Criticisms on Some of the Ablest Preachers. [August,

tions ever made to the literature of its subject. The individual opinion of the present writer is that, fairly judged in view of the whole round of its comparative merits, the volume of which I now speak is not only one of the best works, but by eminence quite the best work of its kind in existence for the use of the average English reader and student. There may be writers on homiletics who surpass Dr. Broadus in suggestive originality of view, there may be those who surpass him in profoundness of formal philosophy, there may be those who surpass him in elegance of exposition; but if I were asked to name a writer on homiletics who, equalling him in the union and harmony of these different traits, moreover equalled him in alert sagacity of insight, in sure sobriety of judgment and of taste, in breadth and comprehension of treatment, in sympathetic and penetrative Christian tone and spirit—and it has been my duty to read somewhat widely in the literature of homilectics— I should be obliged to confess myself unable to do it.

100

Every characteristic that I have now pointed out as found with Dr. Broadus in the teacher of preaching is found also with him, and more rather than less, in the preacher. His practice well comports with his theory—comments and commends it. To the thoughtful student of both the theory and the practice of the man, it becomes evident that in Dr. Broadus's case the practice preceded the theory. But it becomes equally evident that also the theory following reacted, as it should do, conforming the practice. There has been free, intelligent, partly conscious and partly unconscious, exchange and reciprocity of influence flowing helpfully back and forth between the one and the other ; that is, between the theory and the practice—but I ought to reverse the order of words, and say between the practice and the theory—of preaching.

One result is that Dr. Broadus's sermons constitute, as already suggested, a very important key and commentary for study in connection with the study of his homiletical treatise. Every reader of the treatise should read likewise the volume of sermons; and, conversely, every reader of the volume of sermons should read likewise the homiletical treatise. The two go together and complement each other.

Another result is that, apart from the relation of text to commentary, of principle to illustration, thus noted as holding between the treatise and the sermons, the sermons independently make up a body of preaching, alas, too small ! singularly deserving of attention from preachers as studies in the art of genuine pulpit eloquence. I should not necessarily praise Dr. Broadus's sermons as on the whole the very best in the world, were I to pronounce them, as I am inclined to pronounce them, the very best that I know to constitute models for exemplification of what sermons should be.

The sermons read in print and the sermons heard from the pulpit make, in Dr. Broadus's case, exactly the same impression--that is to