

the human reason has constructed out of the elements presented to it? If so, how can the study of Theology be said to precede that of reason? In short, Mr. Harris has gone back to the philosophy of the Dark Ages, and his watchword is that of the school men: *credo ut intelligam*. In consequence of a total misapprehension of Kant's sole aim, he has gone the length of doubting the sincerity of that philosopher's profession of Christianity, and says it would have been better 'if Kant had professed pure Atheism, denied the existence of God, disputed the facts of creation as such' &c., &c. Can it be necessary to tell Mr. Harris that Kant's sole purpose was just to establish Religion on a firm and immovable basis, and, by ridding it of all false support, to roll back the tide of scepticism which overwhelmed all Europe in his time? Must we tell him that while Kant proved the validity of Religion from the nature of man's Practical Reason, he most reluctantly abandoned the hope of making it accord with the freaks of his Theoretical Reason? Need we say that it is precisely this feature in all Kant's works, this 'ogling at theology' in all he says, which has given so much offence to the Empiricists? But if Mr. Harris would only take the trouble of reading an author properly before presumptuously criticising him, he would learn that Kant's religious and moral system is by far the purest which philosopher ever devised, and that Christianity never had a more loyal or more intelligent defender.

But we have inflicted enough of Mr. Harris on our patient reader. We are well aware that to undertake the defence of Kant from such ridiculous attacks is quite otiose, and we fear that in taking up the gauntlet we have presented the same appearance as the doughty don Quixote when he laid lance in rest against the squadron of sheep. In writing thus at length, however, we have also had in view other critics of Kant, whose high standing gives them a stronger claim to our notice. Strange to say, after all that has been done of late in England by writers of eminence to correct the erroneous notions about Kant which have obtained there too long, there are yet those who

cling to the old prejudice, and who raise the cry against Kant as a dangerous enemy of Religion. We are carefully put on our guard against the 'subtle scepticism' which pervades his writings, and we are taught to look at Kant's works in a most unfair light. When one sees men of repute and position writing in such a strain, one cannot refrain from energetically protesting against this perversion of Kant's doctrines. We find in such writers an entire misapprehension of his most glaring and best known dicta, and mis-statements which any tyro could correct. We have only this to say, that the sooner these moralists return to Kant, the better for them and for the interests of Religion. Germany has taught us many a lesson already, and if, instead of spurning her teaching and setting up crude systems which are powerless against scepticism, some of our metaphysicians would but accept a few more wholesome precepts from the same source, their speculations would stand some chance of living after them.

CLASSICS AND MATHEMATICS VIEWED WITH REFERENCE TO THEIR BEARING ON LIBERAL EDUCATION.

Few subjects have so often been discussed in College Periodicals, as that of the relative merits of a Classical and a Mathematical training in the development of the human mind. Yet often as it has been discussed, the writer feels that considering its importance, no apology is necessary for again treating the subject.

In one of his conversations with Dr. Johnson, Boswell remarks in reference to Gray's "Bard" that one of its chief merits is that the Poet plunges at once into his subject. Whether this be a merit in a poet or not, it is certainly a quality to be desired in a writer with only the limited space of the Gazette at his disposal, and we must therefore proceed at once "in medias res."

The most frequent boast made in regard to the Science of Mathematics, is, that it is the most exact of all the sciences and the only one that leads to infallible conclusions. Now, if passing by the chain of deductions, we consider