good because he abuses not only the "modesty of nature," but the Christian liberty, which is not lawlessness in speech any more than in conduct. I would give a large liberty: I would not exclude native humor from the pulpit, nor story-telling, nor pithy illustration, nor home-thrusts at hard cases, nor homely wit, but I would exclude that kind of vulgar exaggeration and low buffoonery which the monks of the sixteenth century indulged in, and a class of preachers of the nineteenth century practice as commending the gospel to the common people, whereas they only increase the prevailing tendency among the illiterate as well as the educated, to make a jest of truth, and take all the nobleness and heart out of divine things. Besides, such coarse and hot spicery makes it very difficult for the simpler diet of the gospel to be relished at all. The language of the English Bible was just the golden mean between the popular and the learned speech. It was plain Saxon-English, which did not stoop to the vulgar and low, nor deal in the high and bookish.

The second more profound difference between true and false sensationalism consists in moral earnestness. A man who is thoroughly in earnest may say almost anything, because by saving it he does not mean to produce a sensation, but to arouse men to goodness. The whole subject of preaching to the emotions, or the emotional element in preaching, is an important subject by itself, which I will not now take up. Neither will the truly earnest man say anything that is absolutely lowering to the truth. What he says does not end in a laugh, or a curse, but in the heart of the sinner, or in the sincere motive to save him from his sins. Love can say what logic and the intellect cannot, because love makes the object and subject one, and prepares the way by a hidden and genial force for the reception of the truth. Here the personality of the preacher is of the utmost importance; and his spiritual condition and conviction of the truth, so that it has

wrought in him its own spirit, even the spirit of Him who is the truth, tells upon all he utters, and makes him, thus speaking the truth in love, an eloquent witness and advocate for Christ. What is eloquence? It is certainly not sensationalism in the common meaning of the term. Eloquence is something more profound. It does not move and agitate the mere surface of the mind. It goes beneath the sense or the sensational, and enters the depths of personal and spiritual being. It is the power of soul upon soul, the reciprocity of influence, so that the thoughts and feelings of the speaker are communicated as by a magnetic power to the hearer, and the two are made morally and spiritually one, by the fusing influence of the truth uttered in the fire of a strong purpose. Then the minds of men are molded like clay in the hands of the potter. The real force of eloquence is seen to reside in the essential qualities of the inmost affections and energies of the soul, which, when stirred to their depths, as the love of a Christlike preacher for his fellow-men and their eternal interests can alone do. produce those lasting effects, those fruits of the Spirit, which have followed the preaching of the Apostles, and of the greatest preachers since their day.

True eloquence can be distinguished from false eloquence, or false sensationalism, in these ways: that the true is thorough in knowledge, while the false is superficial; the true has moral earnestness, while the false has no depth of real sincerity; the true aims for the production of character, the false aims to produce an excitement; the true is enduring, while the false is ephemeral; the true strives through impression for ultimate conviction, while the false strives merely for immediate sensation; the true ends in the subject, the false ends in self; the true springs from religious enthusiasm, while the false springs from sensuous or intellectual enthusiasm; the true is deep and spiritual, while the false plays upon the senses, the superficial nerves of feeling, the outer surface of the mind.