Bicentennial of the Brush Run Church
1811-2011

Is there a Disciples Way of Preaching?

Another factor besides the desire to be biblical, to be reasonable, and to be thorough influenced the structure of sermons. This factor was the ability of the listeners not only to follow the sermon but also to remember it.

By Fred B. Craddock

A WORD TO THE READER: *I feel I owe it to the reader to make three comments, which might aid the reading of this essay. First, you will notice that my attention has been almost totally on the Campbells of the Campbell-Stone Movement. This is not to imply that Stone was somehow different from the Campbells on the matter of preaching or that Stone had less to contribute to the subject. The sole reason for focusing on the Campbells, and on Alexander in particular, was this essay is offered to a collection of essays to celebrate the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the Brush Run Church in Washington, Pennsylvania. Secondly, my comments are primarily concerned with the first two generations of Disciple preaching on the assumption that those were the formative years. I have trusted the reader to attend to continuities and discontinuities with current Disciple preaching. Thirdly, I have chosen not to punctuate our conversation with footnotes. Instead, I have provided at the end a selected bibliography of the works which in my preparation I found most helpful. -Fred B. Craddock*

Is there a Disciples Way of Preaching? If this question is asked with the expectation of an answer Yes or No immediately, then the answer has to be No. That is, one could not listen to a sermon recorded by a preacher unknown to an audience in a location unknown and be able to say that was or was not a Disciples preacher. The reasons for this difficulty of clear identification are many. Among them are:

- The variety of gifts which distinguish among preachers, even those belonging to the same faith tradition.

- The variety of influences that shape preachers, both in style and content, whether preaching was learned in a classroom or through an apprenticeship.
- The variety of seminaries attended, many of them non-Disciple. The number of Disciple ministers receiving their education in schools unrelated to the Disciples has increased greatly in our two hundred-year history.
- An increasing number of Disciples preachers have transferred their credentials to the Disciples after a ministry of several years in another faith tradition. Such preachers bring with them a style already formed.
- The Disciples of Christ arose as a reformation within the broad tradition of Protestant Christianity and within that broad tradition it remains. All Protestant pulpits are more alike than different.
- An individual Disciples preacher may change his or her homiletical method during a lifetime of ministry in the desire to address a culture changing in how and why it does or does not listen.

You may wish to add to this list other reasons for the difficulty in identifying a Disciples preaching style, but these are enough to justify a No in response to the question, "Is there a Disciples way of preaching?" However, a list of scores of reasons would not lead to the conclusion that the Disciple pulpit is therefore weak, lacking in strength or character, built on shifting sand. On the contrary, a pulpit without change could well be a pulpit which speaks but does not listen, a pulpit out of touch, unresponsive, a pulpit in violation of the first law of good communication – appropriateness.

Nor does the response No doom to futility the continued pursuit of the question, "Is there a Disciples way of preaching?" There is much to be learned, not so much in arriving at an answer as in the search for an answer. Preaching is a regularly repeated exercise and, as such, needs now and then to back away and look at itself, and listen to itself, and bring its understanding of its why and how to the level of conscious reflection. The preacher needs now and then to sit on his or her own shoulder and assess a sacred task which can fall victim to rote repetition. The goal is not to evaluate and judge but rather to refresh and renew. So, hold the question in your mind and let's talk a bit.

Preaching has always been held in high esteem among Disciples. Sometimes, perhaps, too high. Ministerial search committees were often called "Pulpit Committees" and candidates preached a "trial sermon." Worship services often were planned around the sermon, serving as the nest into which the sermon's egg was laid. Many other Protestant bodies behaved likewise, but with the Disciples this elevation of the pulpit contradicted the accent on the Lord's Supper as the centerpiece of the worship service. Churches met together on the first day of the week to break bread (Acts 20:7) and if there was a preacher present, there would be a sermon. The wiser congregations found a balance not by diminishing the pulpit but by giving more attention

to the entire service of worship. By contrast, the Roman Catholic Church, after Vatican II (1969), re-asserted the role of the sermon, recalling the words of Thomas Aquinas, "The primary duty of the priest is to preach the Gospel."

The person of the preacher was not a subject receiving much attention in the early days of the Campbell-Stone Movement. If this was a fault it was not theirs alone. Across the board churches seemed to feel no need to speak often of the spiritual and moral life of the preacher. Perhaps it was assumed that the one who spoke of prayer was one who prayed, that the one who weighed in against lying told the truth, that the one who warned against adultery was faithful. Perhaps the churches at that time and place felt attention to the messenger took the eye off the message. Then, too, the psychological tools had not been developed to assist understanding the sicknesses which attack souls of ministers: ennui, loneliness, pride, excessive inwardness, self-doubt, among others. It was important to Alexander Campbell that the one who interpreted the Word of God live within understanding distance of God. Perhaps that was enough to say. Of course, over these two hundred years the Disciples have not taken a back seat to anyone in providing resources and personnel for understanding and encouraging the person of the preacher.

I think it would be fair to say that in general Disciples ministers have been Augustinian and the congregations Donatian in their views of the relationship between the messenger and the message. Augustine insisted that the sacraments and preaching were effective in their purposes and were not rendered ineffective by flaws in the faith or character of the minister. Augustine was not supporting permissiveness in the beliefs and behavior of the minister but was rather upholding the power of God without contingency. Donatus argues that the faith and character of the minister were integral to the effectiveness of ministerial acts such as the sacraments and preaching. Donatus was insisting on the necessity of moral and spiritual quality in ministers and messengers of the word. Although they may not express it in these terms, Disciples preachers would generally agree with Augustine, not because he let them off the moral hook, but because they believe in the power of God in spite of the flaws in the messengers. The laity, on the other hand, so elevate the minister that when a minister is involved in moral or spiritual mischief, the fall is so great that in the eyes of the congregation, the acts of that minister, including preaching, are null and void. I have, on occasion, been asked to re-baptize a person who has discovered that the minister who baptized him or her was at the time an alcoholic or involved in an illicit relationship. I have, in such cases, argued that the moral or spiritual condition did not make valid or invalid the efficacy of the baptism. But I could certainly understand the church's expectation of ministers and the seriousness with which breaches of trust are regarded. Very likely this discussion of the relationship between the messenger and the message will never end, and probably should not.

Receiving more attention in the formative years of the Campbell-Stone Movement was the education of the minister, or, as in some cases, the lack thereof. Several factors make it

difficult to identify the Disciples preacher. One factor is the strong anti-clergy sentiment among settlers in America. In Europe, these soon-to-be settlers felt the power of churches and clergy, in league with governments, assessing taxes, living in luxury, selling salvation, and in many cases, without moral scruples. Clergy seemed to be above the law and above the demands placed on the common citizenry. If being educated gave this elevated status, then many in the new country preferred a preacher with little or no education. Such preachers were accessible, plain in speech, "just one of us." They were not elected to special place, adorned by special clothing; they were called to preach, and did so in the power of the Holy Spirit. It is true, of course, that along the East Coast, some churches and their clergy replicated in America their positions in Europe, and some churches were "established," being supported by taxes and protected by government. But it did not take long for churches to be "disestablished." As the country moved west, with the spirit of equality and democracy, that spirit went back eastward as well, but never fully. The Campbell-Stone Movement had scant success in New England and "down East" but on the frontier it thrived in the climate where anybody can be president and anybody can preach.

Alexander Campbell, himself well educated in Scotland, was, in his early years, opposed to clergy education. He feared the abuses that came with clericalism. When he came to the view that clergy should be educated, their education was to be no different from the education others would receive. What, then, identified the Disciples preacher if it was not a specific kind of education? The identity of the preacher as such was in the use of one's education to prepare and deliver sermons. As we know, the Disciples moved on to the point where a seminary degree was the standard expectation as preparation for ministry. But even today, there remains among the churches a residue of Campbell's anti-clericalism, and it expresses itself in a suspicion of the seminaries. It may seem to many a contradiction: wherever the church goes it establishes and supports schools (the Disciples have in their brief history started over four hundred schools), but at the same time questions the value of those schools. What are they teaching? What good is higher education if men and women graduate with less faith than when they entered? The seminary and the church live in tension and in that tension are echoes of Campbell's warnings.

Again, let it be clear that neither the Campbells nor Stone can be located in the broad stream of anti-intellectualism which has always existed in America. Alexander Campbell was a strong advocate of public education and worked for it in and out of the Virginia Legislature. In the short term he encouraged taking advantage of any educational opportunity on the frontier. For example, W.H. McGuffey of Ohio (1800-1873) developed a series of Readers to be used by individuals, in homes, and in schoolrooms. These Readers were designed to move a student from complete illiteracy to the capacity to read, write, and use numbers. And most importantly, the McGuffey theory of education insisted that a subject had not been learned until the student could stand before a group and say it. Poems were recited, stories were told,

issues were debated. If a person with the slender advantage of such an education exemplified strong character and firm conviction, why should that person not be encouraged to move from the recitation bench of a schoolhouse to the pulpit of the church? Mr. Campbell and others of the Movement did that encouraging. But they also encouraged the pursuit of additional education as opportunity provided, perhaps even to seeking a college degree. To such persons the doors of Bethany College (among others) opened and the student desiring to be a preacher sat among students desiring to be teachers, lawyers, physicians, and homemakers. But whatever the vocational goal, they followed the same basic curriculum, and at the center of it was the Bible. To this day, distinctions between clergy and laity are not so clear among Disciples as among many faith traditions.

With the passing of the frontier so have passed, or at least diminished, some of the traits of Disciples preaching. Those who drank deeply of the emotionalism common to the frontier are fewer now. Emotion remains a quality much desired, but emotionalism is generally regarded as a distortion of the faith. Likewise, debating as a way to advance the Gospel has died the death. Alexander Campbell, himself a debater of great skills, came to the conclusion that the adversarial mentality, not only of the speaker but also of the listener, did more harm than good. Debates had great entertainment value which was needed and welcomed on the frontier, but did little to convert or to advance the truth. What remains and continues to characterize Disciples preaching is the appeal to reasonableness and clear good sense. Here and there this appeal to intelligence has sunk into a cerebral arrogance, but such a fringe distortion does not invalidate the common assumption that the listener can think. This observation leads us to a brief consideration of the Disciples' estimate of the listeners to preaching.

Couched within the matter and manner of sermons lies the preacher's assumption about the listeners, their spiritual, moral, and intellectual capacities. Are they capable of hearing and receiving the message or are they, as human beings, so darkened in mind and soul that it would take a prior act of the Holy Spirit to enable them to respond to the message? In some theologies, the effect of the "fall" of Adam and Eve is to render all humanity incapable of turning toward God. They are not able not to sin. Genesis 3 has completely erased Genesis 1; the image of God does not exist, even in human memory.

With Disciples this is not the prevailing anthropology. Genesis 3 does record a fall, a crash, a major break in human relation to God. However, Disciples believe that Genesis 3 does not completely obliterate the image of God in us, nor did it destroy the appetite, the hunger, the desire for a relationship with God. Stir among the fragments after the "Fall" and one can find a faint recollection of Genesis 1: "And God created them in God's own image." It is to this surviving memory that Disciples sermons are addressed. This residue of the image of God includes rational capacity as well as capacity for trust and love. No "pre-venient" act of the Holy Spirit is required for the listener to hear, to understand, and to believe the Gospel. This is

why so many Disciples' sermons seem to be reminders of what the listener already knows. An atmosphere of expectancy prevails: it is expected that the listener will embrace the announcement of Good News. But the preacher still carries the burden of presenting the message clearly and reasonably since the listener has the capacity and appetite to respond to that which is clear and reasonable. This appeal to the mind, although varying from preacher to preacher, remains a mark of Disciple preaching among all three branches of the movement.

But Disciples preaching not only trusted that listeners to a clear and reasonable message were capable of hearing and understanding and accepting that message; those listeners were also capable of dealing with the best scholarship available to the preacher. While it is true that Disciples preachers have been as guilty as others of "protecting" the church from scholarship, this flaw is not indigenous to the movement. Of course, a good shepherd does not bring into the pulpit every new theological notion just to shock the sheep, but neither does a good shepherd leave the sheep in the same short grass when better grazing is available. Many a seminary education has been left unshared with the congregation because the minister said, "My people aren't ready to deal with that."

Two examples of the preacher's confidence in the mental capacities of the laity will suffice here. (Remember that the ability to reason and respond to the reasonable were regarded as components of "the image of God.") In 1889, B.W. Johnson published *The People's New Testament with Notes*. For the next fifty years this widely used book enabled listeners to sermons to recognize the explanations and interpretations of Scripture given by the preacher. They knew what the preacher knew. This 1889 volume was preceded by many journals and books for the same readership and with the same results. Early on, Disciple preaching knew what some of us were slow to realize, and that is, the power of preaching does not lie in the preacher knowing what the people do not, but rather in the listeners knowing what the preacher knows. And what is more encouraging and refreshing than recognition?

A second example is the preacher's trust of the congregation to be able to handle disputes and disagreements among scholars. For instance, Greek manuscripts differ on Acts 8:37: is it or is it not in the canonical text? Some manuscripts contain the verse, some do not. The Received Text used by the King James translators includes the verse. Alexander Campbell believed the best manuscript evidence did not support including the verse. When he published his translation of the New Testament, Acts 8:37 did not appear. Of course, observant readers asked, "What happened to verse 37? Are you changing the Bible?" Mr. Campbell anticipated such questions, welcomed them, and responded with basic text critical methods. The point is, Mr. Campbell did not think these matters belong in the academy but in the whole church since the Bible is the church's book.

These positive views of human nature were very much at home in a democratic society and especially on the frontier with its offer of a future to all who could see the endless

possibilities of human achievement. A few years ago in a discussion among American historians, a question arose as to how one can account for the unshakeable optimism of former President Ronald Reagan. One in the group, knowing President Reagan was reared in and was a member of the Disciples of Christ, offered the opinion that the church of his upbringing was a real contributing factor. Very likely; after all, this is an American reform movement with its leading journal entitled *Millennial Harbinger*. This is the faith tradition which, after moving one of its journals from Iowa to Chicago, renamed it *The Christian Century.*

And across this fair and hopeful frontier, what did those Disciples preach? A common response was, "You'll have to hand it to the Campbellites, they sure do preach the Bible." And they still do. But if you press for a more specific answer, you may be pointed to tightly woven sermons which were little more than doing exegesis in public (ex., J.W. McGarvey of Lexington), or to the well-crafted sermons of H.L. Willett of Chicago who was as serious about the Bible as McGarvey but who understood it through the methods of biblical criticism. (He was the first Disciple to get a Ph.D. in biblical studies). Or you may be pointed to any of the scores of Disciples preachers who had spent little or no time in an academy but who followed the plough all day and studied at night in anticipation of Sunday's sermon.

It goes without saying that the mixture of natural gifts and educational influences made each preacher unique. This, of course, remains true, but a history of Disciples preaching yields many traits in common as touching the Bible as the source of sermons. To begin with, the entire Bible was understood as the inspired Word of God. The canon was closed and final, delivered once and for all to the saints. The revelation of God in the Scripture was totally adequate for salvation. However, one must guard against bibliolatry. One such guard was reading different translations. To fix on one translation to the exclusion of others is idolatrous. The Bible is always to be in the vernacular of its readers. In addition, God has perfectly adapted the revelation to fit human reason. Therefore, one should not be hesitant to approach the Bible as one would approach any book. Study it scientifically; that is, inductively. Ask of the test: Who wrote it? To whom? Where? When? For what purpose? What aid to understanding is given in the context? Texts thus studied yield Christ. Directly or indirectly all roads lead to Bethlehem. There are in the texts differences, but these differences are only apparent and lose their contradictory character when submitted to the central and overarching message, "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God." Some preachers preferred to draw their messages from particular texts, finding in them subject, substance, and sometimes form. Others, in a single sermon, might announce a subject and then let it draw a score or more biblical references. One particular preacher in the late nineteenth century boasted of 102 references in one sermon. No doubt many listeners applauded his effort as "Bible preaching." It is likely that his conviction that "Bible is Bible" gave him permission to take no time with Mr. Campbell's insistence on explaining the context of each text and on asking, Who? To whom? When? Where? Why? Thankfully, such preaching has disappeared except in remote areas

rigidly preserving an old way of dealing with the Bible. The main stream of the tradition is no longer seduced by the concordance.

It is the case, however, that many Disciples preachers believed that the New Testament yielded a single pattern or blueprint for the church and that the restoration of that pattern would be the certain basis for the unity of the church. Naturally there was much preaching from Acts of Apostles, especially the early chapters. Interestingly enough, however, Alexander Campbell himself preached more from Hebrews than from any other book. It was almost inevitable in the course of time that Mr. Campbell's insistence on a "scientific" (inductive) approach to Scripture would be the means of undoing the single blueprint theory and replacing it with a vibrant variety of ways of being church, all of them supported by Scripture texts. The day would come, and now is, when Disciples preaching, deeply engaged in biblical intramurals, would move to a larger playing field where the Scriptures engaged the life and culture of America and of the world. But even though the playing field grew larger and the struggles to be faithful changed, the Disciples have never abandoned the study of the Scriptures as primary and essential to every engagement in the search for God's way in the world.

It probably would be of interest to the reader to think briefly about the form or structure of Disciples sermons. We cannot, of course, expect a single form, a "one size fits all" pattern to Disciples preaching, then or now. We can expect, however, that forms were favored which were congenial to the central source of sermons, the Scripture, and to the capacity of listeners to hear, to understand, and to receive the Word of God. These two statements become one n practice because the Scripture is reasonable and therefore already shaped to fit the ear of the listener. The preacher could do no better, therefore, than to let the sermon form follow the contours of the text. For example, a favorite text for preaching was also a favorite form or outline: Acts 2:42, "They devoted themselves to the apostles' teaching and fellowship, to the breaking of bread and the prayers." (NSRV). Four points, or four sermons; why look outside the text for a structure? Alexander Campbell urged preachers to analyze the sermons of Peter and of Paul as found in Acts. Such study would yield not only what to preach but also how to preach it. This same search of Scripture for the How as well as the What of preaching was satisfied by the classic model, a favorite of pre-Reformation preaching and still popular long after the Protestant Reformation, especially in England and Scotland. This model had five parts: Introduction, Context, Division of the Text, Discussion of the Divisions, and Application. The sermons of John Donne provide many examples, as do the sermons of scholar-preachers in nineteenth century America, some Disciples among them.

Another factor besides the desire to be biblical, to be reasonable, and to be thorough influenced the structure of sermons. This factor was the ability of the listeners not only to follow the sermon but also to remember it. The American frontier was very much an oral culture and as such depended on hearing and remembering what was heard. Preachers understood this and often built memory devices into the messages. For example, the story of

the Good Samaritan was divided into three parts: What's yours is mine and I'll take it (the robbers); What's mine is mine and I'll keep it (the priest and Levite); What's mine is yours and I'll share it (the Samaritan). The parable of the prodigal son was remembered in two movements aided by alliteration: He went to the dogs, he lost his togs, he ate with the hogs; he got the seal, he ate the veal, he danced the reel. Such sermons could be remembered long after the evangelist was gone and when pulpits were vacant, elders could rise to the occasion and share the remembered sermon. Of course, there were misuses of this consideration of the listener's memory when the preacher used study time to figure out ways to be clever and catchy. For example, a phrase from John 6:23, "And other little ships were there" (KJV) yielded a harvest of "points." What ships? Fellow-ship, Member-ship, Steward-ship, and on and on. Or why not, "A Swarm of Gospel Be's": Be ye kind; Be faithful; Be patient; Be aware; ad infinitum. Thankfully, these sincere but glossy sermons were in the minority and did not define Disciples preaching, then or now.

Those preachers who were more substantive, biblically and theologically, were not, however, inconsiderate of the listener's need for memory aids. No small amount of biblical citation and interpretation could be fastened to frames sturdy but no less memorable. For instance, "Facts to be believed, commands to be obeyed, promises to be enjoyed" was an outline simple and easy to remember, and yet it could carry the freight. Others preferred, "Facts, testimony, faith, feeling, action." A very familiar sermon structure was "Three things man does: believe, repent, be baptized; Three things God does: forgive sin, give the Holy Spirit, promise eternal life." Walter Scott joined gift of the Holy Spirit and promise of eternal life so that the plan of salvation consisted of five steps. So the five finger exercise was born and communicated in and out of the pulpit, by preacher and by schoolboy alike. The sum of the matter was this: the Gospel was plain and clear, reasonable and therefore easy to understand and to remember. The Good News made good sense and could be carried across the country by preachers and lay folk alike. But let no one be deceived: the intention of these Disciples was not simply to pass along information. The simple Gospel was the power of God for salvation.

We come, then, to the question of aim; what was, and is, the aim of Disciples preaching? First of all, we should think in terms of aims, not aim. For Alexander Campbell and for those in his circle of influence, preaching involved three distinct functions and sometimes three different functionaries. First came the evangelist whose aim it was to convert unbelievers. The listeners to the evangelist were not the church but persons not yet in the church. Ordinarily the evangelist moved from community to community and, if effective, left behind a group of baptized believers. These believers were now the responsibility of a pastor whose task it was to teach, to shepherd, to enable the group to grow in the faith and to mature as a church. Sometimes the same person was both evangelist and pastor/teacher, but many of the preachers did not have the gifts to do both. The third functionary was the exhorter. The exhorter might function with an evangelist or with a pastor, but in either case, his task was to

follow the sermon with words of urging or warning or encouraging. He might stand say, "In view of what we have heard, let us----." Ideally, the exhorter listened carefully to the sermon in order to urge activity and behavior implied in the message. Of course, there were some exhorters who were skilled orators who welcomed the occasion to deliver a prepared speech on the principle that "one size fits all." On a personal note, I was as a student called to be an exhorter. I found it very difficult, whether following a good sermon or a poor one. It is my guess that the little congregation hardly knew what an exhorter was, and looked on me as an apprentice, a preacher in training.

Mr. Campbell drew the clear difference between preaching to convert (evangelist) and preaching to teach Christian living (pastor/teacher) on the basis of his study of early Christian preaching as presented in Acts of Apostles. Interestingly, one hundred years after Mr. Campbell, the British scholar C.H. Dodd arrived at the same conclusion in his classic *Apostolic Preaching and Its Development.* Dwight Stevenson in

Disciple Preaching in the First Generation discusses this striking parallel. However, both in Mr. Campbell's day and in ours, one would be hard put to find an audience for preaching which was totally unbelievers or totally believers. Generally speaking, the preacher addresses both in the same sermon.

It seems appropriate to end this conversation with two observations. First, it is surprising how silent most pulpits were on the subject of Christian unity, even though Christian unity was the goal, the vision which energized the nineteenth century reformation. The means of achieving that was the restoration of the Ancient Order of Things as presented in the New Testament. Maybe the reason for this silence lay in the confident assumption that the work of preaching would effect restoration and restoration would in itself create unity. Or, it if did not create unity it would, perhaps more correctly, witness to the unity which is already a given of the church. But however one accounts for the silence, it is still disappointing to read W.T. Moore's collection of sermons from the past fifty years (*The Pulpit of the Christian Church,* 1868) and find none on the subject of Christian Unity.

The second observation is not unlike the first: the relative silence of the Disciple pulpits on the issues of social and economic injustice in the country. W.T. Moore's collection of representative sermons covered the years of 1818-1868 (He published a second volume in 1918). Reading those sermons, you would not know that slavery existed in this country, that the United States was engaged in the bloodiest war in its history, that rapid growth of cities and industry crushed the poor workers who had no representative voice, or that many of the states refused to support public schools. The list goes on. How could anyone who preached Jesus say these were not subjects appropriate for the pulpit? The fact is, they were not preaching Jesus of the Gospels but the Jesus of Paul whose emphasis was on the Jesus who died for our sins and was raised to the right hand of God. Since many of the early preachers believed Jesus lived

under the old dispensation, then his life was not salvific. Jesus' death and resurrection began the Christian era, and so most of their sermon texts were from Acts and Paul. What would Jesus say and do in the face of social and cultural ills was not asked by the early preachers. Rather, they answered the question, "What must I do to be saved?" with some form of Walter Scott's five finger exercise.

As we all know, the major shift from the Jesus of Paul to the Jesus of the Gospels came in the Social Gospel Movement of the early twentieth century. All pulpits were affected by this movement, including the Disciples. In their sermons the preachers developed the social implications of the Gospel. Texts from the life and ministry of Jesus permitted Jesus to address issues such as war and peace, racial tensions, and economic injustices. As could be expected, preachers and listeners divided: personal salvation from sin or social reform. Eventually this either/or became for many a both/and, just as the sharp distinction between Paul's Christology and the narrative Christology of the Gospels lost much of its edge. But even from more conservative pulpits in the Campbell-Stone Movement one can hear echoes of social and economic concern, concerns which were not there in the beginning.

What, then, shall we say: Is there a Disciple way of preaching? Yes and No. That's my answer and I am sticking to it.

Fred B. Craddock

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Boring, M. Eugene, *Disciples and the Bible,* St. Louis: Chalice Press, 1997

Craddock, Fred B., *The Bible in the Pulpit of the Christian Church*, Cassette tape of the 1981 Forrest Reed Lectures, available through Disciples Seminary Foundation, Claremont, California.

Moore, W.T., *The Living Pulpit of the Christian Church*, St. Louis: The Christian Board of Publication, 1868.

Stevenson, Dwight E., *Disciple Preaching in the First Generation,* The Forrest Reed Lectures for 1969. Nashville: The Disciples of Christ Historical Society, 1969.

Walker, Granville, *Preaching in the Thought of Alexander Campbell,* St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1954.

West, William G., "Toward a Theology of Preaching", *The Renewal of Church: The Panel of Scholars Reports,* Vol. 2, *The Reconstruction of Theology,* ed. Ralph G. Wilburn, pp. 241-66. St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1963.