

who is undoubtedly a sincere believer in the Christian religion, and the inspiration of scripture, and yet who is unable after a careful study of the subject, as found in the Bible, or as revealed by the voice of God in his own heart, to accept the idea that the soul passes, at death, at once into a state of happiness or misery, which is everlasting and unchangeable.

The publication of this work was caused by what he considered perversions of his real views, which were prevalent among those who had not heard the sermons, but only heard of them, as they were imperfectly or erroneously reported. Wishing to make his sermons at Westminster Abbey bear upon those thoughts which, he says, "since they are so prominent in literature, must also be prominent in the minds of many of those miscellaneous hundreds who compose our ordinary congregations," he took up subjects which greatly interest thinking men and women, and which he thought were either misunderstood by Christians, or misrepresented by unbelievers.

As regards style, and manner of handling his subject, Canon Farrar's sermons can scarcely be considered equal to Canon Siddon's, as addressed to an intellectual audience. Yet such a comparison would hardly be a fair one, as the writer says they were never intended for publication; nor from the very nature of his plea, and the mixed character of the congregation he was addressing, could he be severely intellectual. Indeed the emotional very largely predominates throughout, and often carries him to such lengths that at times he becomes almost contradictory, making appeals which if logically carried out, and conversely applied, would tell equally against him.

In his first sermon—"What Heaven is"—there is nothing that the most orthodox could object to, as regards conclusions; although the mode of arriving at them may not always be satisfactory to a logical mind. Speaking of the difficulty of convincing the sceptical mind of the truth of spiritual things, he says:—"If he demand a kind of proof which is impossible, and which God has withheld, seeing that it is a law that spiritual things can only be spiritually discerned, and that we walk by faith and not by sight,—if, in short, a man will not see God because clouds and darkness are round about Him, although righteousness and judgment are the habitation of His seat: then we can do no more. He must believe or not believe,—he must bear or must forbear, as seems him best. We cannot argue about colour to the blind. We cannot prove the glory of music to the deaf. If a man shuts his eyes hard, we cannot make him see the sun." Now though this may in a general way be true, it is very dangerous when applied to any particular doctrine. Canon Farrar uses it as an argument for the immortality of the soul, but how if it were used in favour of universalism? How are we to meet the man whose "true inwardness" tells him not only that God has given him a soul, but that He has certainly destined that soul for everlasting happiness?

It is impossible not to observe how the religious leanings of most people depend upon their phrenological development; and how, unless they allow their minds to be balanced by a sober acceptance of revelation, their idea of the character, attributes, and as a consequence the actions, of their Creator, is formed by *their* convictions of what would be appropriate. So that while we would freely acknowledge the force of all such arguments, as showing the