

Mr. Capps:

There is a general agreement regarding your sermon that it was a job well done.

The organization was sound. The idea development was clear and natural. I know how many times we can differ on theological interpretations, but here any differences were conspicuous by their absence. I have few suggestions to offer in regard to the sermon's construction. Perhaps there might be a stronger thrust in the thought as climaxes are reached here and there in the discourse. That is about all.

The delivery is good, but it does leave something to be desired. We must not attempt to change your personality and try to make an orator and actor out of one who has a straight-forward, unemotional style of preaching. Still I feel more animation will help. You can work toward this end by restudying your manuscript, underscoring and then emphasizing key-words. Also by using more vocal power you can interpret vocally what you are saying. Also change of pace, rapid speech in descriptive portions, slower and more measured speech in conclusions - all this, without any undue straining for effect or attempt at play-acting will help greatly.

I am encouraged to find members of the class recognizing the value of your sermon, its outline, its clear thought, its strong conclusions. It is my hope that some of our group, recognizing the value of your methods, will now discipline themselves more sharply and follow your example. I dare say a good example of this sort is likely to prove far more helpful than these many, often "beside-the-mark" criticisms which the final discussion produces.

Thanks for your good effort.

G. E. Lenski.