

academical instruction are required or not in the existing circumstances of the country? which he decides, we think properly, in the affirmative, he enters at once upon the question, whether an institution so constituted as the London University, is calculated satisfactorily to supply that want?

“The fundamental defect in this institution, to which I allude, is the *entire omission of every thing connected with Christianity* among the topics of instruction which are to be imparted to the youth received there for education. Professors are to be appointed on every branch of useful knowledge; lectures are to be given in all the sciences, in Greek and Roman literature, in moral and political philosophy, in jurisprudence, in medicine, in history, ancient and modern; in every subject which commonly forms a part of general or professional education; but the topic of Revealed Religion is studiously, absolutely, and avowedly omitted. I think it right, in order to avoid even the appearance of misrepresentation, to state thus early, that the founders of the institution explain in their prospectus the reasons of this omission. They explain that it arises, *not from choice, but from necessity; not from indifference to the importance of the subject, but from the inability to devise any plan, by which instruction in religion, can be made consistent with the admission of persons of all religious persuasions to the advantages of the institution;** and they expect that all necessary instruction in religion will be supplied by the parents or guardians of the young men, who are placed there as students. This part of their statement I propose shortly to consider a little more at large. At present, I merely mention the *fact*, that in this institution, destined to be a great national institution, and bearing the imposing name of the London University, Christianity is entirely omitted; no instructions are to be given on its evidences or its doctrines, no religious services are to be performed within its walls. In fact, it would appear that the Bible is to be as much an unknown book, and the Christian religion an unknown subject, within the precincts of the University of London, as would be the case in an University founded at modern Constantinople, or as would have been the case in one established at ancient Rome.”—pp. 5, 6.

Having thus stated the character of the defect, and shown afterwards in the clearest manner, that it was quite a novelty in the country, and that, in every other similar institution amongst us, general education is always built upon the foundation of religion; he thus proceeds—

“Hitherto our nation has borne the character of a religious and a moral nation. However we may have had, and may still have, to deplore individual instances of departure from religious principles and practices, yet we have lived as a Christian people, our laws are founded on Christianity, our youth have

*We recommend this sentence, which we have taken the liberty to mark in Italics, to the serious attention of those, in this country, who would have the Professorships of a University open to all denominations of Christians. The founders of the London University are evidently of opinion that the line cannot be drawn between only one system of religious instruction in a University, and none at all—and they have chosen the latter alternative—but with how much wisdom is we think amply shewn in this article.—ED. C. S.