

any other ideas of God and this relationship differ from his notion of the biblical representation, he concludes their authors to have lighted upon "ghosts" and other "misshapen monsters," forgetting that another, whose early religious training had caused his foregone conclusions to take on a different hue, would no doubt look upon many of the biblical representations of God's nature and relationship to man as equally ghostly and monstrous. Unless, too, the writer's conclusion be foregone, in comparison with what he does declare all other ideas on these points, whether belonging to religion or philosophy, to be so utterly astray or inadequate. Again, out of a rational experience, he admits, we are unable to deduce the doctrines of christianity; hence they can never be employed in criticism of any system of philosophy which professes to be so established. Taking up another point, we find it stated that such thinkers as Plato, Plotinus, and Emerson sought to discover the relation between God and man, and being unable to accomplish it by means of reason, the two latter at least sought it in the "ultra rational." But to leave the sphere of reason is to leave the sphere of certainty, and, as he justly remarks, "though we must of necessity be limited by reason, our limitation is our strength." Still we are immediately informed that reason is quite incapable of determining the nature of the relation between God and man. Why, then, blame Plotinus, Emerson, and others for passing beyond reason in their attempts to solve the question? If, as in the present case, the problem is insoluble by reason from the very nature of the case, it is plainly not a rational problem, and hence must be solved, if at all, by a method that is ultra rational. The writer is evidently not aware of the material of which his own edifice is constructed, when he thus hurls critical stones at the glass houses of others. Again, it is but a vain attempt to mix oil and water, when he endeavours to show that Christ supplies the great lack in Kant's system of philosophy. We might just as well talk of the difference between mathematics and chemistry as being a lack on the part of mathematics, as to say that the difference between a certain philosophy and Christianity is a lack on the part of that philosophy. According to the Bible, Christ's primary object in coming to the world was to save man from the consequences of his sin both original and actual; but what has philosophy to do with original sin, with the wrath of God or the love of Christ; with the glories of a heaven to be gained, or the terrors of a hell to be avoided? These are matters which concern the Christian religion alone, and Christ, considered apart from these and the Bible, and in connection with any system of philosophy, loses his divine character and mission, and becomes simply the Ideal Man. There can, therefore, result naught but confusion from attempting to mix philosophical principles and Christian dogmas in that way, and make of them one system. It can only end in casting doubt upon religion, and making philosophy ridiculous. The distinctive principles of Christianity and philosophy are obtained from such dissimilar sources, and by such widely different methods, that they cannot be assimilated with each other. Their harmony must be sought neither in matter nor method, but in results. Lest, however, it may be supposed that I do not believe philosophy to have any connection with religion, let me state in conclusion that there is a vast difference between the philosophy of religion and the doctrines of any particular religious system. The doctrines of Christianity, for instance, are based upon the Bible, whose contents are believed to be the product of revelation and inspiration, and therefore fixed for all time. The philosophy of religion, on the other hand, is based upon an examination of man's religious consciousness, or his religious experience, the nature and conditions of which are to be accounted for in

essentially the same manner as we proceed to account for any other portions of experience. The philosophy of religion does not, therefore, proceed dogmatically, but critically, and is quite independent of any particular system of religion.

AS OTHERS SEE US.

THE following letter, written to a friend over the border, by a certain "pilgrim stranger" who located in the city for a short time, and who seems to have been slightly afflicted with a propensity for "taking notes," (not bank-notes of course), may not be without interest to some of the readers of the JOURNAL. The circumstances which led to its having fallen into our possession are not of sufficient interest to require their statement.

KINGSTON, March, 1883.

DEAR JOHN,—I have been here for some time, now, and my spare moments, being the most numerous variety in my possession, have enabled me to make sundry observations on the character of this queer old city, and, I was about to add, its equally queer old citizens, but that term only applies to a limited portion of its inhabitants, the others being much the same as are to be met with in the average Canadian town or city, though, perhaps, on the whole a trifle slower and more dignified, (from their own stand point), than the others. But as there is little to be gained by describing things and humanity of the everyday and every-where description, I will confine my observations as far as possible to the more unusual side of things, even though they be common in a sense. Among other things which tend to assure a stranger that he is not in his native element here, especially the average American, like myself, is the peculiar character of the edifices in certain regions of the place. In point of time their appearance would seem to indicate that they were erected about the eleventh or twelfth century, while in point of architecture they impress one strongly as belonging to the pre-Adamic age, and their existence at the present day would thus support the view that the Noachian deluge did not, as is held by many, extend over the whole earth.

When compared with the other buildings in the city, there is very little to indicate that there ever existed a transition period from the ancient to the modern styles of architecture. There is equally as little indication of any similarity between certain classes of its inhabitants, for I have observed among the citizens several specimens which have all the appearance of belonging to a very ancient variety of the race, as well as presenting a very ancient look as individuals. In fact, in gazing upon some of them as they move about with a far-away air of abstracted sadness and solemnity, one is led to suppose that the category of time does not apply to these individuals, and that a century or two may have slipped past without their being conscious of the fact, while their obituaries will probably never be written, if we are to judge from present indications. I felt an indescribable feeling of an awe-full nature spread over me as I gazed upon some of these relics of the past, and would gladly have learned something of their