the occasion. Let it not be overlooked that in seventeenth-century Massachusetts, preachers spoke on many occasions. Included among them were fast days, prayer days, humiliation days, election days, thanksgiving days, and execution days. Special addresses also developed from lecture days, specifically those held at Boston, from celebrations of the Lord's Supper, from renewals of church covenants, from natural phenomena, such as comets, or natural disasters, and from funerals. In addition, there were farewell sermons, reformation sermons,

youth sermons, meditational sermons, and of course the regular pastoral and didactic addresses of Sunday and weekday meetings. Reading the sermons published during the century reveals these and perhaps other occasional addresses. Again, each occasion can provide a point of departure for rhetorical analysis, but the method serves inadequately to synthesize data so the critic can gain a more comprehensive perspective of public speaking during this period of history.

A Clue from the Jeremiad

The matter should not be dropped, however, without returning for a moment to the jeremiad. It provides a clue for a more flexible basis of analysis than can otherwise be found.

During an era of geographical, social, and economic expansion, the sermon, as described by Miller, discloses a chronology of steady deterioration of New England Puritanism. It reflects a growing concern among clergymen for the spiritual welfare of the colonists, and as preachers confront church members, it provides expression for what becomes a universal anxiety. Pointing to the terrors which will descend unless repentance is forthcoming, the sermon becomes more intense with emotion. It is not restricted to personalities, and in spite of its thematic emphasis upon apostasy, it represents a sort of rhetorical discourse that

potentially sweeps beyond the limits of occasion. In fact, its distinctive theme, its emotional intensity, and the occasion all interact among variables of personality, form, substance, and style to give the sermon its own identity.

But as suggested previously, Miller's notion of the jeremiad is the product of interests other than rhetoric. A rhetorical appraisal must resolve the problem of identifying the role of such speaking within the broader context of other contemporary public discourse. The appraisal considers prevailing rhetorical elements, and through them seeks out various major types of discourse emerging from the period. In the jeremiad, Miller points to what is indeed a recognizable type within seventeenth-century speaking, but a comprehensive survey of the manuscripts from a rhetorical perspective reveals that the jeremiad is only part of a broader genre of contemporary public address, one with which it shares many rhetorical elements in common.

Summary

Herbert Wichelns provided a valuable contribution to the development of speech criticism. Although Edwin Black was but one of several critics who had ideas about change in speech methodology, his treatise served as a catalyst that has produced needful interaction and careful re-evaluation of contemporary critical thought. Some studies in speech have revealed varying emphases in

approach, but in the study of colonial public address, the most significant approach has been through occasion. Yet occasion does not give an adequate perspective to develop a method for comprehensively studying a large body of discourse.

CHAPTER III

GENRE AS A METHODOLOGICAL CONCEPT FOR CRITICISM

Introduction

Reviewers of Edwin Black's treatise expressed more interest in his assault against neo-Aristotelianism than in his notion of genre criticism. This hardly means that genre criticism has little potential merit, but it does point to the appeal of an iconoclastic strike against tradition. Black also presented his genre system as an "alternative" to traditional criticism, but ironically, Waldo Braden suggested that "both approaches are probably complimentary."[1] Indeed, both traditional criticism and genre theory do have potential to reciprocate one another; both have common origins in classical antiquity.

Black's sketch of genres was somewhat "gross," as he himself remarked, bringing to mind the problem of definition that persists in genre theory from ancient times to

---

[1]Review of Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method, by Edwin Black, in Southern Speech Journal, XXXI (Spring, 1966), 249-250. Other reviews include John Lee Jellicorse in Quarterly Journal of Speech, LI (October, 1965), 338-342; and Lawrence W. Rosenfield in Speech Teacher, XV (January, 1966), 89-90.

the present.[2] One aspect of that problem is knowing just what a genre is, and another is deciding whether, once a genre is defined, to view it as descriptive or prescriptive. For the moment, one might simply remark that a genre is "a class or category of artistic endeavor having a particular form, content, or technique."[3] However, the abstract nature of a dictionary entry demands that more be said.

Genre is not a new concept, but in the study of rhetorical criticism, it can turn into an awkward if not ambiguous word. To resolve any equivocacy that may exist, this chapter examines genre as a concept in the thought of past and present speech and literary theorists, so that evolving ideas about the concept may be understood with their prescriptive and descriptive values. The objective of the chapter is to set forth premises that may be useful in formulating a flexible concept of genre, one capable of handling the sizeable body of seventeenth-century discourse and informing the critic about its significant rhetorical qualities.

Aristotelian Perspective to Genres

Ancient Greek authorities thought of types of literature as naturally as they thought of kinds of oratory.

---

[2]Black, Rhetorical Criticism, p. 176.

[3]As defined in The Random House Dictionary of the English Language, ed. by Jess Stein and Lawrence Urdang (New York: Random House, Inc.), p. 591.

In the Ion and the Republic, Plato wrestled with the problems of art-versus-inspiration among lyric poets, and the uncontrolled passions evoked in the writings of tragic and comic poets.[4] Obviously, he and other men of his age recognized some notion of literary genres.

Genres in Rhetoric

In the Rhetoric and the Poetics, Aristotle demonstrated what a generic approach can accomplish. Though his interests were broad, he had a special fascination with marine zoology, and from this study he developed a methodology that produced keen habits of observation. When turning to other realms of inquiry, he proceeded in a uniform manner, taking specimens, analyzing, and classifying them. As might be expected from his habits of observation, when Aristotle wrote in the Rhetoric about the oratory of Athens, he recognized three kinds of speaking--political, forensic, and the ceremonial oratory of display.[5]

Aristotle offered a four-part rationale for his analysis. First, he explained that the basis for types was "determined by the three classes of listeners." "For of the three elements in speech-making--speaker, subject, and

---

[4]Plato, "The Ion," in Literary Criticism: Plato to Dryden, ed. and trans. by Allan H. Gilbert (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1963), p. 14; and "The Republic," ibid., p. 53.

[5]Aristotle, Rhetoric, trans. by W. Rhys Roberts (New York: Random House, Inc., 1954), p. 32.

the person addressed--it is the last one," he remarks, "the listener, that determines the speech's end and object."[6] Second, he observed that the speaker's goal regarding each audience is unique: political speaking urges the hearer to do or not to do something; forensic speaking either attacks or defends somebody; and, ceremonial oratory either praises or censures somebody. Third, he noted that "these three kinds of rhetoric refer to three different kinds of time."

> The political orator is concerned with the future: it is about things to be done hereafter that he advises, for or against. The party in a case at law is concerned with the past; one man accuses the other, and the other defends himself, with reference to things already done. The ceremonial orator is, properly speaking, concerned with the present, since all men praise or blame in view of the state of things existing at the time, though they often find it useful also to recall the past and to make guesses at the future.[7]

And fourth, he recognized that the end of each type controls the speaker's handling of his subject. "The political orator," says Aristotle,

> aims at establishing the expediency or the harmfulness of a proposed course of action; if he urges its acceptance, he does so on the ground that it will do good; if he urges its rejection, he does so on the ground that it will do harm; and all other points . . . he brings in as subsidiary and relative to this main consideration. Parties in a lawcase aim at establishing the justice or injustices of some action. . . . Those who praise or attack a man aim at proving him worthy of honour or the reverse, and they too treat all other considerations with reference to this one.[8]

---

[6]Ibid., pp. 31-32. [7]Ibid., p. 32.

[8]Ibid., pp. 32-33.

Although Isocrates, Plato, and others wrote of various kinds of oratory, Aristotle merits credit for the most definitive and systematic discussion of the subject. His three types became a standard part of traditional rhetoric.

While discussing the three types, George Kennedy remarks that Aristotle's criteria have been criticized, because no single element forms the basis for his analysis. However, Kennedy finds no problem with the classification, and he notes that Aristotle was more concerned with theory than with individual speeches. Moreover, the categories serve well for what Aristotle subsequently said about the special topics of speeches, as well as for his later discussions of arrangement and style. Perhaps tending to be overly cautious, Kennedy concludes that "the classification should not be regarded as a keen perception of the types of speeches in fourth-century Greece."[9]

His statement can only be accepted with qualifications. That no single criterion forms the basis of Aristotle's analysis suggests not the weakness of the analysis but its strength in recognizing the multiple factors that interact to characterize various kinds of speeches. In addition, one may safely grant that, as Kennedy claims, works of Aristotle's own time "do not always show clearly

---

[9]George Kennedy, The Art of Persuasion in Greece (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1963), pp. 85-87.

the characteristics of only one of his kinds of speeches."[10] But the fact that Aristotle provided a valid means of critically approaching many contemporary speeches is emphatically demonstrated by Kennedy's own use of the system. While studying "the course of oratory as a literary genre," Kennedy devotes a major portion of his book to applying the tripartite analysis to the works of Attic orators, thus assuming an approach to rhetorical discourse that is of itself generic in nature.[11]

Aristotle's types of speeches are accurate reflections of what he observed to the extent that he sought to delineate norms within a field, and concurrently to theorize, on the basis of specific evidence from individual speeches. His focus on the main thrust of a speech rather than on its various digressions, and his capacity to generalize from specifics to formulate theoretical values revealed his genius not merely for identifying genres but for grasping the whole of rhetorical theory from Athenian public discourse.

Genres in Poetics

Aristotle applied to the study of poetics the same analytic methodology he used with rhetoric. In his only extant treatise on the subject, the Poetics, he gave

---

[10] Ibid., p. 87. [11] Ibid., p. 126.

special attention to tragic drama.[12] However, he also recognized comedy, epic, and lyric as additional parts of poetic art, sometimes contrasting tragic with comic or epic qualities. In noting these four categories, Aristotle was not innovative but merely observant. His genius came to bear instead on the manner in which he described tragedy as a poetic genre.

Aristotle identified six constituents of tragic drama--plot, character, thought, diction, spectacle, and music--and each element was developed with the intent to demonstrate its function in producing the whole. He perceived plot, an "imitation" and "putting together" of sections, to be the most important part of tragedy. "Without action there can be no tragedy," said Aristotle. The tragic plot imitates a "finished and entire action having reasonable size," and possesses completeness with a beginning, middle, and end. Moreover, it moves "the feelings of the audience," thus producing pity and fear

---

[12]The extant version of the Poetics is more fragmentary, and perhaps more corrupt in substance than is the Rhetoric. Neither work is complete, and with the Poetics, Aristotle leaves critics guessing about the substance of an alleged companion treatise on comedy. Lane Cooper provides evidence that the "Tractatus Coislinianus" (dated from the Hellenistic era) is an outline that may reflect Aristotle's own adaptation of the Poetics to comedy. See Paul D. Brandes, "The Composition and Preservation of Aristotle's Rhetoric, Speech Monographs, XXXV (November, 1968), 482-491; and Lane Cooper, An Aristotelian Theory of Comedy with an Adaptation of the Poetics and a Translation of the Tractatus Coislinianus (New York: n.p., 1922), pp. 10-18.

through reversals and recognitions. The result is "the catharsis of such emotions."[13]

Closely relating character to plot, Aristotle wrote of these elements as the two natural causes for dramatic action. The plot reveals character through its actions. He described the tragic character as possessing goodness, appropriateness, consistency, and as having resemblance to truth and reality. For an understanding of thought, which is "shown in everything that the characters must bring about by means of speech,"[14] Aristotle referred the reader to the Rhetoric, wherein are developed principles concerning proof and the arousal of emotions. He described a diction that appears "other than commonplace," even if speeches are elevated "in forms no one would use in conversation." He identified such diction as "language that is made sweet" through ornamentation.[15]

The precision with which Aristotle described both poetic and rhetorical genres should be apparent. His categories carried such a convincing validity that they became part of a standard idiom for the study and practice of both arts. During the Hellenistic era, the Peripatetics included the rhetorical types within the canons that Cicero later systematized and made popular. And the rhetorician,

---

[13]Aristotle, "On the Poetics," in Gilbert, p. 76.

[14]Ibid., p. 98. [15]Ibid., p. 76.

grammarian, and poetic commentator, Donatus, perpetuated the poetic types on through the Middle Ages.

Donatus, however, robbed the genres of their qualitative definitions by substituting the qualitative canon of rhetoric for poetic analysis.[16] By the end of the Middle Ages, the rhetorical scheme so strongly dominated poetic studies that the quantitative parts of rhetoric were also employed. Sometimes a schoolman analyzed a whole drama quantitatively, but more often he divided an individual scene as though it were an oration.

When in the sixteenth century scholars once again had access to Aristotle's works, rhetoric and poetics were confused to an extent that had far-reaching effects, going up to French classical drama, which had long speeches given by characters, not as a part of the action. However, the Italian critic, Robortello, partially reversed the trend that Donatus began, when he discovered anew the six poetic qualities.[17] And in doing so, he also discovered the qualitative and quantitative parts of both arts were parallel, and proceeded to combine them into a common basis for criticism. "As a result," says Marvin Herrick, "the

---

[16]A background of Donatus' role in medieval rhetoric and poetics appears in Marvin T. Herrick, Comic Theory in the Sixteenth Century (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1950), pp. 5-58, passim.

[17]Bernard Weinberg, A History of Literary Criticism in the Italian Renaissance (2 vols.; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), I, 75.

rhetorical analysis and the poetic analysis became virtually inextricable, as they formerly were in ancient times."[18]

An Equivocal Genre Tradition

In the midst of medieval confusion, the rhetorical and poetic types remained intact, though greatly weakened in significance. Their deterioration resulted both from growing authoritarian sentiment and from changing conditions. Cicero expressed skepticism at viewing the rhetorical genres as models for all speeches, and Quintilian was even disturbed that one might attempt to so limit rhetoric. Yet both men abdicated to an authoritarianism that allowed for only three types of speeches.[19] The types were also weakened through efforts to apply them to changing forms of discourse. The advent of Roman government by an appointed official class, whether political or ecclesiastical, reduced deliberative and forensic oratory to the formality of syllogistic exercises, while at the same time sophists and churchmen assiduously cultivated occasional oratory and applied its elements to such diverse forms as biography and preaching.

The poetic genres were weakened not only by dis-

---

[18]Herrick, p. 33.

[19]Cicero, De Oratore, trans. by E. W. Sutton (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1967), pp. 97-98, 219-233; and Quintilian, The Institutio Oratoria, trans. by H. E. Butler (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963), pp. 389-395.

tortions in Aristotle's method of analysis, as already described, but also by authoritarianism which laid down rules where Aristotle had observed an ongoing process. With the revival of drama during the Renaissance, the tendency was to view the Aristotelian genres in a cookie-cutter fashion, elevating conformity to tradition above artistic creativity. Such legalism was demonstrated by the conflicts between traditional theorists and innovative playwrights, which appeared, for example, in the development of tragicomedy and in the playwriting of Corneille.

The uncertain role of genre as a concept for criticism can be attributed to its precarious past. The distortions and misapplications of the Aristotelian types have resulted in an ambiguity about how to define and identify genres. Then too, the occasional tendency to view genres as prescriptive carries with it an accompanying reaction. In 1587, Jacopo Mazzoni wrote about the traditional poetic genres. Character forms his basis for analysis, and his tone is moralistic and prescriptive.

> Heroic poetry was chiefly directed to soldiers, since they may be encouraged to imitate the virtuous actions of the heroes. . . . Tragedy is concerned chiefly with what is useful and helpful to princes, magistrates, and powerful persons, and for this reason, in order to hold them always in subject to the justice of the laws, it prefers to present the horrible and terrifying accidents of the great; . . . Comedy has as its chief purpose to benefit persons of low or middle estate, and in order to console them for their low fortune was in the habit of presenting actions that conclude happily.[20]

---

[20]Jacopo Mazzoni, "On the Defense," in Gilbert,

Through his description of each genre's tradition, Mazzoni sought to reveal how good poetry should be written. Though simple in its analysis, his description preserved the clarity of the ancient genres.

While attempting to overcome the traditional rigidity that Mazzoni accepted, Sir Philip Sydney produced a series of genres that reveals far less rationale. He first divided artists into religious, philosophical, and "right" poets, and it is naturally with the latter that he concerned himself. He then remarked that poetry is "sub-divided into sundry more special denominations."

> The most notable be the heroic, lyric, tragic, comic, satiric, iambic, elegiac, pastoral, and certain others, some of these being termed according to the matter they deal with, some by the sort of verse they like best to write in.[21]

Sydney only hinted at a rationale based on substance and versification, but his position characterizes that which often emerges from subsequent criticism.

Further illustrating the problem of definition, Thomas Wilson described, in a 1553 treatise, the ancient rhetorical genres. Wilbur Howell provides a summary of Wilson's description, revealing how it combines elements from both classical and medieval rhetoric. Wilson illustrates deliberative oratory, says Howell,

---

p. 382.

[21]Sir Philip Sydney, "The Defense of Poesie," in Gilbert, p. 416.

> as the private counsel we might give a friend in an effort to induce him to study the laws of England, or as the epistle we might write either to persuade a young man to marriage or to comfort a mother on the death of her sons.[22]

Wilson obviously reflected the status of political processes in previous centuries, but if deliberative oratory were made of personal advice and letters, forensic and demonstrative oratory fared better. "Judicial oratory was flourishing in Wilson's day," observes Howell,

> and he illustrates it without modifying or extending classical doctrine. Demonstrative or ceremonial oratory was also flourishing. Wilson illustrates it by writing a commendation . . . [and] by adding a discourse in praise of King David for the killing of Goliath, and by throwing in a discourse in praise of Justice.[23]

"These two latter are close to sermons in substance and tone," says Howell, "although Wilson does not offer them as pure examples of this type of demonstrative oratory."

Where Wilson hesitated, George Campbell did not, for some two centuries later, in a treatise that at times attempted to encompass rhetoric and poetic as one realm, Campbell described three sorts of discourse: "orations delivered at the bar, those pronounced in the senate, and those spoken from the pulpit."[24] He proceeded to develop

---

[22]Wilbur Samuel Howell, Logic and Rhetoric in England, 1500-1700 (New York: Russell & Russell, Inc., 1961), pp. 106-107.

[23]Ibid.

[24]George Campbell, The Philosophy of Rhetoric, ed. by Lloyd F. Bitzer (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1963), pp. 98-99.

the third, saying little about the other two except where they illustrate some quality of public speaking.

Though familiar with classical doctrine, Joseph Priestly chose instead an analysis more appropriate to an emerging scientific mentality. "All the kinds of composition," he said, "may be reduced to two, viz. Narration and Argumentation."[25] Although Priestly offered a brief explanation for his dichotomy, Hugh Blair included a whole series of chapters in his treatise without any regard for principles of classification. He accepted the traditional genres of rhetoric, though like Campbell, assigning preaching to the demonstrative category, and he proceeded to speak of additional types ranging from historical writing to Hebraic poetry.[26]

Other conceptions of genre have hardly fared better in the intervening time since Campbell and Priestly. While twentieth-century rhetoricians may speak of informative or persuasive discourse, or of the ends of speech to convince,

---

[25]Joseph Priestly, A Course of Lectures on Oratory and Criticism, ed. by Vincent M. Bevilacqua and Richard Murphy (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University, 1965), p. 6.

[26]Hugh Blair, Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres, ed. by Harold F. Harding (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1965), II. Note especially chapters 27-29, 39-42, 45, and 47, which consider speaking before popular assemblies, at the bar, and in the pulpit; historical, philosophical, and epistolary writing; pastoral lyric; didactic, descriptive, and epic poetry; and tragic and comic drama.

to entertain, and so on, little serious thought appears to have been given the subject. With the revival of interest in Aristotle's Rhetoric, critics all too easily assume the traditional genres are applicable to contemporary discourse, even as they assume other rubrics from the Aristotelian system. "Implicit in many of our textbooks and journal articles," says Wayne Brockriede, "is the prescription of precepts derived from ancient, not contemporary, practice." Brockriede points to the fact that Aristotle viewed a relatively simple Greek society of his day, and his observations are necessarily less suited to explain the more complex and very different rhetorical practices of another era. "The permanent value of Aristotelian rhetoric, indeed the essence of Aristotelianism, is its method of empirical description and theoretical system."[27] Rhetorical critics have no need to struggle--like the perplexed Renaissance critics confronting tragicomedy--over the problems of classifying sermons or any other form of modern discourse. A more suitable approach can be found through a contemporary Aristotelian methodology.

Contemporary Genre Theory

Austin Warren speaks about the study of literary kinds as a study in "genre theory," and he is one of a

---

[27]Wayne E. Brockriede, "Toward a Contemporary Aristotelian Theory of Rhetoric," Quarterly Journal of Speech, LII (February, 1966), 34-35.

relatively small number of contemporary scholars who have nurtured an interest in the study.[28] With a background of confusion and skepticism from which to work, he provides insights that breathe new life into an old subject. Aristotle sketched a system of genres for both rhetoric and poetics, and since the premises behind his system have been forgotten, and the genres have been far removed from the empirical context in which they were first developed, it will be helpful to consider the suppositions that a few revisionists offer after having newly evaluated the regulative tradition.

Austin Warren cautions that one should not confuse the prescriptive doctrines of classical literary theory with a modern study of genre. "Classical theory is regulative and prescriptive" whereas "modern genre is,

---

[28]To reflect contemporary work in genre theory, three studies should be noted: Norman Holmes Pearson, "Literary Forms and Types; or A Defense of Polonius," in English Institute Annual, 1940 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1941), pp. 61-72; Austin Warren, "Literary Genres," in Rene Wellek and Austin Warren, Theory of Literature (3rd ed.; New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1956), pp. 226-238 [first published in 1941]; and Northrop Frye, "Rhetorical Criticism: Theory of Genres," in Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays (New York: Atheneum, 1968), pp. 243-326 [first published in 1957].

In January, 1968, a new journal began quarterly publication. Entitled Genre, and edited by Donald E. Billiar, Edward F. Heuston, and Robert L. Vales, the journal announced interests in "(1) theoretical discussion of the genre concept, (2) historical studies of particular genres and genre debates, (3) attempts to establish and define genres, and (4) interpretations of works of literature from a genre point of view." This publication indicates more recent thought in genre criticism.

clearly, descriptive."

> It doesn't limit the number of possible kinds and doesn't prescribe rules to authors. It supposes that traditional kinds may be 'mixed' and produce a new kind. . . . Instead of emphasizing the distinction between kind and kind, it is interested . . . in finding the common denominator of a kind, its shared literary devices and literary purposes.[29]

The modern study of genre is complicated by the fact that genres do not remain fixed. "With the addition of new works," says Warren, "our categories shift."

Genre is not a concept which concerns only the critic or theorist. Warren argues that literary kinds may be regarded as "institutional imperatives which both coerce and are in turn coerced by the writer."[30] While not rigid like a building, the genre is an institution through which the writer can work, either expressing himself through an existing institution or creating a new one. Warren suggests that great writers are rarely inventors of genres. "The good writer partly conforms to the genre as it exists, partly stretches it."

Although insistent upon a descriptive definition, Warren believes that a conception of genre "should lean to

---

[29]Austin Warren, "Literary Genres," in Rene Wellek and Austin Warren, Theory of Literature (3rd ed.; New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1956), pp. 234-235.

[30]Ibid., p. 226. Warren refers the reader to Norman Holmes Pearson, "Literary Forms and Types; or, A Defense of Polonius," in English Institute Annual, 1940, ed. by Rudolf Kirk (New York: Columbia University Press, 1941), pp. 59-72, and especially p. 70.

the formalistic side." Thus he defines genre in terms of "outer" and "inner" forms.[31] A theory of genre is a principle of order, involving an externally observable form, and it classifies literature and literary history not by time or place but by literary types of organization and form. Warren perceives form as an essential factor in any critical or evaluative study of genre. But genre theory reaches beyond the outer form and searches for an inner form--the attitude, tone, or purpose of a work. Warren considers this latter factor essentially a study of subject and audience.

Since the ancient jargon of literary kinds still prevails, Northrop Frye complains that a theory of genre remains an undeveloped subject in criticism. He believes that from a historical perspective, the basis of generic distinctions appears to be the "radical" of presentation. Words may be written for a reader, but they are nonetheless presented in a form that has primitive roots in the speaker-listener experience of oral discourse. Though it may be slightly illogical to describe readers of a book as an audience, Frye argues that "the basis of generic criticism in any case is rhetorical, in the sense that the genre is determined by the conditions established between the poet and his public."[32]

---

[31]Ibid., p. 231.

[32]Northrop Frye, "Rhetorical Criticism: Theory of

Frye believes one must consider the "radical" of presentation if the distinctions of acted, spoken, and written words are to mean anything in an age of printing. A Romantic poet may give his poem a dramatic form, never intending it for the theater,

> yet the poem is still being referred back to some kind of theatre, however much of a castle in the air. A novel is written, but when Conrad employs a narrator to help him tell his story, the genre of the written word is assimilated to that of the spoken one.[33]

Frye supposes it might be simpler not to use the term radical, and whatever the realities are, to say that the generic distinctions identify the ways in which literary works are ideally presented. But this concept of genre does not serve the critic. The purposes of criticism by genres is not merely to classify, but genres should help the critic to clarify traditions and affinities, and identify literary relationships that would go unnoticed without a generic context established for them.

Frye attempts to approach the broad spectrum of literature, searching inductively for a concept of genre, and in his survey he focused specifically on linguistic rhythms and sweeping thematic development. Public address finds a place in his discussion, because as a form of rhetorical prose, Frye says it is best adapted linguistically

---

Genres," in Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays (New York: Atheneum, 1968), p. 247.

[33]Ibid.

to the two purposes of rhetoric--ornamentation and persuasion.

Yet Frye considers the prose of oratory to be in perpetual conflict, struggling between the psychological discords of ornament and persuasion. Ornamental speech is disinterested, inseparable from literature, static in its effect on hearers, and articulative of emotions; in contrast, persuasive speech is purposeful, applying literary art to reinforce argument, leading hearers kinetically towards action, and manipulative of emotions.

Employing the Bible as a model of thematic continuity, Frye observes that from one perspective it "presents a seamy side of bits and pieces," while from another it "presents an epic structure of unsurpassed range, consistency and completeness."[34] The mystery of its continuity should be instructive to literary criticism. Frye suggests, first, that the Bible may be examined from an Aristotelian perspective, as a single form, as a story in which pity and fear are cast out through a knowledge of good and evil. Or secondly, it may be examined from a Longinian perspective, as a series of ecstatic moments or points of expanding apprehension.

Frye maintains that the difference in viewpoint is suggestive of a critical principle for all literature. A generic analysis of literature is dependent on the

---

[34] Ibid., pp. 325-326.

Longinian perspective, which perceives beyond the individual forms to recognize distinctive recurring themes.

> We find that the sense of unified continuity is what the Bible has as a work of fiction, as a definitive myth extending over time and space, over invisible and visible orders of reality, and with a parabolic dramatic structure of which the five acts are creation, fall, exile, redemption, and restoration.[35]

Regardless of implications for higher criticism, Frye contends that biblical literature can be identified as a meaningful genre only when perceived holistically, and in all literature the holistic approach equips the critic to recognize thematic elements essential for generic classifications.

Warren and Frye offer no pretense in these studies for being conclusive. They emphasize a present lack of knowledge which prevents comprehensive theoretical statements. But as a summary of their ideas suggests, they are proposing some tentative hypotheses about the nature of genres. What they fail to emphasize is the means through which they arrive at their conclusions. One will fine no appeal in their essays to traditional or prescriptive authority. In effect, they have assumed a perspective toward genres that reflects Aristotle's original basis for generic analysis. They are employing an Aristotelian method in its truest sense, as Brockriede describes it, a method of empirical description that leads to a theoretical system.[36]

---

[35]Ibid., p. 325.

[36]Brockriede, "Toward a Contemporary Aristotelian

Other genre theorists are quick to emphasize this methodological point of view. E. S. Juan, Jr., for example, points to the difference between literary theory, which is regulative, and genre theory, which is reflective thinking and not deduction. "A literary genre represents a class," says Juan, "whose members are defined by enumerating a set of properties that they share, such properties having been arrived at by empirical induction."[37] Eliseo Vivas concurs in the need for an inductive definition, and he adds that once a genre is defined so, it is an open concept (though it may be closed arbitrarily), and is valid only for the members of the class from which it was obtained.[38]

When examining literature for purposes of defining genres, Juan notes that "one cannot really have any experience unless there is a principle of selection for giving sense to the raw data of experience."[39] And it is at this level that the suppositions offered by genre theorists assist in approaching the raw data of seventeenth-century public address.

Theory of Rhetoric," pp. 34-35.

[37]E. San Juan, Jr., "Notes Toward a Clarification of Organizing Principles and Genre Theory," Genre, I (October, 1968), 261.

[38]Eliseo Vivas, "Literary Classes: Some Problems," Genre, I (April, 1968), 103.

[39]Juan, "Notes Toward a Clarification of Organizing Principles and Genre Theory," p. 261.

There may be a limit to the degree that literary concepts can be applied to rhetorical discourse, but some thoughts from genre theorists appear relevant. Warren suggests a generic analysis based on the identification of inner and outer forms. He speaks of the purpose, attitude, and tone of a work as elements of inner form, and outer form includes not only poetic structure but stylistic dimensions of language. N. H. Pearson clarifies the nature of form when he distinguishes it from the major divisions of literature, such as the novel, short story, or epic. Form represents the patterns in language that have become a norm of expression. "It is possible," says Pearson, "to recognize an arrangement of words as characterizing Miltonic, as Whitmanesque, as Jamesian," and thus as a generic element established and acceptable to an age or school.[40] Frye emphasizes the importance of viewing a literary body holistically to reach beyond individual members of a genre to identify relationships and affinities concerning historical context, poet and audience, themes, and qualities of language that would otherwise go unnoticed. More recent discussions among genre theorists have emphasized the need to discover the unifying principle behind a genre, and thus to arrive at the motive sustaining the genre.

Several precepts emerge from the study of genre,

---

[40]Pearson, "Literary Forms and Types," in English Institute Annual, 1940, p. 71.

specifically from Aristotle and from contemporary theorists, that have relevance to developing a generic approach to rhetorical discourse. First, contemporary genres must be developed out of the context of actual rhetorical practice. Aristotle observed the Athenian forum, and from the evidence provided, he sought to differentiate according to kinds. His immediate contact with the materials of his analysis produced a system that had validity and relevance. A concept of genres for modern discourse must proceed from a similar immediacy with the materials of discourse.

Second, genres must emerge from an inductive process of inquiry and reflective thought. To proceed from the principles of traditional theory, and to force these principles upon modern discourse, may produce an erroneous perception, according to the extent that theory deviates from practice. But to proceed inductively does not minimize the critic's need to move from "experience" with the materials he studies.

Third, genres must be descriptive in definition. From the theorist's point of view, genres give order to reality, and do not regulate or prescribe for future practice. The extent to which a speaker may participate in and be influenced by the conventions of a genre is a potential concern for criticism. But first the genre itself must be defined so as to describe the speaker's actual product.

Fourth, genres must not only classify but also uncover relationships. Kindred qualities emerge among the individual members of a genre, and qualities within members are brought into relationship with their counterparts from other genres. Moreover, genres reveal the overall qualities of a full body of discourse.

Finally, genres must point to the intents and means of discourse. A speaker or occasion are not the foremost concern, but the speech reveals through thought and language the goals of discourse.

Summary

As a concept for analysis in both rhetoric and poetic, genre has evolved along a precarious historical path. Aristotle gave the concept its most systematic treatment as a part of his broader theories for speech and drama. Genres were also incorporated into Roman rhetorical theory and Renaissance literary theory, but even as early as the Hellenistic era, the idea of kinds began to acquire a prescriptive value. Renaissance theorists inherited a muddled tradition that prompted some to view genres as a means for classifying the appropriate rules of practice. Some modern theorists took the traditional categories for granted, or supplemented them, and others occasionally rejected the whole system in a search for an updated approach to discourse and literature. Contemporary theo-

rists have accepted the reality that some system of classification is unavoidable, and have begun to re-evaluate the rationale behind literary kinds, with hope of formulating a comprehensive theory of genres.

CHAPTER IV

A DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF THREE RHETORICAL GENRES

Introduction

The fact that Puritan preaching is occasionally perceived as a rigid, highly-structured specimen of sterile prose is not without some factual basis. The jeremiad is but one sort of seventeenth-century sermon, and it contrasts sharply with a plainer preaching that was heard on many occasions. This contrast is significant, for from it can be found a basis for rhetorical criticism which incorporates a full body of sermonic literature, a criticism which assumes a holistic perspective to better understand any one speech through its relation to other contemporary addresses.

This chapter begins with a summary of two preliminary matters relating to the public discourse of seventeenth-century New England: the cultural milieu in which the sermons were preached, and the traditional guidelines for the structure of sermons. Once these matters have been considered briefly (so as to provide a limited background), the chapter will present a generic approach to colonial speaking, including definitions of three genres and a de-

scriptive analysis from representative speeches.

Background

Preaching in Puritan Life

The meetinghouse was from the beginning a focal point in the construction of every Massachusetts village and town. Its design was not one that harmonized with ritual and encouraged meditation through aesthetic sensory appeals. The meetinghouse was an austere edifice because the builders wanted it plain and functional.[1] The privations of life in a wilderness might have dictated such construction, but even in the cathedrals of England, Puritans insisted upon churches that resembled a public meeting hall more than a house of worship. Prior to his migration to the New World, John Cotton had to face royal authority after parishioners stripped St. Botolph's of all cathedral ornaments.[2] When the New England settlers assembled for religious purposes, they met to speak and listen, whether through prayer, psalms, or preaching. And as they gathered in the meetinghouse,

---

[1]Descriptions of the seventeenth-century meetinghouses are found in John Coolidge, "Hingham Builds a Meetinghouse," New England Quarterly, XXXIV (December, 1961), 435-461; Elise Lathop, Old New England Churches (Rutland, Vt.: Charles E. Tuttle Co., 1963); and Harold Wickliffe Rose, The Colonial House of Worship in America (New York: Hasting House, 1963).

[2]Larzer Ziff, The Career of John Cotton: Puritanism and the American Experience (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1962), p. 41. This is the most thorough biography of John Cotton in print.

they had about them an edifice designed to elevate preaching to a level comparable to the Lord's Supper.

Early immigrants made preaching a regular part of their religious and social lives. While Englishmen in the southern colonies often hustled deep into the forests to cut out large plantations, their northern counterparts moved primarily through the development of new towns. The plan called for re-establishing a complete community on a traditional pattern which reached back to England, and the settlers moved only after acquiring a minister and covenanting together to form a new church.[3] They provided a building for religious assemblies, and as the decades passed they often organized two or more churches to overcome the crowded conditions in the original congregation. The first church at Newtown was established in 1633, with Thomas Hooker as pastor, but during the next two years new immigrants arrived in sufficient numbers to warrant establishing a second church.[4] Whatever the size of a community, the settlers

---

[3]Darrett P. Rutman, American Puritanism: Faith and Practice (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1970), pp. 47-56 and 80-88, passim. Rutman notes that in Massachusetts of 1650 there was one practicing minister for every 415 persons, whereas in Virginia there was one for every 3,239 persons. He says, however, that before the end of the century, Massachusetts people began to establish a few small settlements without immediately covenanting to form a church and secure a pastor.

[4][Edward Johnson], Johnson's Wonder-Working Providence, 1628-1651, ed. by J. Franklin Jameson (New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1959), pp. 90-93, 107-109.

assembled with their pastor at least once on Sunday, and if they were served in addition by a teacher, they also met for an afternoon sermon. In his early history of Massachusetts, Edward Johnson remarked that the first settlers of Cambridge were pleased that their homes were not disturbed by local Indians while they spent "whole dayes at Sabbath-Assemblies."[5] Following a tradition which gained popularity during the years of dissent in Stuart England, these early colonists also assembled for a Wednesday or Thursday lecture. These weekday addresses attracted considerable interest, because churches frequently had opportunities to hear visiting lecturers.

Traditional Structure of Sermons

Whatever the occasion that brought listeners together, New Englanders heard an address that in many respects was peculiar to the seventeenth century, and especially was this true regarding the structure of the sermon. The form of Puritan sermons was influenced by a traditional standard.[6] Each address began with a definite biblical text which the preacher proceeded to "open" or clarify however

---

[5]Ibid., p. 92.

[6]For the origin of this tradition, see Wilbur Samuel Howell, "Ramus and English Rhetoric, 1574-1681," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXVII (October, 1951), 299-310; Howard H. Martin, "Puritan Preachers on Preaching: Notes on American Colonial Rhetoric," Quarterly Journal of Speech, L (October, 1964), 74-82; and Everett H. Emerson, "John Udall and the Puritan Sermon," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLIV (October, 1958), 282-284.

possible. Most often, through definition or etymology, he explained the meaning of key words or phrases. Other methods called for surveying the historical background or revealing the biblical setting from which the text was taken. The preacher was not bound to any one approach. If he had a text that met his needs in developing a message, he felt no compulsion to limit himself. In fact, he might choose to ignore surrounding passages and historical background, and proceed to define the text according to his immediate needs, even if meanings were developed in disparity with the broader context of the Scripture. On the other hand, he might choose to explicate the text by employing several methods. Although the opening varied in length among sermons, generally, it was limited to no more than one-tenth of the total message, and framed somewhat as a preliminary, though essential, part of the sermon.

The "doctrine," following immediately after the opening, was the most important part of the sermon's structure. As a proposition epitomizing the speaker's main idea, it probably received vocal emphasis in delivery comparable to its bold type in the published manuscripts. Often the doctrine appears as a mere rewording of the text, or it may be a separate though related idea, forming the basis to build the remaining sermon in an inverted-pyramid fashion.

After the doctrine came a series of "proofs," "reasons," or "causes," which served to amplify the doctrine, and usually constituted the sermon's first section of any length. The proofs were corollary propositions to the doctrine, and each was developed primarily through use of quoted or paraphrased biblical references. If the sermon was aimed primarily to instruct about some biblical concept in a broad, abstract sense, this constituted the longest part of the sermon. If, however, the sermon was intended to give immediate relevance to a scriptural concept perhaps already familiar to hearers, the preacher here occupied himself with little more time than he spent in opening the text. The exact function of the proofs might appear obvious in some sermons, whereas in others a confused organization emerges as the sermon alternates between proofs, reasons, and causes, with no apparent rationale or line of thought. Perhaps some of this confusion can be attributed in part to a lack of subordinated printing type when enumerating various series of propositions. New Englanders valued a clearly organized message that facilitated the taking of notes.

If the preacher did not devote most of his emergies to proofs, the sermon became more dependent upon the "improvement" or "uses" of the doctrine. As a rule all sermons contained an improvement section, but it received

far greater emphasis when the message was aimed at immediate concerns. The improvement often proceeded through a series of enumerated uses which were each developed in turn. Sometimes the uses were more specifically defined according to a pattern Charles Chauncy once sketched for a fellow minister.

> Explain the words of your text clearly; bring clear proof of parallel scriptures; let your reasons be Scripture-reasons; but be most in application; which is spent in five uses, refutation of error, information of the truth, correction of manners, exhortation and instruction in righteousness. All of which you find in 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17. And there is a fifth use, viz: of comfort, 1 Cor. xiv. 3.[7]

Although the application was usually more general than readers of subsequent generations would have liked, some sermons tended to possess more concrete references to persons, events, and issues at hand than did others. All sermons ended with an affirmative appeal, in accordance with Chauncy's precept "of comfort," regardless of how vehement a "refutation" or "correction" had preceded. This appeal was often no more than a sentence or two.

Identification of Genres

The speeches examined for this study have been approached inductively with the purpose of identifying rhetorical elements that characterize distinctive groups of speeches. With the realization that an analysis of

---

[7]Quoted from a letter dated December 20, 1665, in Cotton Mather, Magnalia, I, 471.

the raw materials of discourse cannot be handled without some "experience," the investigation began with concern for the interaction of such factors as speaker, subject, listener, theme, style, context, and time.[8] These factors were applied as perceived in traditional rhetorical theory and contemporary genre theory. After speeches were examined individually, they were re-evaluated in order to move beyond preliminary elements of analysis and toward subsequent identification of types. The results of the investigation are provided in the definitions and descriptive analyses of three rhetorical genres.

Thus, seventeenth-century public address can be understood from a generic perspective when individual speeches are envisioned as occupying some point along a hypothetical continuum or scale. Toward the left end of this horizontal line would be placed speeches that are to be described as <u>expository</u> addresses, and toward the right end would be <u>imprecatory</u> addresses. A middle position on the scale would indicate <u>hortatory</u> addresses.

<u>Expository Genre</u>

Expository addresses are those which reveal a minimum effort to produce belief, sometimes appearing to be

---

[8]In an inductive investigation, "one cannot really have any experience unless there is a principle of selection for giving sense to the raw data of experience." Juan, "Notes Toward a Clarification of Organizing Principles and Genre Theory," p. 261.

only an interchange of information. The occasion is ordinary and ritualistic, and the message's temporal focus is primarily in the past. Characters within the message are fixed and fated. The speaker strives to make his message remembered, and the speech is often characterized by persistent repetition at points of division rather than by reasoned argumentation. The message can usually be trimmed to order more or less casually without any revision of its overall internal organization. It is frequently given in series. Its style is diffused, usually in the manner of an equation and in a series of parallel terms, often exhibiting some common element of form. The structure is ordinarily apparent, or even bold. The message is developed at a high level of abstraction, primarily through textual exegesis and with a thorough biblical orientation. The speech stands forth on its own in an immediate cultural vacuum. It is distinctively contextual, self-enclosed, non-referential, and intramural in substance. The speech keeps the listener firmly within the bounds of the message itself, obligating him to create in his own mind the world to which the speech relates. Although it may be partially aimed at dissuasion, the speech has an objective tone that projects a sense of speaker detachment. This detachment tends to minimize the significance of source credibility in reception of the message. The overall rhetorical effect is that a

subject be regarded in a certain way. The speech itself tends to be functional in nature, didactic, instructive, informative.

Expository addresses were the most commonly delivered of seventeenth-century sermons, but their routine functions of informing the unregenerate and edifying the elect made them so commonplace as to find little acclaim. Ministers believed, however, that the major burden of their work was to teach biblical doctrine, both from the pulpit and with the catechism. Pulpit teaching either expounded on major tenets of the faith, or else dwelt on long passages of Scripture. Whatever approach was chosen, the minister assumed his responsibility seriously. Having been ordained teacher of the Hartford church, Samuel Stone reportedly felt a "peculiar obligation to endeavour the edification of his people, by a more doctrinal way of preaching."[9] In a similar manner, Thomas Hooker also valued the role of expository discourse. "Although he had a notable hand," says Cotton Mather, "at the discussing and adjusting of controversial points, yet he would hardly ever handle any polemical divinity in the pulpit."[10] Hooker's advice to young ministers was "that at their entrance on their ministry, they would with careful study preach on the whole body of divinity methodically."[11] He believed they

---

[9]Cotton Mather, Magnalia, I, 435.

[10]Ibid., 346. [11]Ibid., 346-347.

afterwards would be better prepared to speak on specific topics and at special occasions. In one of his first undertakings after reaching Massachusetts, Hooker's own perseverance at instructing the settlers was demonstrated. Having just arrived from England, friends requested him to preach a favorite series of addresses on "God's regenerating works upon the soul of his elect." Mather records that John Higginson copied from Hooker's manuscripts "near two hundred of these excellent sermons," all amazingly from the one series.[12]

Although good expository preaching contributed greatly to the reputation of many venerable ministers, few manuscripts were ever put into print. When offering remarks on preaching in his eulogies of New England ministers, Cotton Mather often notes the books of Scripture a preacher covered while in service to a church. It was easier to eulogize a minister for his stedfastness in providing a meaty spiritual diet through years of pulpit duty than it was to single out sermons which excelled in such a routine capacity. Those addresses which did achieve publication are often found as a collection in a volume prepared by the speaker himself. Increase Mather, who had an uncanny capacity to get himself into print, prepared at least six of these collections. In a publication of eight sermons enti-

---

[12]Ibid., 347.

tled The Mystery of Christ, he provided examples of what has been defined as the expository address. His individual sermon titles, for example, are all in the typical equation of an expository statement. They read as follows: (1) "There Is a Covenant of Redemption," (2) "Jesus Christ Is the Son of God," (3) "Jesus Christ Is over All, God Blessed for Ever," (4) "Jesus Christ the Son of God, Is Man as Well as God," (5) "There Is a Personal Union between the Two Natures of Christ," (6) "Jesus Christ Is the Mediator," (7) "God the Father Has Received Full Sanctification in the Obedience of His Son Jesus Christ," and (8) "The Humane Nature of Christ Is, of All Created Objects the Most Excellent or Glorious."[13] Increase Mather examines from Scripture the attributes of Christ, with his thoughts ranging broadly over such notions as the legal aspects of the covenant of redemption, and the sufferings, conversion, and salvation of the elect. In each sermon the doctrine is merely a restatement of the title. With intentional uses of repetition, the sermons produce a static effect, though they do much to reinforce their individual doctrines in the memory.

Meriting repute for an unusually long sequence of addresses (though far short of Hooker's massive series), Samuel Willard's Mercy Magnified impressively demonstrates

---

[13]Increase Mather, The Mystery of Christ (Boston: n.p., 1686).

the inconsequential continuity of thought within expository discourse.[14] In 28 sermons filling a total of 391 pages, Willard journeys through a mere 22 verses (Luke 15:11-32) which tell the parable of the prodigal son. The doctrines begin with God's response of grace to sinful man, and conclude with the joy that comes over the conversion of the sinner. Willard views the parable as representing the traditional Christian epic of man's struggle from sin to salvation. While the narrative of biblical events produces a heightening drama over the whole series, any aroused sense of anticipation quickly dissipates when looking at an individual sermon. The parable was to become familiar material in the revivalistic preaching of subsequent generations, but Willard treats it in a manner unique to Puritan theology, setting forth a morphology of conversion epitomized in the life of an elected saint.[15] His objective is not so much

---

[14]Samuel Willard, Mercy Magnified on a Penitent Prodigal (Boston: Samuel Green, 1684).

[15]Rutman, American Puritanism, pp. 99-101. Rutman postulates ten steps in the life of a saint, the first four most often as points in preparation, the last six of assurance. Constituting points along a scale, the steps are: (1) Attendance upon the Word, (2) Submission to the moral law (the Commandments), (3) Awareness of one's sins, (4) Fear of the consequence of sin, (5) Consideration of the promises of salvation propounded, (6) A spark of faith, a will and desire to believe, (7) Doubt and despair of salvation, (8) Doubt, but also a feeling of assurance and a persuasion of mercy, (9) A grief for sin because it is sin (not because of its consequences), and (10) Grace to endeavor to obey God's commandments. Another discussion is found in Perry Miller, "'Preparation for Salvation' in Seventeenth-Century New England," in his Nature's Nation (Cambridge,

to produce a state of evangelistic fervor as to develop an appreciation for God's covenant with man by shelling from the parable every kernel of spiritual truth.

Except for the overall continuity suggested by the parable, individual sermons possess little organic unity, one message often running into another with barely discernible divisions. For example, Willard set forth two doctrines in the twelfth sermon: (1) "The Soul of Man, without sutable spiritual supplies must needs perish," and (2) "In order to the conversion of a sinner, God makes him deeply apprehensive that he is perishing with hunger." Although the thirteenth sermon also has a stated doctrine--"The consideration of divine sufficiency and bounty, are great encouragements to the soul, that feels itself ready to perish"--this sermon is nonetheless a continuation of the twelfth, having no interruption in substance or style other than a spatial break indicating the sermon number.

A closer examination of expository discourse makes more apparent those qualities that characterize it as a unique type of public address, a type having attributes setting it apart from the larger body of contemporary rhetorical literature. An example is found in the first extant American imprint in public address. In 1652, Richard Mather published what he called The Summe of Certain Ser-

---

Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1967), pp. 50-77.

mons, but in all probability it was one among many sermons he delivered while working his way through Genesis. Mather's preaching was apparently well received. In a preface he speaks of "a serious & solemn request" from brethren who, having heard the sermons, thought "they might afterwards also bee usefull for the benefit of themselves and their families if they might enjoy their printing, which they did very much desire." Mather describes his many objections but relents to their request. A recommendation "to the Christian Reader" is also included with the sermon, in which John Cotton and John Wilson together remark, "The manner of handling, thou shalt find to be solid, and judicious, succinct and pithy, fit (by the blessing of Christ) to make wise unto salvation."[16]

The text comes from Genesis 15:6: "And hee believed in the Lord, and Hee counted it to him for righteousness." Within the space of forty-seven pages, Mather develops three doctrines which proclaim that "justifying & saving faith is wrought by the word of the Gospel," "that it is the Lord Himself who doth justify," and "that, it is by faith . . . that men come to be justified." The sermon progresses in a traditional fashion, with an opening of the text, and with a statement of each doctrine, followed by reasons and uses. Not only in the opening but in

---

[16]Richard Mather, The Summe of Certain Sermons, pp. iii-xi, passim.

the development of the doctrine as well, Richard Mather employs definition extensively as a means of amplification. His dependence on definition, which in turn produces the stylistic equation so common in expository discourse, is exemplified in the following remarks on justification:

> Justification is a judiciary act, the work of a Judge pronouncing sentence of absolution upon a man; and this appears by this, because it is opposed to condemn, as Rom: 8.33. Math: 12.37. and so it differs from sanctification, which is to make a man really holy by changing his qualityes, whereas justification makes only a relative change in a man in respect of state, from a state of guiltiness to a state of absolution & clearing judicially. . . . Justification either consists in, or conteins in it, the forgiveness of sins, and not imputing of iniquity; Rom: 4.4,5.[17]

Mather is declarative in language and thinks himself unequivocal, but circulocutions easily dissipate the impact of his thought. Yet he repeats key equations to reinforce the message and enhance its recall. Following the above statements, for example, he says,

> Therefore a man can not justifie himself. . . . But the Scripture makes man passive in his justification, and that this work is wrought by God himself, and by him only. . . . Hence it followeth, that justification once obteyned, can not be lost. . . . Man once justified shall never loose his justified estate, nor fall from it.[18]

Richard Mather clenches the concept of justification with these words, which, in a rhythm of their own, impart a quiet confidence to the doctrine of election. Justification once obtained cannot be lost, says Mather, and man once justi-

---

[17] Ibid., pp. 6-7. [18] Ibid., p. 7.

fied shall never fall. His tone is objective, his development abstract, and his style diffused and repetitious. But his arrows of truth are aimed at the mind and not the heart.

Failing to emerge and disclose their identity, the speaker and his audience remain veiled behind the straightforward didacticism of the sermon. All mental energies strain to grasp at every nuance of theological analysis. Yet with all its informative purposes, the sermon emits a subtle tension, as though speaker and listeners anticipated some stealthy antagonist in their presence. This element of tension, appearing so obscure and illusive in its source, is in effect produced by two phenomena within the sermon.

First, the speaker repeatedly employs rhetorical questions when moving from one thought to another. This technique serves less to provoke thought and more as a transitional device, binding together portions of the sermon which fail to flow smoothly from one idea to another. The speaker proposes a thought at one point, for example, saying, "Wheresoever Regeneration is wrought, and the Spirit of grace is bestowed, there saving can not be wanting." Although appearing to have already discussed the idea sufficiently, he nonetheless remarks, "For the explanation of this point it may first of all be demanded, What is the Gospel?" And in his response, "It is the Doctrine of salvation by Christ," he leaps forward into new material, again not so

much to clarify the earlier statement as to advance the message.[19] It is through these repetitious questions that the sermon acquires an internal tension which gives it a sense of cohesiveness. Interestingly, the questions have no basis in argument or controversy, but are assimilated from a method of instruction quite familiar to the auditors. In effect, the questions produce the strained pace of a catechism drill as participants trek through the principles of religion.

The dissuasive techniques of the speaker also contribute to the subtle element of tension within the speech. A distinction between persuasion and dissuasion may ordinarily be inconsequential, but it can be useful in understanding the expository address. Mather forgoes any attempt to appeal to his hearers for a response, whether for an overt change of behavior or for an extensive alteration of thought. In contrast to persuasion, his function is to open, reveal, or disclose the mysteries of Scripture. Of course, the accumulative effect of this exposure to religion is a vital phase in the morphology of conversion. Yet the long-range consequences do not negate the immediate objective of expository discourse.

Richard Mather intends to uncover biblical truth, give it substance and clarity, and thus enhance the lis-

---

[19] Ibid., p. 3.

tener's understanding and memory. He does not seek persuasion, but neither does he circumvent dissuasion. His affirmative statement of religious faith assumes an adversary, and his son, Increase, once preached what all New England knew, when he cried: "As long as there is a Devil out of Hell, or a Pope in Rome, we may be sure that there will be dayes of trouble to the Church of God."[20] But when Richard Mather wrestles with the theology of imperfect faith versus perfect righteousness, his adversary is handled in remarks which take on an antiseptic isolation from the context of his times. The speaker declares that imperfect faith produces in the believer not his own righteousness, but the righteousness of Christ, and while amplifying this notion, he remarks that "in this the tenent of the Arminians is more injurious to the Lord, then of the Papists." In explanation he continues:

> For the Papists hold, & that truely, that God justifies by perfect righteousness; only herin is their great errour, that they think this perfect righteousness may be found in our selves, in our works, or our faith &c: But the Arminians would have God to justifie man without any perfect righteousness at all, but to accept his imperfect faith in steed therof.[21]

This statement is conspicuously void of the invectives that readily appear in imprecatory discourse. The speaker performs his sacred task like a well-regulated mechanical

---

[20]Increase Mather, The Day of Trouble (Cambridge, Mass.: Marmaduke Johnson, 1674), p. 5.

[21]Richard Mather, The Summe of Certain Sermons, p. 10.

instrument, and he is himself largely absent in personality from the materials of the sermon. While revealing little self-involvement, he develops his thought with a detachment from the immediate social context that might well characterize a discriminating analysis of some Pharisaic doctrine on demonology. The Puritan mentality always assumes warring spirits lurking in the shadows, yet judging from the substance of the message, neither the speaker nor his auditors perceive any real and immediate threat to themselves, their faith, or their society.

The dissuasive function is seen less in any reasoned argument against a specified adversary, and more in the implication that the adversary is heinous in the eyes of godly persons, and that, of course, such an adversary and its doctrine should be viewed askance. The speaker thus identifies the enemy (Arminianism and Catholicism), and likewise defines the proper stance of the believer. He executes dissuasion by implicitly advising his auditors to assume a negative disposition toward the specified persons and doctrines. His dissuasive tactic in this case is clearly referential but not immediate, and the speech as a whole remains non-referential or intramural. Thus, the referential nature of dissuasion does not negate the self-enclosed qualities that unquestionably dominate the whole speech.

Imprecatory Genre

Imprecatory addresses, found to the right of the scale, reveal a maximum effort to produce belief or to motivate, having a decidedly persuasive goal, albeit a uniquely conceived one. The overall rhetorical effect is that the listener regard himself in a certain way. Through this intensified self-awareness, the speech creates a mental disposition aimed at leading the hearer kinetically toward a response.

The speech is distinctly referential, occasional, and highly social. Its referent lies quite literally in a social context or public occasion, and the occasion is ordinarily of greater significance than most speaking occasions. The speech points to real events, characters, and moral problems, and the response itself is ritualistic. With the speech assuming a unique communal moment, its temporal focus is primarily on the present and future. It seeks to create a sense of community among hearers.

In contrast to expository discourse, where the speaker submits himself more to the dictates of his subject, the imprecatory speaker exerts greater control over his materials, announcing his proposition explicitly, and shaping his materials to amplify that proposition according to his immediate needs. The speaker creates a series of recurring themes from prevailing ideas within

the unique social context. The context encourages flexibility in handling characters, whether biblical or contemporary, within the materials of the speech, a flexibility measured by the degree of the speaker's inventiveness. The speech is primarily subjective in tone, though possessing greater concreteness in development through the use of comparisons and examples, especially from contemporary or familiar settings, and through less use of allegory. The speaker emphasizes a cyclical conception of history as summarized in man's degeneracy, sanctification, and apostasy. His message pivots on a lofty principle which may in the social context appear threatened, and the materials are commonplace rather than novel to the hearers. The speaker shapes his argument out of familiar cloth rather than anything like exposition, especially instruction in difficult or novel matters.

The speaker does not seek so much to induce anyone to remember the parts of his argument as to invoke concurrence. Though perhaps offering a relatively reasoned pattern of thought, the speech moves through referential immediacy and emotional intensity to create a climax. The materials are each carefully machined to fit as a part in a proper place, and each part exerts its full force only in its place. In construction the speech is highly organic, though its visible structure may be lax for the sake of uninterrupted fluency.

Employing stimulating suspensions with prominent subordinating constructions, the style creates a constant sense of progress and climax. Climax is further enhanced through visceral interjections and exclamations. With an unusual degree of speaker involvement, the speech reveals a highly self-conscious performance, and requires substantial source credibility for acceptance from the audience.

Imprecatory addresses are found in imprints far more than warranted by their frequency of occurrence. The popular appeal which resulted in their publication was often that which accomplished a major social event, such as a fast or an election. The addresses, however, are not defined or limited by such occasions, and they may in fact be the essential ingredients which made many occasions significant or memorable within their own time. The addresses are also the result of the same rhetorical know-how which produced the expository sermon, but because of the speaker's motivations and objectives, they came forth as a different product, as another distinctive rhetorical genre.

The weekday lectureship, though often highlighted by a guest speaker, was nonetheless a regular feature of Boston religious life. However, Cotton Mather seized a rare opportunity, "upon the news of an invasion by bloody Indians and Frenchmen," to address himself to immediate civil and social problems. The strongly referential nature of imprecatory discourse is apparent. In this sermon,

entitled The Present State of New England, and delivered on March 20, 1690, the speaker declares the needs and advantages of a public spirit in every man, "especially, at such a time as this." The address was preceded by another which, in all probability, was of the expository type. Having referred to the earlier speech as complying with the usual manner of lectureship speaking, Mather proceeds somewhat apologetically, remarking that now "you must Indulge me this Digression, that the fresh News of our Distress and Danger which within this four and twenty Hours arrived unto us, have diverted my Thoughts to That which you may behold this Text point at."[22]

The text, from Esther 4:14, reads, "If thou altogether hold thy peace at this time, thou and thy fathers house shall be destroyed." Cotton Mather draws from it the doctrine "That every Christian should readily and chearfully venture his all to serve the people of God, when a time of distress and danger calleth for it."

Though having only a broadly sketched form, the sermon is still basically divided according to the traditional pattern for an opening, doctrine, and application. However, the structure within these divisions is minimal, and subdivisions which occasionally exist are identified by numerical series (first, second, third, etc.) to indicate

---

[22]Cotton Mather, The Present State of New-England (Cambridge, Mass.: Samuel Green, 1690), pp. 1-2.

the speaker's progression from one idea to another. Since the speech lacks the dichotomies or balanced divisions so characteristic of Ramist rhetoric, it takes on a modern appearance of continuous, sequential discourse.

It is worthy to note that the qualities characterizing one type of discourse may also be present, though having less prominence, in other types. As suggested already, the speaker opens a text in both expository and imprecatory discourse. Thus Cotton Mather proceeds according to pattern, opening the text on this occasion by employing a description of the biblical setting from which it is taken. But even in the opening, Mather's language reflects a low-level abstraction and vehemency of style seldom found in expository discourse. This quality is apparent, for example, after he tells how Mordecai, an exiled Jew, refused to bow down and do obeisance to Haman, chief officer to the king and villain who, in revenge, seeks to destroy Mordecai and his people.

> Now that a godly Jew should refuse to render such an Honour to a sorry Potsheard of the Earth, is not to be wondered at, when we call to mind, That even the prudent, but pagan Grecians did refuse it, in their Address to the Persian Monarchs; and the Athenians put one Timocrates to death, for adoring of Darius in such a manner. Such a check was given to the pride of Haman! Now the bloody Revenge of this Hellish Monster prompted him to pursue no meaner a satisfaction for this indignity, than the utter Desolation and Extirpation, of the whole Nation Mordecai was of: one Lark will not fill the belly of such a Vulture.[23]

---

[23]Ibid., p. 4.

This excerpt also demonstrates the referential qualities of an imprecatory address. However, the speaker goes even further to give historical materials such as this a sense of relevancy to the present and future. After declaring that Haman sought advice from the Devil to destroy the Jews, he announces the startling claim that all these events surrounding Mordecai happened "about this time of the year--Anno mundi 3485."[24] And to give biblical materials of imminent doom an even greater immediacy to the social context, he concludes, saying, "Perhaps, the Jews were before this, grown a little too secure and careless." With these remarks from the opening, Cotton Mather has already begun to direct the thrust of his message less upon the biblical past and more upon the present and future welfare of those who hear him. From the same remarks, his listeners know he is speaking of their own overconfidence and carelessness in religion, for this is the recurring theme in conversations and sermons of many New Englanders.

The sermon's remaining parts function to develop a unity of spirit within the community which, in turn, will affect a rally to the defense of neighboring settlers. The speaker handles his doctrine by examining, "First, What, And Secondly, Why, we must Venture for the Distressed People of God."[25] He argues that a person's own peace, estate,

---

[24]Ibid., p. 5. [25]Ibid., p. 10.

honor, and even his very life are small contributions to the present needs of brethren, and each person should willingly part with "all but his precious soul" if the circumstances require it. "In Times of much Distress and Danger with the People of God," he says, "we are there especially to Venture our All on their behalf. We are at this Time to speak, yea, and Act for them, Let the Venture Look never so big and black upon us."[26] Having thus far broadly considered the question of assistance, the speaker now focuses his message to attack those who might fail to willingly respond. His tactic is identification. He examines the sin that would cause such failure, and directs an appeal to his listeners for self-examination. Each person responds to the needs of God's people, or else he is the most contemptuous of hellhounds. The speaker characterizes the sin in question as a "private spirit" or sense of personal selfishness. "Tho' they [men of private spirit] can spend many Pounds in a year upon a pernicious Lust," he declares, "they would not care tho' the House of their Neighbours were Burnt, if their own Apples might be Roasted at the Flame."[27]

In spite of its poignancy, Cotton Mather's assault is hardly capable of shocking or stunning his listeners. For a generation, New England ministers had lamented in their sermons over the decline of religion, and their vociferous jer-

---

[26]Ibid., p. 21. [27]Ibid., pp. 22-23.

emiads were familiar to settlers throughout the region. "Alas, For this Private Spirit!" cried Mather. "It is this that has a more Dismal Aspect upon our own Land, than all the other things that Bode ill unto us."[28] No one sin burst forth in the New England conscience, but there are many cancerous evils which eat steadily at the foundations of the Bible commonwealth. This theme had been articulated repeatedly over the past three decades, and Mather finds neighborly indiffiernce only a part, albeit momentarily the weightiest part, of the total malaise.

The sermon intensifies its vehemency with every forward movement. The speaker grasps at varied items of biblical and secular support to substantiate his argument. "By a Private Spirit no man proves a Real Garner in the end," he exclaims, whereupon he cites a ruin of the Midianites and of Constantinople, demonstrating how no selfish men who oppose God shall prevail. "When the Roman Emperour upbraided his General Terrentius, for the Loosing of a Battel, he reply'd Sir, I must tell you, that it is you that lost [the] Day for us, by your open Fighting against the God of Heaven as you do."[29]

The case has been well laid throughout the sermon, and the climactic appeal is due. It is as though God would now bring down fire upon this New-World Sodom. A Roman

---

[28]Ibid., p. 22. [29]Ibid., p. 28.

emperor openly fought God, and to New Englanders, the speaker charges, "This may duely be cast in the Teeth of all the Bad Livers in this place." Time has come to pronounce the curse.

> You that Live without the fear of God, you that Live after a Prayerless and Careless and Profane rate, not having the Fear of God before your Eyes: You are those that every Day do the things, For which the Wrath of God comes. This people of God is now in such Distress and Danger as it never saw before; and I ask not your leave to tell you, That you are the Authors of it all. Tis You, That bring whole Armyes of Indians and Gallic Blood Hounds in upon us; tis you that cloy all our Councels with such Delay and Slowness, as terrifies us in our most karnal Expectation. You are perhaps the most Querimonious, and Outragious of all People, in your Discontents, why, but your unsubdued Sins are those which breed all our Discontents.[30]

The sermon seems dreadful in its castigation. It is as though words come forth as poisoned arrows to strike down the hearers, while the archer watches such mortals languish in pain. But any macabre evaluation of the sermon fails to grasp the import of the conversion process as internalized by every Puritan saint. To those giving attendance to the Word, the speaker seeks to create awareness, fear, doubt, despair, and grief, for out of the abyss of conviction comes grace to obey God's commandments. Through this intensified self-awareness, the speech creates a mental disposition that compells its auditors forward to a feverish moment of cathartic response.

The speaker is ready to conclude his address, and

---

[30]Ibid., p. 28.

as a denouement, he directs attention to a recent proclamation of the General Court, "warning all Offenders against the Lawes of Sobriety, to mend their manners, and all Officers to Prosecute such offendors, as the principal Troublers of their Countrey." In a final appeal from the patriarchs of the commonwealth, he remarks, "Behold the Fathers of this Country, have been Warning all Bad-livers, That if They don't Repent, We must perish."[31] With its emphasis on self-examination, the sermon almost loses sight of the crisis that prompted it, but in the end, the speaker concludes with five proposals for action to defend the settlements.

Imprecatory addresses are not readily found throughout all of the seventeenth century, but they do appear frequently during the last five decades. Their rarity in earlier years may be owing to the unanimity that pervaded the first settlements, and to the lack of sufficient manuscripts to give a fair representation of early public addresses. The ideological identity shared among the first settlers tends to suggest that few occasions for rhetorical transactions of the imprecatory type ever occurred. The genre had conditions favorable for its development in England, but Laudian restraints upon dissenters temporarily discouraged its development.

Cotton Mather's lecture-day sermon is but one exam-

---

[31] Ibid., p. 29.

ple of imprecatory discourse, the same type also being found among speeches for annual elections, artillery elections, executions, funerals, and days of fasting. In an address delivered at the Boston election of 1672, Thomas Shepard, for example, bemoans the problem among some settlers of insubordination toward ruling authorities, in which case he inquires "whether the same faith & faithfulness, which dwelt in our fathers in the first times of these plantations dwell in us, also their children." Reflecting the sentiments of ministers and magistrates alike, he remarks, "'Tis matter of Lamentation and reproof for the too great proneness that is to be found among too many among us, unto a revolt from the Lord."[32]

Shepard's sermon is argumentive in development, more so than usually found in other imprecatory addresses. But like most speeches of its kind, the sermon pivots upon a long-standing value or principle which appears threatened within the social context. Shepard advances two such values: social stratification and religious reformation. Drawing upon materials from recent transactions within both church and commonwealth, the sermon easily becomes referential. Shepard also conveys a high degree of self-consciousness when appealing for the pattern established by the first generation for governing church and state.

---

[32]Thomas Shepard, Eye-Salve (Cambridge, Mass.: Samuel Green, 1673), pp. iii, 10.

He is himself a witness to the transitions which have occurred since his arrival in 1635. The original plantation was patterned after a biblical model, and Shepard perceives no distinction between respect for that pattern and respect for Scripture itself. "O Generation, See the Word of the Lord!" he cries. "Is there any new way more eligible then the good old way . . . which the Lords People have already tryed? shall we seek and enquire after any new-found out way?"[33] Shepard ultimately confronts the dilemma met by many crusaders who, once their movement has succeeded, find themselves desperately applying the brake. However, he avoids the role of brakeman, and instead appeals that progress continue in the legitimate direction pursued by the first generation, namely, the advancement of the Reformation. "Remember," he exclaims,

> that a main design of Gods people's adventuring in to this wilderness was for progressing in the work of Reformation, and that in the way of brotherly communion with the Reformed Churches of Christ in other parts of the world. O forsake not, deny not, condemn not that fundamental design! and otherwise indeed what need they to have removed from England?[34]

In the closing pages of his sermon, Shepard speaks of young people who are coming of age as "the Rising Generation." His expression, conveying fears of apostasy among children of the original settlers, occurs repeatedly in the imprecatory discourse of the period. In a fast-day

---

[33] Ibid., p. 18. [34] Ibid., p. 37.

sermon delivered at Boston on July 3, 1678, Increase Mather points to the urgent need that everyone Pray for the Rising Generation. "Children dying in a natural, unconverted state, are liable unto Wrath, and Death, and Curse, and Hell," he charges. And then to the parents he asks, "Are you willing that the Children of your own bowels should be miserable throughout the dayes of Eternity? That they should be burning in a fiery Ocean as long as God shall be God?" Increase Mather is as aware as anyone that religion progresses poorly throughout the colony. "In the last age," he says,

> in the dayes of our Fathers, in other parts of the world, scarce a Sermon preached but some evidently converted; yea, sometimes hundreds in a Sermon: which of us can say we have seen the like? Clear sound conversions are not frequent in some congregations.[35]

The results of such unfruitful preaching are obvious. "The body of the Rising Generation," says Increase, "is a poor perishing, unconverted, and . . . undone Generation." His assault now intensifies in strength as he sorrows for the widespread sins of the colony.

> Many that are profane, Drunkards, Swearers, Lascivious, Scoffers at the power of Godliness, Despisers of those that are good, Proud, Disobedient creatures, God from Heaven pity them![36]

Increase Mather's prescription for "the rising generation" is

---

[35]Increase Mather, Pray for the Rising Generation (Cambridge, Mass.: Samuel Green, 1678), pp. 13-14.

[36]Ibid., p. 14.

prayer, but through the examples of other godly people, he must remind his hearers of its efficacy. When one eminent minister prayed with friends, persons in the next room felt such strange elapses within their hearts that one was caused to cry, "O what a man is this, that can knock down the spirit of God into all our hearts?" "Who Knoweth," injects Mather, "but that we may pray down the spirit of God into the souls of our children." He offers another example of all-night prayer in Scotland which the next day produced five hundred converts at the hearing of one sermon. Even in a New England church, he continues, parents have fasted and prayed, and "so many of the younger Rising Generation have been brought home to Christ."[37]

Having completed his message to the parents, Increase Mather carries the sermon to a climax. To the younger children who are listening, he first portrays the judgment day, when he and parents alike will have to witness against unconverted youths. "O why should I," he cries, "that can appeal to God, that I long for your conversion, be your accuser before the Lord Jesus at the last day?" Then he speaks to older youths "that are grown up to years of more discretion, and understanding." "Young Men, and young Women," he pleads, "O be in earnest for Converting Grace, before it is too late. . . . Beware of out-standing your day of Grace, lest the Spirit of God depart, and your

---

[37]Ibid., pp. 14-15.

Souls become desolate." With an increasingly fervent supplication, he cries:

> Awake, Awake, and turn to God in Jesus Christ whilst it is called to day, and know for certain that if you dy in your sins, you will be the most miserable of any poor Creature in the bottom of Hell. Oh consider of it, to be prayed, wept, Preached, Fasted down to Hell, what an amazing thing will it be![38]

The pleas now come to a halt, and in a moment of sudden tranquillity, he concludes: "Christ stands and knocks at the door of your hearts." Even at its most vehement heights, the imprecatory sermon offers a final balm of peace.

From other imprecatory addresses, children receive more than their share of the onslaughts. Of all men, Increase Mather is not one to restrain himself. His sermons almost screech from the printed pages with a shrillness of language. On a Boston lecture day coinciding with the execution of two murderers, he again addresses himself to "the rising generation." Among other violations of the Decalogue, he warns about horrors which come to those who disobey parents. "One of these that are to be executed this day," he announces, "doth confess that his disobedience to his Parents hath provoked the Lord to bring this misery upon him."[39] As if the sight of the con-

---

[38] Ibid., pp. 22-23.

[39] Increase Mather, The Wicked Mans Portion (Boston, Mass.: John Foster, 1675), p. 17.

demned wretch were not enough, Increase turns to an authority which transcends all empirical evidence. "There is a Scripture," he recalls, "which me thinks should strike Terror and Trembling into your Souls." From Proverbs 30:17, he reads, "The eye that mocketh at his father . . . the ravens of the valley shall pick it out." But Scripture alone is insufficient without the nurturing a minister provides it, and this verse offers the unnerving imagery he wants. "You children that disobey your Mothers," he implores, "harken to this."

> The ravens are like to feed upon you; that is to say such sinners shall come to an untimely death, and it may not have a decent honourable buriall. It is to be feared that such children will come to the Gallows, and be hanged up in Gibblets for the ravens and eagles to feed upon them if they will.[40]

Increase Mather confirms again that most victims of the gallows ultimately confess their early guilt of disobeying parents.

In a funeral sermon for an eighteen-year-old youth, Samuel Wakeman demonstrates an astonishing directness in his appeal to "the rising generation." The text, from Ecclesiastes 12:1, "Remember now thy Creator in the dayes of thy youth," was suggested by the deceased. Whereas the time and manner of his death is "a real Sermon upon the Text," Wakeman adds that the young man was both "a Pattern for

---

[40]Ibid., pp. 18-19.

your Imitation" and "an Example for your Admonition."[41] When developing the "example," Wakeman engages in some of the most direct judgments to be found in any sermon. His straightforward approach to an audience becomes vivid from such portions of his sermon as the following:

> Art thou Fifteen, Sixteen, Eighteen years old? is it too great an adventure, measuring thy Life by thy Image and Constitution; but are these certain Evidences as to adventure thy Soul upon? are these such infallible probabilities as to run the hazard of thy hopes for Heaven upon? The Example that is before thee in this young man (whom Death scarce suffered to be called a man) may convince thee of the contrary. O who would not be always ready, when his Summones are so exceeding uncertain.[42]

But a brief space later, Wakeman closes the address in a manner that illustrates the bolting vehemency of style in imprecatory discourse. "O Sirs," he exclaims,

> Dying times are Trying times; to die causlesly confidently I am afraid is too common, but to die groundedly comfortably is a great work. O do, do thoroughly what thou hast to do, man, when Death comes thou wilt not finde it is too well done.[43]

The initial rhyme, the alliteration, the thumping accents of stress-crowded rhythm, and repetitous exclamations all combine to batter the wits and impart a swelling sense of urgency to the sermon. Such instinctive expressions, combined with the visceral thrusts of garish examples,

---

[41]Samuel Wakeman, A Young Man's Legacy to the Rising Generation (Cambridge, Mass.: Marmaduke Johnson, 1673), p. 42.

[42]Ibid., p. 44. [43]Ibid., p. 45.

produce a kinetic response within a unified audience. In the harrowing experience of imprecatory speaking, the community of hearers quickly find a ritualistic awakening and purge of religious conscience.

Hortatory Genre

Expository and imprecatory addresses mark the limits of variety found in the speeches considered for this study. When registered at their appropriate ends of the scale, these speeches may be identified as forming clusters for each genre. Although numerous similarities exist, diversity naturally occurs within genres. Moreover, some addresses do not fit within either category but require instead a medial position on the scale. Among the speeches examined, a sufficient cluster exists to designate hortatory addresses as an intermediate genre.

Hortatory discourse is easily recognized but described only with difficulty. A problem arises because this type of speech takes on qualities that characterize both ends of the generic scale. For instance, a hortatory speech may have the highly structured form of expository discourses, but have the referential qualities of imprecatory speeches. Or the structure may be lax, revealing an organic form and direct style, while the speech in substance has little referential quality. Hortatory discourse emerges as a distinct type of speaking because it does not

project any combination of qualities that would place the speech within the main thrust of either expository or imprecatory discourse. The result of such a combination is a discourse that is both didactically and motivationally oriented. It exhorts to give assurance or argues to give conviction, but even in its most persuasive moments it lacks the vehemency of tone and rhythmic style of imprecatory discourse. In its most simple and gentle appeals, it possesses a concreteness of development and referential vitality that cannot be found in expository discourse. Its materials may be handled so as to instruct or to argue, though hardly commonplace in either case, and its overall objective remains exhortation, whether subtle or forceful.

A sermon by John Norton helps exemplify the eclectic nature of hortatory discourse, especially regarding how the genre develops an appeal from a didactic foundation.[44] Delivered on a spring lecture day in 1663, the sermon responds to a growing egalitarian sentiment among colonists. The authoritarian social order that was part of the Old World mentality once assumed by early colonists now becomes the substance of teaching and admonition for the rising generation. At issue is the future of the Puritan oligarchy in both church and commonwealth.

---

[44]John Norton, "The Evangelical Worshipper," in Three Choice and Profitable Sermons (Cambridge, Mass.: Samuel Green and Marmaduke Johnson, 1664), pp. 29-38.

Congregationalism developed rapidly among early colonists, primarily because of the efforts of John Cotton, who hoped that once the Anglican episcopacy was overthrown, the Church of England would adopt a Congregational rather than a Presbyterian system of government. Before giving the Puritans military support against Charles I, the Scots demanded, in 1643, that Parliament establish the Presbyterian system.[45] Cotton lived to see his plan conclusively defeated, but nonetheless, New England Congregationalism remained a viable entity far beyond Norton's own lifetime.[46]

Outwardly, the Congregational way of local church government gives an appearance of democratic control resembling Brownism. Yet New England Congregationalists repudiated the Brownists as readily as they eschewed the Papists.[47] For in the actual rule of the local church, full authority rested in a body of elders to whom all members

---

[45]G. M. Trevelyan, England under the Stuarts (New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1965), p. 250.

[46]Norton died in 1663, and the sermon under consideration was published as the last he preached.

[47]John Cotton and his colleagues had no sympathies for true democracy, as is apparent in a letter Cotton wrote in 1636 to Lord Say and Seal, in which he says: "Democracy, I do not conceyve that ever God did ordeyne as a fitt government eyther for church or commonwealth. If the people be governors, who shall governed?" Cotton's attitude was hardly peculiar for his times. Letter in Thomas Hutchinson, The History of the Colony and Province of Massachusetts-Bay, ed. by Lawrence Shaw Mayo (2 vols.; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936), I, 414-417.

remained in submission. Although the elders were enjoined to rule according to the will of Christ, they naïvely assumed that Christ would reveal his will to them, but would not to the church members. The daily interaction between the rulers and the ruled eventually helped to wear thin a traditional awe for authority. Once seeing the foibles of their rulers, church members occasionally became restless and bold to assert their own convictions.[48]

While sensitive to these democratic aspirations, Norton chooses a text which speaks of God's command that Moses build the tabernacle "according to the pattern shewed to thee in the Mount." And from it he develops a doctrine urging that care be taken in church government "that all things proceed according to the prescript word of God."[49] With an objective toward teaching, admonishing, and even convincing in an argumentive vein, Norton carries the burden of his message in an extended application. While orienting himself toward biblical authority, he does not hesitate to make referential statements regarding either his audience or the social context. Norton explains that if church government be according to the Gospel, Christ must be acknowledged as Lord and every member must be subject to him. The corollary to subjection is order, and

---

[48]Thomas Jefferson Wertenbaker, The Puritan Oligarchy (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1970), p. 63.

[49]Norton, "The Evangelical Worshipper," pp. 29-32.

while Norton concedes that submission to order is not easy, he remarks:

> Remember it was matter of tryal of those that came out of Egypt, and through the Sea (as we have done) yet there were men of renown that could not bear Church-Order. Let me tell you, it is a greater matter to be subject to Order, then to come over the Seas, or to endure the troubles of a Wilderness; many will bear a Prison, before they will endure the Government of Christ, and Gospel-order in his Church.[50]

Concerning the Congregational system, which was synonymous to New England, and which now appears weakened, Norton admonishes that

> if any are departed from it, let them look to it, I know none of the Elders that have receded from it. It was given many years ago as the Confession of our Faith, to this Country, and to the World: it is distinct from the Episcopacy, and from the Presbyterian way, from the Morellian way, from that of Separatism: . . . And so we have the patern, only this is complained of, that it is not practiced, though we have had it many years ago; now practice is the end of Doctrine.[51]

The Congregational way "is a matter of very good Policy," says Norton, "Let the Churches look to it."

At a point in the sermon where Norton might have engaged in some of the vociferous tirades of imprecatory discourse, he speaks soberly and rationally about the chances of God's punishing New England. "Times of trouble & danger may approach," he suggests, but as to "how farre the drought, and the last years and other troubles are here considered, referring to our selves, let the Scripture be

---

[50] Ibid., p. 36. [51] Ibid., p. 37.

the interpreter." Rather than giving a vehement attack on sinners who bring ominous doom to all New Englanders, Norton explains what Scripture has to say.

> The matters of outward prosperity have much dependance upon the carrying on the cause of Religion, and that according to the Order of the Gospel, or by the Scripture-patern; our safety lies in keeping there, not turning to the right hand nor turning to the left hand.[52]

And in his closing appeal, he "beseeches you beloved" that in transactions concerning all authorities--elders, brethren, councils, magistrates, and churches--"settle the same as the Lord hath Commanded, i.e. according to Scripture-precept and patern; we are then a safe People." Norton has explained the principle of Christian submission with simplicity and straightforwardness, and his admonition reveals a sincere hope that "practice is the end of Doctrine."[53]

A humiliation-day sermon by Willard Hubbard further exemplifies the didactic and exhortative ends of hortatory discourse, by demonstrating the clarity and delicacy with which Scripture can be applied to life. Hubbard entitles his sermon The Benefit of a Well-Ordered Conversation, and his text, from Psalms 51:27, reads, "And to him that ordereth his conversation aright will I shew the salvation of God." The Scripture receives close attention in the opening, where Hubbard engages in a series of

---

[52]Ibid., p. 38. [53]Ibid.

Hebrew, Greek, and English word studies. After explaining part of the verse, Hubbard comes to "conversation," which, he says, "in a few more words will be all cleared." Metaphors and comparisons highlight the whole sermon, and Hubbard finds them both useful and biblical when opening the text. "What is meant by the Conversation?" he asks.

> It is answered, that according to the original word . . . the way or course of a mans life, according to the Metaphor usual in the Scripture, where a man works or the course and frame of his life is compared to a way or path that leads from one place to another.[54]

When employing another translation, Hubbard again finds metaphorical imagery helpful. "In the Greek Testament," he notes, "there is a word [that] properly answers conversation." In addition to suggesting one's manner of living, the Greek conveys the imagery of a person moving through life as a "Horse-man in a Battle, that turn this way, and that way, as occasion serves: yet still aims to carry on the main design as first intended."[55]

Hubbard tries to help the listener in comprehending the sermon. After his lengthy opening of the text, he states the doctrine, which asserts that "a right ordered conversation is the direct and necessary way for any . . . person to obtain Gods salvation." And following the doctrine, he carefully partitions the remaining sermon.

---

[54]William Hubbard, The Benefit of a Well-Ordered Conversation (Boston: Samuel Green, 1684), pp. 1-3, passim.

[55]Ibid., p. 4.

"The improvement of this Doctrine," says Hubbard, "will be,"

> 1. By shewing wherein consists a well ordered conversation. 2. By laying open the salvation which such shall see. 3. Confirming this truth by such instances, and reasons, as may be found in our experience. 4. By answering such objections as look another way. 5. By making such application, as the nature of the truth requires.[56]

In an expository address, one might expect the preacher to follow the doctrine with an abstract, and perhaps lengthy, presentation of reasons and proofs. Or in an imprecatory address, the preacher might state the doctrine with only brief comment, and hasten on to the application. But Hubbard balances the parts of his sermon well, and little fluctuation appears in the low-level abstraction of his development. In response to the doctrine, Hubbard continues in a didactic vein, but his didacticism appeals to both the intellect and the senses through imagery.

> The heart must be changed before the words and works will be found pure and perfect; for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaks, the hands work, and the feet walks: the Index in a Clock points to those figures without, that the wheels within move unto. The heart is the primum mobile, in this little World, that carries all the other Orbs of the thoughts, affections, senses, and Organs along with it.[57]

To develop a sermon with extraneous references and artistic amplifications was not without potential criticism. The Puritan ideal for Bible-centered and plain-styled preaching would seem to almost restrict a sermon to the diction of Scripture. As already noted, Hubbard justifies

---

[56] Ibid., p. 10. [57] Ibid., pp. 11-12.

himself when opening the text by declaring he proceeds "according to the Metaphor usual in the Scripture." Centuries earlier, Augustine said that a preacher seeking clarity "sometimes neglects a more cultivated language, not caring for what sounds elegant but what well indicates and suggests what he wishes to show."[58] Puritan ministers valued Augustine's opinion, but they also shunned their Anglican contemporaries, whose pulpit oratory seemed like the "'carnal eloquence' of a 'blubber-lipt Ministery.'"

> "Metaphysical" preachers, mounting their pulpits "with Metaphysical high flown Notions, or Words of Mens Wisdom . . . to make a Clattering with Latin, Greek or Hebrew Sentences," full of "obscure phrases, Exotick Words," "liking to hover and soar aloft in dark expressions," seemed immoral to Puritans, not merely because they blasphemously polished God's altar and adulterated the Word of God, "like as Paint doth marble, or as honey and wine in childrens milke," but also because their sermons could never become a means of grace to common men.[59]

The extreme nature of the Puritan ideal must be accepted with an awareness of their enmity for the doctrinal banality of Anglican preaching. Augustine found a defensible mean, thus saying "our eloquent churchman should neither be left unornamented nor be ornamented indecently."[60] And once Hubbard's sermon is underway, he, like many of his

---

[58]Augustine, On Christine Doctrine, trans. by D. W. Robertson, Jr. (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1958), p. 133.

[59]Miller, The New England Mind, I, 302.

[60]Augustine, On Christine Doctrine, p. 163.

colleagues, strays from the ideal of plain-styled preaching.

In developing his message, Hubbard explains theology by drawing upon a wide variety of materials. The physics of heat and energy, as seen in the ordinary affairs of life, provide the basis for remarks about the emotions. One may arouse religious sentiments, he says, but it will not last long "if the heart be not changed by the infusing a new disposition."

> It will be but a stone that may be by Engines forced upward, or as water heated by the fire, which retains their innate qualities, to which they will soon return again, and to that place of their center. Therefore he that would have his way set right, must begin with his heart, and get that changed, and put into a right frame, and then all the rest will follow.[61]

At another point, Hubbard remarks that "it is as natural for a man to breed himself troubles, as for sparks to fly upward." And again he says, "Weeds grow out of the ground without mens labour or care; but . . . we bring our selves into trouble."[62] From both the Bible and nature, he projects yet another analogy of the sojourn of life. "True Religion," he says, "may be fitly compared to a Tree,"

> as such are called Trees of righteousness, which looks upward, yet takes root downward we look up to God by our holiness, and the devotion of our hearts unto him, and so are said to have our conversation in Heaven, yet while we are conversant here below, we must attend the duties, that do concern those amongst whom we sojourn on the Earth.[63]

---

[61]Hubbard, The Benefit of a Well-Ordered Conversation, p. 15.

[62]Ibid., p. 70. [63]Ibid., pp. 32-33.

Hubbard also applies his acquaintance with the physical anatomy of the heart to explain the function of the spiritual heart.

> Naturalists tell us, there are two great veins that arise out of the heart . . . which carry forth out of the heart the spirits that quicken all the whole body: so spiritually, the heart purified by Faith, by those two great issues of Religion and Righteousness maintains the whole frame of obedience in the new creature.[64]

As part of their aversion to human authority, Puritans often expressed opposition to any references from classical sources. John Preston had decreed that "the pure Word should be purely delivered."[65] To give clarity and effect to his ideas, Hubbard relates stories from Greek antiquity, but not without asserting the superiority of divine wisdom over human knowledge. The story of Archimedes illustrates the power of faith.

> It was said of Archimedes, the great Mathematician of old, that he would undertake by the force of Engines which he would invent, that if he had a Foundation to place his Engine upon, he would raise the whole body of the Earth out of its Center: it was a great speech, but natural Ingeny will never be able to out-vye Theology. Faith can do greater things than natural strength or skill. Gods immutable word is a foundation for Faith to rest upon while it accomplishes all things that are needful for Salvation.[66]

Hubbard proceeds throughout the sermon with a

---

[64]Ibid., p. 109.

[65]Quoted in Miller, The New England Mind, I, 302.

[66]Hubbard, The Benefit of a Well-Ordered Conversation, p. 85.

consistency of both substance and style, blending his materials to give clarity and movement, all to produce the gentle eloquence of hortatory discourse.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter has been to conceptualize the nature of genres within the study's selection of seventeenth-century discourse, and to provide a descriptive analysis to exemplify qualities from each genre. The speeches have been generically classified according to expository, imprecatory, and hortatory discourse. In the analysis of genres, the dual concerns for methodology and seventeenth-century discourse have been merged to demonstrate a means of critical inquiry especially suited to the inherent nature and the quantity of the selected speeches.

CHAPTER V

GENRE CRITICISM AND EARLY AMERICAN PUBLIC ADDRESS

Introduction

When Oliver Cromwell faced the English crises of church and state, king and parliament, he was sometimes a man with inward doubts. In fact, he considered on two occasions, once under Laud when he sold his land and again when the Grand Remonstrance was in danger of rejection by Commons, to depart England and seek a more tranquil existence in the New World.[1] Other members of the Puritan fellowship had already met frustration and found an alternative in emigration. These experienced what all men experience, in varying degrees, when old solutions fail to resolve new problems. One alternative, which later reveals itself to be the better choice, may not be the easier choice when a more familiar way lies near at hand.

Dissonance also comes when old ways of understanding meet new circumstances. Hopefully, the confrontation will

---

[1]Trevelyan, England under the Stuarts, p. 215.

produce a moment when one's thought is re-evaluated in the light of new conditions. "Our ideas must agree with realities," said William James, "be such realities concrete or abstract, be they fact or be they principles, under endless penalty of inconsistency and frustration."[2]

In the study of public address, the past decade has been a period of such re-evaluation. Aristotle was an astute observer and theorist, but rhetorical critics have become more aware that he wrote about a rhetoric of his own times. The formulas and rubrics that critics have extracted from his thought have been increasingly subjected to question. After Edwin Black's treatise appeared in 1965, John Jellicorse remarked that Black's "kicks at the corpse of new-Aristotelianism were perhaps unnecessary since the empiricists in our ranks have already made considerable hay by kicking out most of its straw."[3] Jellicorse pointed to conflicts between empirical evidence and the traditional values among rhetorical critics.

In 1959, Marie Hochmuth Nichols was also aware of the problem facing rhetorical critics. "Year after year," she said,

---

[2]William James, Pragmatism: Four Essays from the Meaning of Truth (New York: The World Publishing Company, 1967), p. 139.

[3]Review of Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method, by Edwin Black, in Quarterly Journal of Speech, LI (October, 1965), 338-342.

> our dissertations go through the ritual of discovering logical, emotional, and ethical proof in speeches. . . . Hoary with age, the classification meets the test of time, but I am not sure that it reveals much of a search for a methodology adapted to the needs of our times.[4]

She noted that the experimentalists have necessarily moved in the direction of exactness and system, "but we also should be looking for an orderly methodology." Nichols' interest was in a "methodology not merely for the analysis of persuasive discourse, but methodology for the ordering of all types of discourse."[5]

Relation of Method to Criticism

As stated at the outset, this study pursues dual interests in critical method and public address. The method with which one approaches discourse may give results that reveal less than a complete perspective. Emphasis may be given to one realm of inquiry to the neglect of others, or else a preconceived system of analysis may distort evidence so as to duplicate and even give a sense of validity to the system itself. Nichols mentioned the persistent application of traditional categories, and J. K. Piercy exemplified the problem involved when she applied the categories to seventeenth-century preaching.[6] She intended to reveal

---

[4]Nichols, Rhetoric and Criticism, p. 107.

[5]Ibid.

[6]Josephine Piercy, Studies in Literary Types in Seventeenth-Century America, 1607-1710 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1939), pp. 245-246, passim.

Ciceronian influence and not to criticize speeches. The results, however, are a surprising demonstration of what one can do with the traditional categories. She suggested, for example, that the text, doctrine, and application of a Puritan sermon coincide with exordium, proposition, narration, confirmation, refutation, and peroration of classical rhetoric. Moreover, she said that forensic oratory survives in the sermon through its exhaustive analysis and its presentation of question and answer. She finds no parallel with deliberative oratory, but believes the demonstrative address survives in funeral and election sermons. Piercy sufficiently establishes the fact that Puritans were heirs to Ciceronian rhetoric, but a rhetorical critic might even carry her correlations further, identifying sermons that fit the notion of deliberative oratory. In fact, such sermons can be found. Yet the critic would reveal little insight and would do much injustice to a sermon by forcing it in the ancient mold.

Genre has been described in this study as an open concept. Because the concept must be defined inductively, it does not become a mold that one is inclined to force upon a collection of speeches. As positioned along a hypothetical scale, a genre is refined in meaning according to the individual members added to the cluster, and the genre itself will vary in definition as the qualities of speeches within the cluster differ. The inductive quality

of a generic definition gives the concept a flexibility to relate to varied speech collections. The concept will not only classify the speeches, but its advantage over traditional categories of rhetoric lies in its capacity to descriptively inform the critic about the complex qualities of speeches. Although not in a full theoretical sense about which Nichols spoke, a generic analysis is nonetheless a method for ordering all types of discourse.

Genre is an open concept in definition, and it is also an open concept in its potential dimensions for criticism. While serving to order and inform, a generic analysis also permits the critic to pursue whatever directions he may judge relevant in adding to his understanding of speeches. His alternatives may be biographical, social, cultural, or economic, and he is free to interpret the rhetorical transaction according to the broad spectrum of evidence available to him.

Results of Generic Analysis

The initial problem of methodology for this study was to provide an alternative basis for genre criticism to that provided by occasion. In Chapter Three, the inquiry about genre as a methodological concept produced several premises for developing a generic approach, with its basis in the nature of the discourse itself rather than the occasion. Contemporary genres (1) must be developed

out of the context of actual rhetorical practice, (2) must emerge from an inductive process of inquiry and reflective thought, (3) must be descriptive in definition, (4) must not only classify but also uncover relationships, and (5) must point to the intents and means of discourse. These premises from genre theory underlie the preliminary definitions of each genre identified in Chapter Four. The three definitions of expository, imprecatory, and hortatory discourse are the product of an examination of seventeenth-century speeches included within the limits of the study. The premises, the definitions, and the descriptive analysis combine to give credence to a generic approach for rhetorical criticism.

In addition, Chapter Four provides in its analysis answers to questions posited at the beginning of the study. Regarding both methodology and discourse, the questions were as follows: (1) Does any significant diversity exist within the speeches examined? (2) Within the diversity, what rhetorical types or genres can be recognized? (3) In delineating these types, what rhetorical elements are significant? What differences exist in form, substance, language, and strategy? (4) What insights are gained when a speech is examined within the context of its own genre, and in relation to other genres of the period?

First, diversity does exist within the speeches examined, to an extent that one might not expect. To

assume that Puritan discourse is straitlaced within the binds of a plain style and a rigid structure is to ignore the fervor, imagination, and individualism of Puritan speakers. The language and structure of sermons varied along the extremes of the continuum. The diffused style of one sermon found its counterpart in the thumping rhythmic style of another. Structure, like style, varied according to the goals of discourse. A message of vehement interjections lacks the concern for the intricate structures of syntax in more rational discourse. Significantly, one's judgment of plain intellectual preaching must be tempered with the realization that such preaching was in reaction to the elegant preaching of "popish" Anglicans. The Puritan ideal had its functional role in the morphology of conversion, but ideals and practices often parted ways.

Second, the extent of diversity provides a range within which the speeches can be analyzed according to type. Although sermons may be positioned at all points along the suggested scale, three distinct clusters can be identified. Expository and imprecatory discourse occupy the extremes of the scale, from left to right, and hortatory discourse occupies a medial position. Within these genres, sermons vary considerably, always possessing qualities common with members of other genres, but a sermon of one genre nonetheless reveals a dominant thrust in goal, substance, or tone that distinguishes it from other genres.

Third, in delineating genres, a broad range of rhetorical elements prove to be significant. Included among them are the intent of the message and the overall rhetorical appeal. The occasion, whether conceived as ritualistic or ordinary, and the message's relation to the occasion, whether referential or self-enclosed, are other significant elements. The organic or inconsequential nature of structure, the degree of control over materials, the level of abstraction in language and materials, the climactic development of ideas and appeals in the message, the speaker's role as a character in the message, the qualities of style, the temporal focus of the message--these all prove to be significant rhetorical elements in the analysis of each genre.

Fourth, insights gained through generic relationships may be neglected or overlooked in other methods of study. A classification according to occasion will reveal a speaker's ability to blend substance and social context, or else his choice to separate the two. This was also apparent in the analysis of this study. But the classifications of the study reveal the interaction between intent, substance, and the kinds of materials and language to fulfill the purpose of discourse. In addition, the analysis uncovers the significance of the speaker's self-image in relation to subject as a factor which controlled the materials, temporal focus, and referential

qualities of the sermon. But perhaps most significantly, the generic approach reveals the complex interaction of these elements that give the speech a unique rhetorical identity.

Further Research

Some areas for further inquiry have emerged from this study. Though developmental and descriptive in nature, the dissertation excludes from its concern the areas of interpretation and evaluation, realms in which research might produce further insights about the nature of genres. The generic analysis definitely provides a vantage from which to offer critical judgments more confidently. Another problem for study would be the speaker's relationship to a genre as a controlling mode of rhetorical expression. Relevant to this would be the correlation between genres and the New England church offices of pastor and teacher, with their declared duties to exhort and teach. With a generic approach similar to the one developed in this study, research is possible in many other historical and geographical areas where one wishes to consider a large body of discourse.

Summary

Having expressed dissatisfaction over the repetitious uses of traditional rubrics for criticism, some rhetorical critics have recognized a need to explore

alternative methodologies. The need is produced by the problems of analyzing speeches from perspectives relating appropriately to their inherent qualities. In effect, these critics have realized that traditional categories may not always fit realities of modern public address.

This study has developed a methodology for critical analysis that transcends traditional limitations and identifies distinctive rhetorical elements characterizing various types of discourse. Through this methodology, the study has described qualities of three genres within seventeenth-century American public address.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Selected Seventeenth-Century Public Addresses

Allin, James. Serious Advice to Delivered Ones from Sickness. Boston: John Foster, 1679.

_____. The Spouse of Christ Coming Out of Affliction. Cambridge, Mass.: Samuel Green, 1672.

Arnold, Samuel. David Serving His Generation. Cambridge, Mass.: Samuel Green, 1674.

Chauncy, Charles. Gods Mercy Shewed to His People. Cambridge, Mass.: Samuel Green, 1655.

Cotton, John. "God's Promise to His Plantation." Old South Leaflets. Vol. III. Boston: Directors of the Old South Work, n.d., pp. 1-16.

Danforth, Samuel. A Brief Recognition of New-England's Errand into the Wilderness. Cambridge, Mass.: Samuel Green and Marmaduke Johnson, 1671.

_____. The Cry of Sodom Enquired Into. Cambridge, Mass.: Marmaduke Johnson, 1674.

Davenport, John. Gods Call to His People to Turn to Him. Cambridge, Mass.: Samuel Green and Marmaduke Johnson, 1669.

Fitch, James. An Holy Connexion. Cambridge, Mass.: Samuel Green, 1674.

_____. Peace the End of the Perfect and Upright. Cambridge, Mass.: Samuel Green, 1672.

Higginson, John. The Cause of God and His People in New-England. Cambridge, Mass.: Samuel Green, 1662.

_____. Our Dying Saviour's Legacy of Peace. Boston: Samuel Green, 1686.

Hoar, Leonard. The Sting of Death and Death Unstung. Boston: John Foster, 1680.

Hooker, Samuel. Righteousness Rained from Heaven. Cambridge, Mass.: Samuel Green, 1677.

Hooker, Thomas. The Application of Redemption. London: Peter Cole, 1656.

_____. The Unbeleevers Preparing for Christ. London: Andrew Crooke, 1638.

Hubbard, William. The Benefit of a Well-Ordered Conversation. Boston: Samuel Green, 1684.

_____. The Happiness of a People in the Wisdome of Their Rulers. Boston: John Foster, 1676.

Mather, Cotton. Addresses to Old Men, and Young Men, Little Children. Boston: R. Pierce, 1690.

_____. Call of the Gospel Applyed unto All Men. Boston: R. Pierce, 1690.

_____. Military Duties, Recommended to an Artillery Company. Boston: Richard Pierce, 1687.

_____. The Present State of New-England. Boston: Samuel Green, 1690.

_____. Speedy Repentance Urged. Boston: Samuel Green, 1690.

_____. The Wonderful Works of God Commemorated. Boston: Samuel Green, 1690.

Mather, Eleazar. A Serious Exhortation to the Present and Succeeding Generation in New England. Cambridge, Mass.: Samuel Green and Marmaduke Johnson, 1671.

Mather, Increase. A Call from Heaven to the Present and Succeeding Generations. Boston: John Foster, 1679.

_____. The Day of Trouble is Near. Cambridge, Mass.: Marmaduke Johnson, 1674.

_____. A Discourse Concerning the Uncertainty of the Times of Men. Boston: B. Green and J. Allen, 1697.

_____. An Earnest Exhortation to the Inhabitants of New-England. Boston: John Foster, 1676.

_____. Heavens Alarm to the World. Boston: John Foster, 1681.

_____. The Mystery of Christ. Boston: n.p., 1686.

_____. Pray for the Rising Generation. Cambridge, Mass.: Samuel Green, 1667.

_____. Renewal of Covenant the Great Duty Incumbent on Decaying or Distressed Churches. Boston: John Foster, 1677.

_____. The Times of Men Are in the Hand of God. Boston: John Foster, 1675.

_____. The Wicked Mans Portion. Boston: John Foster, 1675.

_____. Wo to Drunkards. Cambridge, Mass.: Marmaduke Johnson, 1673.

Mather, Richard. The Summe of Certain Sermons upon Genes[is]. Cambridge, Mass.: Samuel Green, 1652

Mather, Samuel. A Testimony from the Scripture. Cambridge, Mass.: Samuel Green, 1670.

Mitchel, Jonathan. Nehemiah on the Wall in Troublesome Times. Cambridge, Mass.: Samuel Green and Marmaduke Johnson, 1671.

Moodey, Joshua. The Believers Happy Change by Dying. Boston: B. Green and J. Allen, 1697.

_____. Souldiery Spiritualized or The Christian Souldier Orderly. Cambridge, Mass.: Samuel Green, 1674.

Norton, John. Three Choice and Profitable Sermons upon Severall Texts of Scriptures. Cambridge, Mass.: Samuel Green and Marmaduke Johnson, 1664.

Oakes, Urian. New-England Pleaded with, and Pressed to Consider the Things Which Concern Her Peace. Cambridge, Mass.: Samuel Green, 1673.

_____. The Unconquerable. Cambridge, Mass.: Samuel Green, 1674.

Oxenbridge, John. New-England Freemen Warned and Warmed, To Be Free Indeed. Cambridge, Mass.: n.p., 1673.

_____. A Quickening Word for the Hastening a Sluggish Soul. Cambridge, Mass.: Samuel Green and Marmaduke Johnson, 1670.

Rowlandson, Joseph. The Possibility of Gods Forsaking a People. Boston: John Ratcliffe & John Griffin, 1682.

Shepard, Thomas. Eye-Salve, or a Watch-Word from Our Lord Jesus Christ unto His Church. Cambridge, Mass.: Samuel Green, 1673.

_____. Wine for Gospel Wantons. Cambridge, Mass.: n.p., 1668.

Stoughton, William. New-Englands True Interest; Not to Lie. Cambridge, Mass.: Samuel Green and Marmaduke Johnson, 1670.

Torrey, Samuel. An Exhortation unto Reformation. Cambridge, Mass.: Marmaduke Johnson, 1674.

Wakeman, Samuel. A Young Man's Legacy to the Rising Generation. Cambridge, Mass.: Marmaduke Johnson, 1673.

Walley, Thomas. Balm in Gilead to Heal Sions Wound. Cambridge, Mass.: Samuel Green and Marmaduke Johnson, 1669.

Wheeler, Thomas. A Thankefull Remembrance of Gods Mercy. Cambridge, Mass.: Samuel Green, 1676.

Whiting, Samuel. Abraham's Humble Intercession for Sodom. Cambridge, Mass.: Samuel Green, 1666.

_____. A Discourse of the Last Judgement. Cambridge, Mass.: Samuel Green, 1664.

Willard, Samuel. The Duty of a People That Have Renewed Their Covenant with God. Boston: John Foster, 1680.

_____. The Fiery Tryal No Strange Thing. Boston: Printed for Samuel Sewell, 1682.

_____. The Heart Garrisoned. Cambridge, Mass.: Samuel Green, 1676.

_____. Mercy Magnified on a Penitent Prodigal. Boston: Samuel Green, 1684.

_____. A Sermon Preached upon Ezek. 22. 30, 31. Boston: John Foster, 1679.

_____. Useful Instructions for a Professing People in Times of Great Security and Degeneracy. Cambridge, Mass.: Samuel Green, 1673.

Wilson, John. A Seasonable Watch-word unto Christians against the Dreams & Dreamers of This Generation. Cambridge, Mass.: Samuel Green, 1677.

Winthrop, John. "A Modell of Christian Charity." The Puritans. Edited by Perry Miller and Thomas H. Johnson. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1965.

Sources on Seventeenth-Century Old and New England

Allen, J. W. English Political Thought, 1603-1660. Vol. I. London: Methuen and Company Ltd., 1938.

Barck, Oscar Theodore, Jr., and Lefler, Hugh Talmage. Colonial America. 2nd ed. New York: Macmillan Company, 1968.

Baritz, Loren, City on a Hill: A History of Ideas and Myths in America. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.

Boorstin, Daniel J. The Americans: The Colonial Experience. New York: Vintage Books, 1958.

Calvin, John. Institutes of the Christian Religion. 2 vols. Translated by Henry Beveridge. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Grand Rapids Book Manufacturers, Inc., 1966.

Carroll, Peter N. Puritanism and the Wildreness: The Intellectual Significance of the New England Frontier, 1629-1700. New York: Columbia University Press, 1969.

Coolidge, John. "Hingham Builds a Meetinghouse." New England Quarterly, XXXIV (December, 1961), 425-461.

Cremeans, Charles Davis. The Reception of Calvinistic Thought in England. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1949.

Curti, Merle. The Growth of American Thought. 3rd ed. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1964.

Davies, Norman H. "Titles as Symbols of Prestige in Seventeenth-Century New England." William and Mary Quarterly, VI (January, 1949), 69-83.

Emerson, Everett H. English Puritanism from John Hooper to John Milton. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1968.

Fingerhut, Eugene R. "Were the Massachusetts Puritans Hebraic?" New England Quarterly, XL (December, 1967), 521-531.

Grabo, Norman S. "The Veiled Vision: The Role of Aesthetics in Early American Intellectual History," William and Mary Quarterly, XIX (October, 1962), 493-510.

Gummere, Richard M. The American Colonial Mind and the Classical Tradition. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963.

_____. Seven Wise Men of Colonial America. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1967.

Haller, William. The Rise of Puritanism: Or, The Way to the New Jerusalem as Set Forth in Pulpit and Press from Thomas Cartwright to John Lilburne and John Milton, 1570-1643. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1957.

Heimert, Alan. Religion and the American Mind: From the Great Awakening to the Revolution. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1966.

Hill, Christopher. The Century of Revolution, 1603-1714. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1961.

Hutchinson, Thomas. The History of the Colony and Province of Massachusetts-Bay. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936.

James, Sydney V., ed. The New England Puritans. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1968.

[Johnson, Edward]. Johnson's Wonder-Working Providence, 1628-1651. Edited by J. Franklin James. New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1958.

Lathrop, Elise. Old New England Churches. Rutland: Charles E. Tuttle Co., 1963.

Lockridge, Kenneth A. "The History of a Puritan Church." New England Quarterly, XL (September, 1967), 399-424.

McGiffert, Michael, ed. Puritanism and the American Experience. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969.

McNeill, John T. The History and Character of Calvinism. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Mather, Cotton. Diary of Cotton Mather. Vol. I. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., [1911].

_____. Magnalia Christi Americana; or, The Ecclesiastical History of New England, from its First Planting, in the Year 1620, unto the Year of Our Lord 1698. 2 vols. New York: Russell & Russell, 1967.

Miller, Perry. "The End of the World." William and Mary Quarterly, VIII (January, 1951), 171-191.

_____. Errand into the Wilderness. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1964.

_____. The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century. Vol. I. Boston: Beacon Press, 1965.

_____. The New England Mind: From Colony to Province. Vol. II. Boston: Beacon Press, 1966.

Miller, Perry, and Johnson, Thomas H., eds. The Puritans. 2 vols., rev. ed. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1965.

Morgan, Edmund S. The Puritan Family: Religion and Domestic Relations in Seventeenth-Century New England. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1966.

_____. Visible Saints: The History of a Puritan Idea. New York: New York University Press, 1963.

Morison, Samuel Eliot. Builders of the Bay Colony. Boston, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1958.

_____. The European Discovery of America. New York: Oxford University Press, 1971.

_____. Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century. 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936.

_____. The Intellectual Life of Colonial New England. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1966.

_____. The Oxford History of the American People. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Murdock, Kenneth B. Literature and Theology in Colonial New England. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1963.

Notestein, Wallace. The English People on the Eve of Colonization. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1962.

Parrington, Vernon Louis. Main Currents in American Thought. Vol. I: The Colonial Mind, 1620-1800. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1954.

Pearce, Roy Harvey, ed. Colonial American Writing. 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.

Powicke, Maurice. The Reformation in England. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Reinitz, Richard, ed. Tensions in American Puritanism. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1970.

_____. "The Typological Argument for Religious Toleration: The Separatist Tradition and Roger Williams." Early American Literature, V (Spring, 1970), Part I, 74-110.

Rose, Harold Wickliffe. The Colonial House of Worship in America. New York: Hastings House, 1963.

Rowse, Alfred Leslie. The Elizabethans and America. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959.

Rutman, Darett B. American Puritanism: Faith and Practice. New York: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1970.

Schneider, Herbert W. The Puritan Mind. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1961.

Sewall, Samuel. "Diary." The Puritans. Edited by Perry Miller and Thomas H. Johnson. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1965.

Simpson, Alan. Puritanism in Old and New England. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966.

Smith, James Morton. Seventeenth-Century America: Essays in Colonial History. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1959.

Stewart, Randall. "Puritan Literature." William and Mary Quarterly, III (July, 1946), 319-342.

Tillyard, E. M. W. The Elizabethan World Picture. New York: Vintage Books, n.d.

Trefz, Edward K. "The Puritan's View of History." Boston Public Library Quarterly, IX (1957), 115-136.

Trevelyan, G. M. England under the Stuarts. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1965.

Tyler, Moses Coit. A History of American Literature During the Colonial Period. 2 vols., rev. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1897.

Wertenbaker, Thomas Jefferson. The Puritan Oligarchy: The Founding of American Civilization. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1970.

Wilson, John F. Pulpit in Parliament: Puritanism during the English Civil Wars, 1640-1648. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1969.

Winthrop, John. Winthrop's Journal: "History of New England." Edited by James K. Hosmer. 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1908.

Wright, Louis B. The Cultural Life of the American Colonies, 1607-1763. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1957.

Wright, Thomas Goddard. Literary Culture in Early New England, 1620-1730. New York: Russell & Russell, 1966.

Ziff, Larzer. The Career of John Cotton: Puritanism and the American Experience. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1962.

_____. The Literature of America: Colonial Period. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970.

Sources on Rhetoric and Public Address

Aly, Bower. "The Gallows Speech: A Lost Genre." Southern Speech Journal, XXXIV (Spring, 1969), 204-213.

Andrews, William D. "The Printed Funeral Sermons of Cotton Mather." Early American Literature, V (Fall, 1970), 24-44.

Augustine. On Christine Doctrine. Translated by D. W. Robertson, Jr. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1958.

Blair, Hugh. Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres. Edited by Harold F. Harding. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1965.

Blench, J. W. Preaching in England in the Late Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries: A Study of English Sermons, 1450-1600. New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1964.

Bohman, George V. "The Development of Secular American Public Address to 1787." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1947.

_____. "The Historical Background of American Public Address: The Colonial Period." A History and Criticism of American Public Address. Vol. I. Edited by William Norwood Brigance. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1943.

_____. "Rhetorical Practice in Colonial America." History of Speech Education in America: Background Studies. Edited by Karl R. Wallace. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954.

Camp, Leon Ray. "Man and His Government: Roger Williams vs. the Massachusetts Oligarchy." Preaching in American History: Selected Issues in the American Pulpit, 1630-1967. Edited by DeWitte Holland. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1969.

Campbell, George. The Philosophy of Rhetoric. Edited by Lloyd F. Bitzer. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1963.

Caplan, Harry. "Rhetorical Invention in Some Mediaeval Tractates on Preaching." Speculum, II (July, 1927), 284-295.

_____. "The Four Senses of Scriptural Interpretation and the Medieval Theory of Preaching." Speculum, IV (July, 1929), 282-290.

Christophensen, Merrill S. "The Unfinished Work of the Research Scholar in the Carolinas." North Carolina Journal of Speech, II (Fall, 1968), 2-6.

Collins, Edward M., Jr. "The Rhetoric of Sensation Challenges the Rhetoric of Intellect: An Eighteenth-Century Controversy." Preaching in American History: Selected Issues in the American Pulpit, 1630-1967. Edited by DeWitte Holland. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1969.

Davis, Richard Beale. "A Sermon Preached at James City in Virginia the 23d of April 1686 by Devel Pead." William and Mary Quarterly, XVII (July, 1960), 371-394.

Davis, Thomas M. "Edward Taylor and the Traditions of Puritan Typology." Early American Literature, IV (Winter, 1970), 27-47.

_____. "The Exegetical Traditions of Puritan Typology." Early American Literature, V (Spring, 1970), Part I, 11-50.

Emerson, Everett H. "John Udall and the Puritan Sermon." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLIV (October, 1958), 282-284.

Guthrie, Allen Warren. "The Development of Rhetorical Theory in America, 1635-1850." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1940.

_____. "Rhetorical Theory in Colonial America." History of Speech Education in America: Background Studies. Edited by Karl R. Wallace. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954.

Hitchcock, Orville A. "Jonathan Edwards." A History and Criticism of American Public Address. Vol. I. Edited by William Norwood Brigance. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1943.

Hiten, Stephen Stegmann. "The Historical Background of the Election Sermon and a Rhetorical Analysis of Five Sermons Delivered in Massachusetts between 1754 and 1775." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1960.

Holland, DeWitte, ed. Preaching in American History: Selected Issues in the American Pulpit, 1630-1967. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1969.

Howell, Wilbur Samuel. "English Backgrounds of Rhetoric." History of Speech Education in America: Background Studies. Edited by Karl R. Wallace. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954.

_____. Logic and Rhetoric in England, 1500-1700. New York: Russell & Russell, 1961.

_____. "Ramus and English Rhetoric, 1574-1681." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXVII (October, 1951), 299-310.

Hudson, Roy Fred. "Rhetorical Invention in Colonial New England." Speech Monographs, XXV (August, 1958), 215-221.

_____. "The Theory of Communication of Colonial New England Preachers, 1620-1670." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1953.

Kerr, Harry P. "The Election Sermon: Primer for Revolutionaries." Speech Monographs, XXIX (March, 1962), 13-22.

_____. "Politics and Religion in Colonial Fast and Thanksgiving Sermons, 1763-1783." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLVI (December, 1960), 372-382.

Kilgust, Dean. "Massachusetts Election Sermons." Unpublished M.S. thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1949.

Lazenby, Walter. "Exhortation as Exorcism: Cotton Mather's Sermons to Murderers." Quarterly Journal of Speech, LVII (February, 1971), 50-56.

Levy, Babette May. Preaching in the First Half Century of New England History. New York: Russell & Russell, 1967.

McGee, Michael C. "Thematic Reduplication in Christian Rhetoric." Quarterly Journal of Speech, LVI (April, 1970), 196-294.

Martin, Howard H. "Puritan Preachers on Preaching: Notes on American Colonial Rhetoric." Quarterly Journal of Speech, L (October, 1964), 285-292.

_____. "Ramus, Ames, Perkins and Colonial Rhetoric." Western Speech, XXII (Spring, 1959), 74-82.

Miller, Perry. "Declension in a Bible Commonwealth." Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society, LXXXVIII (April, 1941), 3-60. Reprinted in Nature's Nation (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1967), pp. 14-50; and in The New England Puritans, ed. by Sydney V. James (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1968), pp. 130-158.

Minnick, Wayne C. "The New England Execution Sermon, 1639-1800." Speech Monographs, XXXV (March, 1968), 77-89.

Mixon, Harold Dean. "The Artillery Election Sermon in New England, 1672-1774." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Florida State University, 1964.

Nadeau, Ray. "Oratorical Formulas in Seventeenth-Century England." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXVIII (April, 1952), 149-154.

Oliver, Robert T. History of Public Speaking in America. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1965.

Ong, Walter J. Ramus: Method, and the Decay of Dialogue from the Art of Discourse to the Art of Reason. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958.

Plumstead, A. W., ed. The Wall and the Garden: Selected Massachusetts Election Sermons, 1670-1775. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1968.

Potter, David, and Thomas, Gordon L., eds. The Colonial Idiom. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1970.

Priestly, Joseph. A Course of Lectures on Oratory and Criticism. Edited by Vinvent M. Bevilacqua and Richard Murphy. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1965.

Reed, John William. "The Rhetoric of a Colonial Controversy: Roger Williams Versus the Massachusetts Bay Colony." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1966.

Sandford, William Phillips. English Theories of Public Address, 1530-1828. Columbus, Ohio: Harold L. Hedrick, 1965.

Seaver, Paul S. The Puritan Lectureships: The Politics of Religious Dissent, 1560-1662. Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press, 1970.

Taylor, Edward. Christographia. Edited by Norman S. Grabo. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962.

Terris, Walter Franklin. "The Right to Speak: Massachusetts, 1628-1685." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1962.

Trefz, Edward K. "Satan in Puritan Preaching." Boston Public Library Quarterly, VIII (1956), 71-84 and 148-157.

White, Eugene. E. "Puritan Preaching and the Authority of God." Preaching in American History: Selected Issues in the American Pulpit, 1630-1967. Edited by DeWitte Holland. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1969.

_____. "Solomon Stoddard's Theories of Persuasion." Speech Monographs, XXIX (November, 1962), 235-259.

Sources on Critical Methodology

Aristotle. On Poetry and Style. Translated by G. M. A. Grube. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1958.

_____. Rhetoric. Translated by W. Rhys Roberts. New York: Random House, Inc., 1954.

Baird A. Craig, and Thonssen, Lester. "Methodology in the Criticism of Public Address." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXIII (April, 1947), 134-138.

_____. "The Study of Speeches." American Public Addresses. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.

Baskerville, Barnet. "Addendum, 1967," to "Selected Writings on the Criticism of Public Address." Essays on Rhetorical Criticism. Edited by Thomas R. Nilsen. New York: Random House, 1968.

_____. "Nineteenth-century Burlesque of Oratory." American Quarterly, XX (Winter, 1968), 726-743.

_____. "The Place of Oratory in American Literature." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXIX (December, 1953), 459-464.

Black, Edwin. Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method. New York: Macmillan Company, 1965.

Braden, Waldo W. "The Emergence of the Concept of Southern Oratory." Southern Speech Journal, XXVI (Spring, 1961), 173-183.

_____., ed. Oratory in the Old South, 1828-1860. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1970.

_____. Review of Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method, by Edwin Black. Southern Speech Journal, XXXI (Spring, 1966), 249-250.

Brandes, Paul D. "The Composition and Preservation of Aristotle's Rhetoric," Speech Monographs, XXXV (November, 1968), 482-491.

Brigance, William Norwood, ed. A History and Criticism of American Public Address. Vol. I. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1943.

Brockriede, Wayne E. "Toward a Contemporary Aristotelian Theory of Rhetoric." Quarterly Journal of Speech, LII (February, 1966), 33-40.

Brown, Huntington. Prose Styles: Five Primary Types. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1966.

Bryant, Donald C. "Rhetoric: Its Function and Scope." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXIX (December, 1953), 401-424.

_____. "Some Problems of Scope and Method in Rhetorical Scholarship." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXIII (April, 1937), 182-189.

Burgess, Parke G. "The Rhetoric of Moral Conflicts: Two Critical Dimensions." Quarterly Journal of Speech, LVI (April, 1970), 120-130.

Cicero. De Oratore. Translated by E. W. Sutton. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1967.

Clark, Robert D. "Lesson from the Literary Critics." Western Speech, XXI (Spring, 1957), 83-89.

Conville, Richard. "Northrop Frye and Speech Criticism: An Introduction." Quarterly Journal of Speech, LVI (December, 1970), 417-425.

Cooper, Lane. An Aristotelian Theory of Comedy with an Adaptation of the Poetics and a Translation of the Tractatus Coislinianus. New York: n.p.; 1922.

Crandell, S. Judson. "The Beginnings of a Methodology for Social Control Studies in Public Address." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXIII (February, 1947), 36-39.

Croft, Albert J. "The Functions of Rhetorical Criticism." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLII (October, 1956), 283-291.

Ehninger, Douglas. "On Rhetoric and Rhetorics." Western Speech, XXXI (Fall, 1967), 242-249.

Ericson, Jon M. "A Critique of Rhetorical Criticism." Quarterly Journal of Speech, L (October, 1964), 313-315.

Farmer, Norman K., Jr. "A Theory of Genre for Seventeenth-Century Poetry." Genre, III (December, 1970), 293-317.

Frye, Northrop. "Rhetorical Criticism: Theory of Genres." Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays. New York: Atheneum, 1968.

_____. The Well-Tempered Critic. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1967.

Gregg, Richard B. "A Phenomenologically Oriented Approach to Rhetorical Criticism." Central States Speech Journal, XVII (May, 1966), 83-90.

Griffin, Leland M. "The Rhetoric of Historical Movements." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXVIII (April, 1952), 184-188.

Grube, G. M. A. "Rhetoric and Literary Criticism." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLII (December, 1956), 339-344.

Herrick, Marvin T. Comic Theory in the Sixteenth Century. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1950.

Hillbruner, Anthony. "Creativity and Contemporary Criticism." Western Speech, XXIV (Winter, 1960), 5-11.

_____. "Rhetoric, Region and Social Science." Central States Speech Journal, XXI (Fall, 1970), 172-174.

Hunt, Everett Lee. "Rhetoric and Literary Criticism." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXI (November, 1935), 564-568.

Jellicorse, John Lee. Review of Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method, by Edwin Black. Quarterly Journal of Speech, LI (October, 1965), 339-342.

Juan, E. San, Jr. "Notes Toward a Clarification of Organizing Principles and Genre Theory." Genre, I (October, 1968), 257-268.

Kennedy, George. The Art of Persuasion in Greece. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1963.

Klyn, Mark S. "Toward a Pluralistic Criticism." Essays on Rhetorical Criticism. Edited by Thomas R. Nilsen. New York: Random House, 1968.

Mazzoni, Jacopo. "On the Defense." Literary Criticism: Plato to Dryden. Edited by Allan H. Gilbert. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1963.

Murphy, Richard. "The Speech as Literary Genre." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLIV (April, 1958), 117-127.

Nichols, Marie Hochmuth. "Burkeian Criticism." Essays on Rhetorical Criticism. Edited by Thomas R. Nilsen. New York: Random House, 1968.

[Nichols], Marie Hochmuth. "The Criticism of Rhetoric." A History and Criticism of American Public Address. Vol. III. Edited by Marie Hochmuth. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1955.

[Nichols], Marie Hochmuth. "I. A. Richards and the 'New Rhetoric.'" Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLIV (February, 1958), 1-16.

[Nichols], Marie Hochmuth. "Kenneth Burke and the 'New Rhetoric.'" Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXVIII (April, 1952), 133-144.

Nichols, Marie Hochmuth. Rhetoric and Criticism. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1963.

Nilsen, Thomas R. "Interpretative Function of the Critic." Western Speech, XXI (Spring, 1957), 70-76.

_____. "Criticism and Social Consequences." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLII (April, 1956), 173-178.

_____. Essays on Rhetorical Criticism. New York: Random House, Inc., 1968.

Pearson, Norman Holmes. "Literary Forms and Types; or, A Defense of Polonius." English Institute Annual, 1940. Edited by Rudolf Kirk. New York: Columbia University Press, 1941.

Piercy, Josephine K. Studies in Literary Types in Seventeenth-Century America, 1607-1710. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1939.

Plato. "The Ion." Literary Criticism: Plato to Dryden. Edited and translated by Allan H. Gilbert. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1963.

_____. "The Republic." Literary Criticism: Plato to Dryden. Edited and translated by Allan H. Gilbert. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1963.

Quintilian. The Institutio Oratoria. Translated by H. E. Butler. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963.

Randall, John Herman, Jr. Aristotle. New York: Columbia University Press, 1963.

Redding, Charles. "Extrinsic and Instrinsic Criticism." Western Speech, XXI (Spring, 1957), 96-102.

Reichert, John F. "Organizing Principles' and Genre Theory." Genre, I (January, 1968), 1-12.

Riddel, Joseph N. "Against Formalism." Genre, III (June, 1970), 156-172.

Rosenfield, Lawrence W. Review of Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method, by Edwin Black. Speech Teacher, XV (January, 1966), 89-90.

Sacks, Sheldon. "The Psychological Implications of Generic Distinctions." Genre, I (April, 1968), 106-115.

Scott, Robert L. Review of Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method, by Edwin Black. Quarterly Journal of Speech, LI (October, 1965), 335-338.

Sydney, Sir Philip. "The Defense of Poesie." Literary Criticism: Plato to Dryden. Edited by Allan H. Gilbert. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1963.

Thonssen, Lester, and Baird, A. Craig. Speech Criticism: The Development of Standards for Rhetorical Appraisal. New York: Ronald Press Company, 1948.

Utley, Francis Lee. "Oral Genres as Bridge to Written Literature." Genre, II (June, 1969), 91-103.

Vivas, Eliseo. "Literary Classes: Some Problems." Genre, I (April, 1968), 97-105.

Weinberg, Bernard. A History of Literary Criticism in the Italian Renaissance. Vol. I. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Wellek, Rene, and Warren, Austin. "Literary Genres." Theory of Literature. 3rd ed. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1956.

Wichelns, Herbert A. "The Literary Criticism of Oratory." Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of James Albert Winans. Edited by Alexander M. Drummond. New York: Russell & Russell, 1962.

Wrage, Ernest J. "Public Address: A Study in Social and Intellectual History." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXIII (December, 1947), 451-457.

Bibliographical Guides

Abel, Darrel, ed. American Literature. Vol. I: Colonial and Early American Writing. Great Neck, N.Y.: Barron's Educational Service, 1963.

Benton, Robert M. "An Annotated Check List of Puritan Sermons Published in America before 1700." Bulletin of the New York Public Library, LXXIV (May, 1970), 286-337.

Bibliotheca, Americana. Catalogue of the John Carter Brown Library in Brown University. 3 vols. Providence, R.I.: John Carter Brown Library, 1919-1931.

Bristol, Roger P. Index of Printers, Publishers and Booksellers Indicated by Charles Evans in his American Bibliography. Charlottesville: Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia, 1961.

_____. Supplement to Charles Evans' American Bibliography. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1970.

Davis, Richard Beale, ed. American Literature Through Bryant, 1585-1830. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969.

Evans, Charles. American Bibliography: A Chronological Dictionary of All Books, Pamphlets, and Periodical Publications, Printed in the United States of America from the Genesif of Printing in 1639 Down to and Including the Year 1820. With Bibliographical and Biographical Notes. Vol. I: 1639-1729. n.p.: Privately printed by the Author, 1904.

Leary, Lewis. Articles on American Literature, 1900-1950. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1954.

Shipton, Clifford K., ed. Early American Imprints, 1639-1800. New York: Readex Microprint Corporation and Massachusetts Antiquarian Society, 1965.

Shipton, Clifford K., and Mooney, James E. National Index of American Imprints through 1800: The Short-Title Evans. n.p.: American Antiquarian Society, 1969.

Stark, Lewis M., and Cole, Maud D. Checklist of Additions to Evans' American Bibliography in the Rare Book Division of the New York Public Library. New York: New York Public Library, 1961.

Walters, Willard O. American Imprints, 1648-1797, in the Huntingdon Library Supplementing Evans' American Bibliography. San Marino, Calif.: Huntingdon Library, 1933.

Weimer, David R., ed. Bibliography of American Culture, 1493-1875. American Studies Association. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1957.