

Protestant versions of Germany and France, and again perceives that they correspond almost exactly. If he be a member of the Church of England, he may note the fact that the authorized version is accepted by all the Protestant dissident bodies at home, and by other Protestant Churches of English parentage abroad; which, differing on many points, agree in this, that this version is a faithful representation of the original. If it were not so, could it have been thus accepted by Christian societies too often not favourably disposed to each other? The inference which he draws is that he does possess the Bible substantially, and is by no means disqualified by the fact that he is reading a version for the duty of Biblical study, or precluded from the expectation of ascertaining, on all essential points, the meaning of Scripture.¹

On the other hand, it must be remembered that these versions are but versions, and cannot be allowed to usurp the place of the original text. To attempt to stamp any one or more of them with ecclesiastical authority as superseding that text,² would be to place unwarrantable fetters on the science of Exegesis, and to shut the door to improvement of the versions themselves.

E. A. LITTON.

ART. VI.—THE ART OF READING.

REALLY good reading, in the strict sense of the words, is an uncommon accomplishment, rarer perhaps than those who have not studied the art are apt to imagine; and yet, for the clergy, its importance can hardly be overrated. For them, indeed, it is more than a mere accomplishment; it is a qualification on which too much labour, thought, and study, cannot be spent, provided they be rightly directed. Those who consider the subject must see that such is the case; they must be aware, that in every mixed congregation, attention and fervour of devotion are likely to be either promoted or hindered by the manner in which Divine Service is conducted. And when we

¹ It is a remarkable fact that in two great nations at least, Germany and England, the translation of the Bible has formed an epoch in the formation of the language. This is eminently the case with Luther's version and our own authorized one. Such is the power of the original text to mould the vernacular tongues.

² "Statuit (synodus) ut hæc ipsa vetus et vulgata editio, quæ longo tot sæculorum usu in ipsa Ecclesia probata est, in publicis lectionibus, disputationibus, prædicationibus, et expositionibus, pro authentica habeatur; et ut nemo illam rejicere quovis prætextu audeat vel præsumat."—Con. Trid. Sess. IV.

come to the occasional services of the Church, such as Baptism, Marriage, &c., the impression produced by these on the minds of the hearers, especially the uneducated among them, depends very much on the way they are performed. As an instance of this, we may quote a remark which, to our knowledge, a servant once made to her mistress, after being present at a wedding where the Service was read with great solemnity and with earnest and correct emphasis, that if *she* had been the bride, and had been about to marry a bad man, she would have felt it impossible to take the vows; and this feeling she ascribed entirely to the clergyman's mode of delivery. Now, if a good delivery were like a good voice, simply a gift of Nature, there would, of course, be no use in dwelling on its importance. But correct reading is an art which can, to a certain degree, be acquired by all, though some may have a greater aptitude for it than others. And we cannot help thinking that many do themselves injustice in this matter; they fall below their capability. In some cases this deficiency is the result of mere carelessness and inattention to the subject; in others it is owing to the want of a full apprehension either of the meaning or force of what is read, or of the manner in which that meaning should be conveyed to the hearers. In others, again, it arises out of a false principle, and this may account for the fact that there are, or at least used to be, many whose reading would be generally styled *fine*, but who nevertheless could not be called with truth *good* readers, however much they might be generally admired; for though their reading might be good of its kind, the kind is a faulty one. So, in like manner, there are some, who would be generally designated as *nice* readers, and perhaps rightly so, for their voice is pleasing and their mode of delivery characterized by good taste and good feeling; but, with all these requisites, such may stop short of being *good* readers.

We consider that the conditions of good and effective reading are four—first, simplicity; secondly, earnestness and fervour; thirdly, critical correctness; and, fourthly, a proper management of the voice with a view to being distinctly audible.

With regard to the first point—simplicity, if we view this quality merely as opposed to affectation in the proper sense of the word, it is easy to see that it must be a necessary accompaniment of good reading, for positive flagrant affectation either in voice, manner, or gesture, is always offensive, but when manifest in those who are addressing the Almighty is simply revolting. Many, however, without being affected, in any obnoxious sense of the word, nevertheless read in an artificial voice, and there are not a few who think that, in reading the Church Service, it would be wrong to do otherwise. Those who would wish to see this part

of our subject fully discussed had better study the chapter on Elocution in Archbishop Whately's "Elements of Rhetoric," from whence we shall borrow most of our remarks on this as well as on other points relative to the art of reading. As regards the adoption of an artificial voice in reading the service, there are, as we just remarked, many in favour of it, but the highest authority we know on this side is that of the late Bishop Wilberforce, from whose opinion, however, we venture to dissent, though there is something to be said in its defence. It cannot be doubted that an artificial voice, such as is often employed, seems not unfrequently to carry with it a peculiar solemnity, the more so, because its tones being unlike those used in ordinary conversation, are not associated with the affairs of everyday life. And certainly if a clergyman wishes to conceal a want of real reverence for, and interest in, what he reads, he will find that the most effectual mode of attaining this end is to employ a tone unlike that which he uses in speaking. But any one who, for such a reason, feels himself obliged to resort to this expedient, is not fit to take orders, and after all, true reverence for what we read is best shown by giving full expression to the writer's meaning and sentiments, which cannot be done effectually unless the natural—*i.e.*, the speaking voice, is used. But where the reader makes this his object, then the genuine spirit of devotion will infuse into his voice and manner a real, not an artificial solemnity. Let a man watch over his heart and mind, get himself into a proper frame—not, indeed, by looking at his own feelings, but by the contemplation of heavenly things and inward prayer—and his delivery and general demeanour will take care of themselves. "I have no fear," (we once heard a prelate remark who was about to ordain for the first time) "of not performing this ceremony with sufficient dignity, because I am conscious of being deeply impressed with its awful momentousness." And the event proved that he had judged rightly. But, indeed, though such a frame of mind is perhaps required in order to do full justice to the services of our Church, yet even good taste and a sense of propriety are sufficient safeguards against any levity of manner in those who conduct these services; though without such safeguards the reader, in his endeavour to give full force and emphasis to his subject, may fall into an exaggerated emphatic style, and become either too colloquial or too theatrical. And this is what sometimes happens, though not often. Here, as in every thing else, the reverse of wrong is not right. But the chief danger lies on the side of an artificial delivery, and, try as much as they will, very few will be able to read exactly as they speak, and fewer still to deliver the composition of another as if it were their own. And, indeed, when it comes to reading the

Scriptures, it is perhaps not desirable that we should do so ; but there is little danger in that direction. The truth of what we have just said, has been tested in the following manner :—A clergyman, who used sometimes to preach sermons chosen from eminent authors (a practice which we do not consider an honest one, unless done avowedly) and also occasionally sermons of his own composition, found that whenever he was asked to lend a sermon it was always one of his own. This, of course, must have been owing, not to their superior excellence but to the manner in which they were delivered. It may be said, indeed, that the reason why he delivered his own compositions better than those of another was that his heart was more in them ; but this does not alter our position, for the voice of the heart is the natural voice—*i.e.*, the voice used in speaking. And moreover, the employment of one's own voice is more likely to arouse the feelings, both of the speaker and of his hearers, whereas the use of an artificial tone tends to foster a spirit of inattention in both parties. And when the prayers are read in this way, people are apt to regard them as a sort of offering to God for the sake of which they expect to receive a blessing, in fact, as a kind of meditation, rather than as a means whereby we may obtain access to God and through which we hold communion with Him. The former of these views of prayer is, we suspect, held by many, if not all, of those who would wish to introduce intoning into our churches, and who, not quite liking to venture on such an innovation, assimilate their mode of reading to intoning, as far as they dare. And the arguments which they use in favour of this practice are untenable, except on the supposition that their view of prayer is correct (which we cannot admit). They say that intoning must be the natural voice of prayer, because the ancient heathen used to intone or chant their requests, and because children, in an imperfect manner, often do the same. This may be the fact. But then it must be remembered that the ways which men naturally fall into are very often artificial ways. Thus, the voice which they spontaneously adopt in reading compositions not their own, is an artificial one; and so in like manner the tone in which uninstructed persons, like heathen and children, intone their prayers is an unnatural one. They do so because they cannot understand the true nature of prayer; they repeat prayers, but they cannot be said in the strict sense of the word to *pray*. It is true, indeed, that professional beggars generally ask for alms in a sort of chant, but they adopt this tone partly to create compassion and partly to rest their voices. But their mind is not exercised while they put forth their request. The voice of earnest supplication, in which both the understanding and the heart are engaged, is the voice which we use in speaking. Why, then, should we wish to intro-

duce into our churches what is unnatural to any one who worships God in spirit and in truth? For cathedral worship something may be said in favour of intoning. It has always been more or less the practice, and it is said (whether truly or not) that, in buildings where there is a great echo, intoning the service enables the officiating clergyman to be heard better with less effort. If so, it differs in this respect from a mere artificial tone of reading in churches in which the contrary is the case. But there are not the same excuses for its ordinary employment, and though it is possible by long practice, to learn to pray in the spirit where the prayers are intoned, just as it is possible for the bodily constitution to adapt itself to an unnatural mode of living, why should we make the experiment? Why imitate a cathedral service? Even when the imitation is good, it is unnecessary and out of place, and sure to be distasteful to many, and if bad will render the service ridiculous, an effect which we have seen produced in a country church, where the congregation were taught to intone.

We come now to the second requisite—*i.e.*, fervour and earnestness, or, as it is sometimes called, unction. There is little to be said on this head except what is almost self-evident. Critical correctness in reading, without fervour, renders the delivery cold and inanimate and like a marble statue, which may be well shaped in all its limbs but wants life. But, indeed, it is hardly possible to read the Scriptures correctly without unction, for if we read the most impassionate and sublime parts of the Bible as if we were reciting an Act of Parliament we can hardly be said to render them correctly. But, on the other hand, fervour, without correctness, loses all its real force and impressiveness—it is like zeal without knowledge.

Now, as regards correctness in reading. This is an acquirement which cannot be too carefully cultivated. Labour devoted to this object, if rightly directed, will be spent most advantageously; but in order to attain it, our attention, while conducting the service or preaching, should be studiously turned away from ourselves, our voice, and our delivery, and directed to the subject matter. At the same time, it must be remembered that general inattention to these points is quite incompatible with good reading, the more so because (as we have already pointed out) what may be called the natural style of voice is not the style which most persons will spontaneously fall into. But to occupy our mind with these matters at the time of Divine Service, is likely to make our manner affected, or at least awkward and constrained, besides drawing away our minds from those thoughts which ought to occupy them at such a time.

We will now mention some of the passages in the Liturgy and

the Lessons, in which mistakes of reading most frequently occur, pointing out, at the same time, the manner in which we think they ought to be read. But, before doing this, perhaps it would be as well to remark that one of the chief objects which we should propose to ourselves, when studying our subject matter, is to find out which is the emphatic word, for, of course, it is on that word that the stress should be laid. Sometimes there are more than one in the same sentence. We will commence with one of the sentences which occur just before the Exhortation. "If we say that we have no sin," &c. Here the emphasis is generally laid on the word *no*, whereas *have* is the really emphatic word, because the Apostle was writing against the heresy of certain gnostics who held that sin in the believer was *no* sin. Then, again, in the Absolution, stress is too often laid on the words *true repentance*, for no other reason than that true repentance is of the highest importance, whereas these two words are manifestly not emphatic, because they are only a repetition of an idea which has been previously expressed by the words "truly repent," so that, the clause *true repentance* might be altogether left out and the word *it* substituted. The emphasis ought to be laid, either on *us*, or (as some think) on *grant*, in order to draw attention to the fact that true repentance is a gift from God.

Then again, in reading the Ten Commandments the stress is very often, indeed generally, laid on the word *not*, which is manifestly a mistake. For the emphatic part of the Commandments is not the prohibitions, but the things prohibited. When the question is whether such a thing should or should not be done, as when God said to Balaam, "Thou shalt *not* curse the people for they are blessed," then the stress should be laid on the prohibition. Again, in the Tenth Commandment, we not uncommonly hear the word *nor* emphasized, as if this commandment contained a list of the things which we ought not to covet, and as if, "anything that is his," were one of the number, instead of comprising all the others, which are merely quoted as examples. We will now cite a few passages from the Scriptures which are often wrongly emphasized. In Acts of the Apostles, xx. 16, it is said, "Paul determined to sail by Ephesus." This passage is generally read, so as to imply (what, indeed, most persons think it means) that the Apostle intended to take Ephesus on his route, or at least to choose that particular route in the direction of which Ephesus lay. But any one who is at all acquainted with, and studies the passage in, the original, must see that its real meaning is that St. Paul intended to sail *past* Ephesus, without stopping there—the emphasis therefore, should be laid on the word *by*. Then again, in 2 Kings v. 25, where Gehazi says to Elisha, "Thy servant went no whither,"

the stress is sometimes laid upon *no*, whereas it ought to be laid on *went*, for the idea which Gehazi meant to convey was that he could not have come from any place, for he had not gone anywhere.

We will now quote certain examples of passages where the emphasis is not misplaced but simply omitted. Let us turn to 1 Cor. xv., where it is said, "That which thou sowest is not quickened except it die." Many read this passage (as indeed they sometimes do the whole chapter from which it is taken), with little or no expression. Now here, the words which ought to be emphasized are *sow* and *die* for the meaning of the passage when paraphrased would run thus, "Why should you make a difficulty about the manner in which the dead are raised, when the analogy of the way in which a seed sown brings forth a plant will sufficiently explain the matter?" Evidently, then, in order to convey this meaning, the chief emphasis should be laid upon the words *sowest* and *die*, and a slighter emphasis on "quickened." Again, farther on in the same chapter, where the Apostle says, "One star differeth from another in glory," what he means is, that not only is there one glory of the sun, another of the moon and another of the stars, but that even one star differeth from another in glory. The emphasis, therefore, should be laid on *star*. It is a great pity that the beautiful chapter from which we have just quoted is not rendered with greater feeling and expression than it generally is, especially considering that it forms part of the Burial Service, and is therefore read in the ears of those who are softened by sorrow and rendered thoughtful by being brought face to face with death, and are therefore likely to be open to serious impressions. What an opportunity may we not be throwing away if we read this chapter and the rest of the service in a cold mechanical manner! It is, indeed, difficult for those who have to go through it several times in the week to avoid falling into such a manner, but they should make the effort. Let us now turn to the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. A certain passage in it is sometimes wrongly read; it is as follows:— "Son, remember that thou in thy life-time receivest thy good things." Some people lay an emphasis only on *had*, and not on *thy*, which tends to foster the impression that the happiness of the next world is a sort of compensation for what is wanting in this, a notion which the poorer classes not unfrequently entertain. Now the emphasis ought to rest upon the two words *had* and *thy*, especially the latter, which would bring out what was probably the Saviour's meaning—*i.e.*, that the rich man had already enjoyed those good things for which alone he cared, and sought, and lived, and which therefore were his only portion. It is to be remarked that wherever two ideas are

placed in contrast with one another, the words which express them should each be emphasized in an equal degree in order to mark the contrast, as in the following passage: "The wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life." This rule is sufficiently obvious, and, in the passage just quoted, the right emphasis is seldom omitted, but it may be sometimes, and it is of the highest importance that it should be given, because it brings before the hearer's mind a most important truth, which he is very liable to forget, that the punishment of sin is earned, but that the reward of faith is gratuitous. Where several expressions occur which rise successively in force one above the other so as to make a climax, this climax should be marked by a gradual increase of emphasis. Thus, as Sheridan in his "Art of Reading" observes, that sentence in the Exhortation, at the beginning of the service, where it is said that we should "confess our sins in an humble lowly penitent and obedient heart," ought not to be read (as it sometimes is) in a monotone, because each of the above-mentioned adjectives is stronger than the last, as is also the case in the Collect for the Second Sunday in Advent, where a similar climax is gradually reached, as—"read, mark," &c. Sometimes the meaning of a passage is misrepresented, not by a wrong or defective accentuation of the words, but simply by the omission or misplacement of the stops—as, e.g., in the Second Commandment, which is often read thus:—"For I the Lord thy God am a jealous God and visit the sins of the fathers upon the children—unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me." This mode of reading conveys the idea that the sins of their ancestors are visited only on those of their children who hate God, which is not the true sense of the passage. The real meaning is, that (in the old dispensation) God sometimes saw fit to punish the innocent for the sake of the guilty. In order to express this, we should pause after the word "generation," and not after the word "children." Again, in the Nicene Creed, the following passage is generally read thus:—"Begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father by whom all things were made," as if the latter part of the sentence referred to the Father, whereas it really refers to the Son; therefore there should be a pause after the word "Father," and no pause, or at least a very short one, after the word "made." And, as we are speaking of the Nicene Creed, it may be as well to notice another mistake which is sometimes made in reading it, though it has nothing to do with punctuation. In that clause where Jesus Christ is called "God of god, Light of light," &c., it is very common to neglect laying the emphasis on "of," by which omission the force of the passage is in some measure lost. Sometimes the meaning of a sentence is perverted merely by its being read in the wrong tone, and

therefore (as Archbishop Whately remarks) it would be impossible to teach the art of reading correctly (as Sheridan attempts to do) by accentuating the words in a sentence, to show where the emphasis should be laid, or indeed by any method of marks, because you cannot write down the tone. The following is an instance in point:—"Do men put a candle under a bushel or under a bed?" It is possible to read this passage with correct emphasis but in such a tone as to imply that to place a candle under a bushel or under a bed were the only alternatives. Again, where St. Paul reproves the irreverent manner in which some of the Corinthians celebrated the Holy Communion, he says:—"And one is hungry and another is drunken." This passage, though rightly accentuated, may be, and sometimes is, read as if the Apostle censured one man because he took more of his share and left too little for the other, or at least, as if the fault lay in the unequal distribution of food and drink, whereas he expressly says "Have ye not houses to eat and drink in?" What he wishes to point out to the Corinthians is the unseemly results produced by the custom of taking their own meals at the time when they met to celebrate the Lord's Supper. And the passage should be read in a tone which expresses this meaning.

Most of the mistakes in reading which we have hitherto noticed are such as arise either from the reader's misunderstanding or at least not fully understanding, the meaning of a passage, or not seeing how that meaning should be imparted to others. But innumerable errors are made from mere thoughtlessness, and most of these are such as no man would be likely to fall into who read as he spoke. It would, perhaps, be as well to give one or two instances of these sorts of blunders, such as may suffice for a warning to careless readers, by showing them how they may, merely through the want of a little consideration, unconsciously turn God's Holy Word into a jest. We knew a clergyman in Ireland who used to conduct the service in a very pompous, but not really reverent manner. He was once reading an account of the miraculous multiplying of the loaves and fishes, and when he came to the passage where it says of the multitude "and they did eat," he laid a strong emphasis on the word *did*. It is unnecessary to say what a ludicrous idea such a mode of accentuation suggested.—There was a master of one of the colleges in Cambridge (long since deceased) who read a passage in Matt. xx. 19-21 as follows:—" 'Show me the tribute money.' And they brought unto him a *penny*. 'Whose image and superscription is this?' And they *say* unto him '*Cæsar's*.'" Such mistakes are, it is to be hoped, uncommon. But there is one error which a great many fall into when they read the Tenth Commandment; they lay the emphasis on *neighbour* and thus

convey the idea that you may covet the goods of those who are not your neighbours. We quote these mistakes as specimens to show into what gross errors men may be betrayed by mere thoughtlessness. And let not any one suppose that because he sees the absurdity of these particular faults he is therefore safe from falling into others nearly as bad if he is not careful. "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall."

We now come to the fourth requisite for good and effective reading—*i.e.*, the proper management of the voice with a view to render ourselves audible. Of course, a good and strong voice is a natural gift, the want of which cannot be entirely supplied by art; but proper management will do much, though not everything, and one of the advantages which the natural voice possesses over the artificial is, that it enables us to be better heard with less exertion, with less fatigue and with less injury to our throat. It is a very significant fact that the clergy are the only public speakers who (as a class) are subject to affections of the throat, and yet barristers in full practice exercise their voices much more than the clergy. The reason why the former do not suffer from the same complaint must be that they use their natural speaking voice, while the clergy, many of them, do not. But there is another thing to be remembered by those who wish to make themselves clearly heard. Distinctness of articulation is even more conducive to this end than loudness. A voice is not audible in proportion as it is noisy, sometimes the reverse. There is one fault, moreover, which readers whose articulation would be otherwise distinct sometimes unconsciously fall into. They drop their voice at the end of each sentence, thus rendering a part of what they say or read totally inaudible. In large churches where the echo is very great, the articulation should be proportionately slower than in others, in order that the echo of one word or sentence may, in some measure, subside before is begun another. As regards ascertaining the loudness with which it is necessary to speak in each particular church, of course it would be impossible to lay down any set of rules for the regulation on this point. The only rule we have ever heard suggested is that the speaker should fix upon those who are sitting at the most distant part of the building and address himself especially to them. But this suggestion though useful to the preacher yet, for one who is going through the liturgy, is open to grave objection. It may lead him to deliver the prayers too much as if he were reading them to the congregation instead of praying with them. There must be, however, a sort of instinct which to a certain degree guides a man in pitching his voice. Otherwise, why is it that, when a clergyman has officiated in a strange church he is sometimes asked, if he found the church easy to read in? But the only certain way of knowing how to pitch the voice is to find

out whether those who sit in the most distant part of the church, or at least in that part of the church, were able to hear. It is evident, from what we have just now said, that there are certain points, such as distinctness of articulation, &c., to which some attention must be paid while we are engaged in reading, especially when we are not sure that we have acquired the right habits. These, then, form an exception to the general rule as to drawing off attention from the voice and manner; but still the rule holds good, as a rule, and should be strictly adhered to.

We are now approaching the end of our subject, but we cannot quite conclude without warning our lay readers against a fault which the perusal of a Paper like the present may perhaps tend to foster—*i.e.*, that of listening to the reading of the Church service in a critical rather than a devotional spirit. Of course, they cannot help forming an opinion as to the manner in which that service is conducted, or occasionally noticing palpable mistakes (if such occur) in the accentuation of certain passages. But they should not set themselves to criticize. Their business is to pray and to listen in a devout spirit to the reading of God's Word. *Our* business is not to lay ourselves open to criticism, and to render the service as impressive as possible, and the rules laid down are the most calculated to produce this effect, both on ourselves and others. Do not let us think that the end to be aimed at is an unimportant one; it well deserves careful attention, labour and prayer.

E. W. WHATELY.

Reviews.

The Evangelical Revival, and other Sermons; with an Address on the Work of the Christian Ministry in a Period of Theological Decay and Transition. By R. W. DALE, Birmingham. Pp. 286. Hodder and Stoughton. 1880.

IN this ably written volume appear many passages which Evangelical Churchmen will read with pleasure. The author is known as a theologian of considerable intellectual grasp; his writings show research and independent thought, as well as an eloquent and vigorous Protestantism. Nevertheless, we put down his present work, not without sympathy, but with painful regret. We have felt ourselves unable to understand the author's doctrinal position, or, rather—to express our thought perhaps more precisely, we doubt whether he has not been moving farther from the old theological landmarks than he is sensible of. We may, indeed, be doing him an injustice in these remarks. It is known, however, that upon one important doctrine he has separated himself from orthodox Nonconformists; and he states his conviction, in the present work, that “the Evangelical theology—not the Evangelical faith—