

that oratory is a natural gift and not an acquirement? The objection then is a thoughtless opinion and not a thoughtful conclusion, for numerous instances of success, where success seemed impossible, attest its unsoundness. Few, perhaps, will reach the eminence on which Demosthenes and Bossuet stood, but all may make some progress. The timid may gain courage, the stumbling may acquire steadiness; indistinctness may be turned to clearness, unnaturalness to grace. How often is the service of the English Church marred because the preacher is ignorant of Elocution! How often, for the same reason, is the Church of the Apostles deserted, and the Chapels of Calvin, of Wesley, and of Joe Smith crammed! There is, in Canada at least, a demand for trained speakers.

How does the English Church meet this demand? What is Trinity, the representative Church College, doing? What has she done? She has sent out men, learned in Clement and Augustine, in Butler and Paley, but generally speaking innocent of Elocution, and worse still wanting in tact. She has secured a staff of eminently scholarly men to teach a vast amount of knowledge which never comes into requisition, and Elocution, which is indispensable, she excludes from the calendar and tolerates two weeks yearly as a permissible diversion.

A system, so irrational, cannot produce good results and it does not. Proficiency in Elocution characterizes the Methodists and their advance corresponds to their proficiency: the Anglicans are deficient in Elocution and proportionate to their deficiency is their stagnation. Many a graduate, scholarly, refined and pious has exerted little or no influence, has, in a word, failed. Why? Because the only channel by which his intelligence might reach the people, that is, the medium of speech, has not been well used. What an amazing list of stars would stud the College calendar if the name of every unsuccessful parson were distinguished by a star. Yes, many of Trinity's brightest intellects have grown rusty for want of proper use, and the future will not be better than the past, unless students are trained to adapt themselves to matter-of-fact people.

On what does the Minister base his hopes of success? He may be pious, he may be carefully instructed in Church doctrine; but piety unless it is practical, or doctrine unless it can be intelligently imparted is of little avail in church enterprise. The church people cannot be expected to love the church when the Minister, who is often educated at their expense, persists in chilling them by his cold lifeless utterance. They think that the first concern of a prospective clergyman should be to read well and to speak well, and they think rightly, for his highest duties are performed in the sanctuary where his vocal organs are in constant use. The English Church has provided a liturgy for divine service—Is it too much to require her Ministers to read it intelligibly? There is no reverence in frigid immovableness: nor is there edification in dead monotony or in hysterical emphasis. Moreover the gospel is easy of comprehension

and congregations would gladly exchange the learned references to the Greek and Hebrew scriptures, with which manuscripts teem, for a simple, straight-forward discourse. To all this it may be replied that a sermon read excels a sermon preached, and reference may be made to Melvill, Vaughan, French, and a host of other readers. But between reading and preaching there is much in common, and which is the better suited for sermonizing is still undecided. Reading may suit the city very well, for city congregations are more critical and less emotional than their country brethren, but in the country it is intolerable; good preaching on the other hand is acceptable in city and country alike. Sinners have, in these days, the same rhinoceros skin as they had in the days of St. Paul, and it is a tegument on which smooth circumlocutions fall without effect. Vice still requires the scourge and the hot iron. Should not the clergy then assault the citadel of iniquity with all the force of fervid eloquence. Should not they so speak as to show that they are thoroughly in earnest, that what they say they feel? Were this done, there would be fewer clerical icicles. Were this done, ministers would not strain out the gnat, extemporaneous ruggedness, and swallow the camel, insipid faultlessness.

But whether preaching excels reading is a secondary question. The main question is, can the minister do either acceptably? Does he discard manuscript? Then he should preach well; he should have a firm grasp of his subject and be profoundly earnest. Does he employ manuscript? Then he should be no less earnest, no less firm in tone or clear in expression than the preacher. He should be able at least to read his own writing, and to group his words significantly—a feat which sometimes baffles ministerial skill. It is painful to find a man degrading divine service by careless preparation, by slovenly reading or by indistinct mumbling. He who undertakes to spread the Gospel should bend his highest energies to the work and unless he does he is better out of the pulpit. We are not advocating flashy oratory for it is inconsistent with earnestness, thought and taste, the three elements of genuine eloquence. We want manliness and energy, we want the church to fulfil her mission.

To other students besides divinity students, elocution is very necessary. The law student, and, indeed, every student needs it. But as the Church looks to Trinity for her faithful clergy, Trinity is morally bound to supply the church with good readers and good speakers.

ALPHA.