

each soul into "entire obedience to God." He will say to every one, "The meeting of your will with the will of God, whatever it may bring, is the purpose of all discipline." "Obedient love! Loving obedience! That is what binds the soul of the less to the soul of the greater everywhere. I give myself to the Eternal Christ, and in His eternity I find my own. In His *service* I am bound to Him." Such quotations fairly represent the spirit of Mr. Brooks's preaching. Largeness, "tolerance," charity, freedom, are great ideas with him; but a man *obedient*, not indeed to "law," but to a personal "Lord," this, and not a man "full of unrestrained will," is the true ideal man whom this preacher's whole strife seeks to realize. Heady self-will, superiority to Christ's commands as judged not useful, finds no encouragement with Mr. Brooks. He knows nothing of any transcendental sonship to God that releases from obligation, or from necessity, to obey. He trains no disciple to forget that even Jesus, himself, though He was a son, yet learned *obedience*. Mr. Brooks warns young preachers against that spirit in religion which "disowning doctrine and depreciating law" "asserts that religion belongs to feeling, and that there is no truth but love." He says: "The hard theology is bad. *The soft theology is worse.* You must count your work unsatisfactory, unless you waken men's brains and stir their consciences. Let them see clearly that *you value no feeling that is not the child of truth and the father of duty.*" "Those who honestly own for *Master* Jesus Christ," is Mr. Brooks's short, comprehensive description of Christians.

"Will-dedication," an expression of Mr. Brooks's, and "unrestrained will," an expression of Mr. Beecher's, each answering to an idea in human character, approved by its respective author, will give the contrast in tone and spirit between the two preachers. Now a preacher may make loss of many particular points of truth in his teaching, but if he teaches Christ as a personal *Master* whom it is the whole of religion to *obey*, then the chief point of truth is safe in his hands. Mr. Brooks's example stands here in a contrast, for which we may be grateful, with the example, once overwhelmingly strong, of Mr. Beecher.

I feel bound now, finally, to explain that the high praise of Mr. Brooks's work, which, on the whole, I have here been gratefully glad to pronounce, must be understood to apply only to such work of his as he himself has decided to be considerate enough for appearance in authorized form of publication. Many of the newspaper reports of his sermons present him at serious disadvantage. There must, one would say, be a wide gulf of contrast, in Mr. Brooks's case, between his best and his worst. A certain forlorn comfort may be gleaned by the average minister from knowing that one who can preach so well as does Mr. Brooks in his authorized works, can also preach so ill, as does Mr. Brooks sometimes in the newspapers.

I have said nothing of that part of Mr. Brooks's pulpit eloquence which consists in delivery. And little really needs to be said. The