

The weight give way,
 Then with a statue's smile,
 A statue's strength,
 Patience, nothing loth,
 And uncomplaining, does
 The work of both."

Do I seem to be applying a literary standard to what is homiletical rather than literary? I acknowledge the existence here of a valid distinction. But I insist that there is a true ethical, and even religious, teaching force in what I have somewhere seen called "strict literary conscience," applied to such things as are now pointed out. And this series of criticisms has a faithful and serious aim to help make the prevalent practice of the pulpit, even in subordinate things, better and better. Is not the aim worthy?

Negligence not verbal and not literary is exemplified, when, on page 17, "Sermons Preached in English Churches," Mr. Brooks attributes to "a young man" the question, really asked by quite another person than the one the preacher must have been imagining, as also in a quite different spirit: "Lord, which is the great commandment?" It seems also a freedom hardly compatible with reverence, reverence at the moment effectively working in the preacher's heart, for Mr. Brooks to say boldly even concerning the "young man" of whom he was mistakenly thinking:

"The man saw a new vision of himself, a vision of a life filled with a passionate love of the Holy One, and so he went back determined not to rest until he had attained all holiness."

What warrant, outside of his own creative imagination, could Mr. Brooks adduce for making such a statement? The man who asked Jesus the question actually quoted by Mr. Brooks did so "*tempting* him;" and of the man who asked Jesus, "What shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?" and whom, as the touching record reads, Jesus beholding "loved," the final word given is that he "went away sorrowful for he was one that had great possessions."

It is a strange inadvertence, once again, for Mr. Brooks to take as his text, "Jesus said unto him, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God . . . with all thy mind,'" Matt. xxii:37, and set out by saying that this is an injunction addressed by Christ "to his disciples"—the fact, of course, being that the words form part of a reply made by Christ to "a lawyer" "*tempting* him."

Less pardonable seems it, when, treating the text, "The Spirit said, Behold, three men seek thee," Mr Brooks makes the remark, as if quite in parallel with his text for idea of Divine authority involved: "The artist dreams his dream, and as he thinks upon the vision, the Spirit says, Behold the marble seeks thee." Does Mr. Brooks seriously justify such a mode of speaking? Does he really think that the Scripture text with which he was dealing is a mere Orientalism, not intended by God to convey to men the idea of any Divine inspiration