

"It is not for me to refer to what he was to this congregation. That has been done already, but it is not unfitting that I should take this opportunity of testifying how a wide community sympathizes with you. Especially can I speak as Principal of the University of Queen's College, at whose Trustee Board he had sat for many years, and where his modesty and practical wisdom, his willingness to serve and ready liberality, had given him a deserved place of honour. I knew him personally, and loved him as a brother. He was a true man; for he combined the simplicity of a child and the tenderness and purity of a woman with the strength and courage of a man. He was a brave man, and I considered that his chief characteristic, though many may not have thought so. He was brave with that rare moral courage that does not despair when weaker spirits faint. He was the first man who encouraged my predecessor to appeal to the Church when the fortunes of Queen's were at their lowest point. He was the first man in Toronto to encourage me in the work to which I came five years ago. What should we learn from his death? This, that goodness, unselfishness, purity of heart, and the qualities that do most good in the world, and that makes the deepest impression upon others. He loved much, therefore he was much loved. This, again, that each of us should be inspired with the same spirit; so we shall best honour his memory, so we shall live nobler lives, so shall we triumph over death."

#### UNIVERSITY SERMON.

ON Sunday afternoon, January 21st, the Rev. Charles Doudiet, of Montreal, conducted the services in Convocation Hall, when he delivered the following able discourse:

John XIV. 8.—"Philip saith unto Him, Lord show us the Father and it sufficeth us."

It is well known that one of the most popular systems of modern philosophy is that which denies the possibility of knowing God as the father of his children. The personal God who careth for us, who heareth and answereth prayer. In view of this fact we propose to consider briefly this accidental request of an apostle to the Lord Jesus, a request much deeper in its meaning than Philip himself had thought. "Show us the Father, and it sufficeth us."

The more we reflect upon it, the more also we are strengthened in the conclusion that this question lays bare the very foundation stones of the whole Christian structure. If God, as the Father, can be known, humanity may find in that sublime knowledge, every sufficient motive for its moral development in the direction of all that is beautiful and good; and if God, as the Father, cannot be known; if the Supreme Being is to be a mere abstraction; if men can think of Him only as the "Unknowable," it is hard to see what inducements will remain that will be sufficient to insure the moral well-being and spiritual advancement of the human race. Take away the Personal Living God, deny the truth of what Christians call His revelation, and you have a world without hope. In such a world where can we find sufficient motives of charity, mutual love and self-denial. In such a world, when times of darkness and affliction come, where shall we look for consolation and peace?

Our subject divides itself most naturally in two parts. In the first, we will try to show what appears to us the insufficiency of that philosophy which excludes the knowledge of God. In the second, the sufficiency of the gospel system, which does not only rest on the assumption that God can be known, but presents him to man as the Father. Finally, we will add a few remarks concerning the central figure of the Christian system, Jesus Christ, who has revealed the Father unto men.

We say, first, that those systems of philosophy which exclude the knowledge of God, are insufficient for the good of the human race. By the words "The knowledge of God," we include all that scripture teaches concerning the Deity. Not only His existence, but His attributes; not only His general relation to the universe as its Author and Preserver, but His particular relation to men as Father, Judge, Law-giver, Avenger and Saviour. There are atheists, although not many. Their theories have lived their little day, grown old, and if not quite dead, they are not far from it. Finding their position untenable before the attacks of science, reason and revelation, they have practically abandoned it and taken refuge in a new citadel, called Agnosticism. The Agnostic does not deny the existence of God; neither does he affirm it. He owns that he knows nothing about it. He affirms that you know no more than he does on the subject, and he lays down the axiom "that nothing can be known of the personality of God." This last principle has had already scores upon scores of books written in support of it. Some arguments are so ably constructed; their sophistry is so cleverly veiled under scientific terms that plain people, that have never made a special study of these subjects, may find themselves utterly unable to unravel the tangle, and unearth the fallacies which hide themselves under bold and often unscrupulous assertion. Therefore we do not wish here to do more than to present you with an aspect of this whole question which every intelligent hearer can appreciate. We do not intend to discuss the cause so much as the effect. Looking at the effects of agnosticism on mankind we claim it is 'insufficient' for our needs. It is, indeed, applying the rules given by Our Lord, "By their fruits ye shall know them." We might be shown a golden powder, highly perfumed, attractive in every respect, and be urged to use it as an article of toilet, as a most precious cosmetic. We are asked why dozens refuse it? Is it not beautiful? Yes. But it is deadly. It is a rank poison. Slow it may be, but sure. It saps our health, destroys our strength, inflicts unspeakable torture. It kills. Such a powder is agnosticism to us. We may say of it what Alfred de Musset, one of the greatest French poets of our age says, himself of his atheism. "What have we been working at, we stupid demolishers, when we dissected Christ upon his altars? What were we going to sow on His heavenly tomb, when casting the Holy Dove to the winds, we sent it bleeding, whirling down eternal space? We have made a world according to our fancy. It is grand. It is sublime. But men die in its breath! Hypocrisy is dead, we believe no more in priests! But virtue is dying, for we no longer know God!" We do not wish to be understood to say, that our modern philosophers knowingly work to kill virtue and destroy the hopes of men. Neither did Voltaire and the men of his school, dream that they were doing anything destructive to the welfare of humanity. They thought that their philosophy, like new blood, transfused in the veins of a dying man, would renew and regenerate the world. And thus the best men of the agnostic school prefer to work for the amelioration of the world. But can they effect it with their principle of an unknowable God? We think not.

If God is unknowable it follows that we cannot have any certainty that the good we do in the world will have any other reward than the satisfaction it may give us to do it. Also, that the evil that we are guilty of will meet with other punishment than that which earth sometimes affords. There are some men whose broad views and philanthropic despotism will lead to give largely of their means, time and labor, to relieve the destitute, educate the ignorant, raise the fallen, and civilize the savage. Some of these may have been agnostics, but the immense majority