

functions of the clergy were narrowed to the pastoral office and theological study; and institutions of which all the officers were clergymen underwent a corresponding contraction of scope and character, besides being enslaved politically to the reactionary party with which the Established Church was identified. Clerical restrictions on elections to headships and fellowships, especially those on headships, now act as powerful guarantees for the ascendancy of the Church of England in the universities. This fortress of Establishmentarianism is closely besieged by the Liberal forces, and in the end will no doubt fall. It is being daily rendered less tenable by the manifest progress of the new opinions among the academical clergy. The presidency of a layman, even if he were neutral in theological questions, could hardly be so subversive of religion as is that of a clergyman who, as everybody believes, would at once doff his black coat and white tie if he could do so without at the same time doffing his academical dignity with an income of \$10,000 a year.

Anglican or clerical ascendancy is one question; religious education is another, though the two are naturally confounded in a country accustomed to identify religion with a State church. In a period of religious division, such as that through which we are passing, the happiest solution of the problem would seem to be a secular university open to all, with colleges each of which, while availing itself of the professoriate, libraries, and apparatus of the university, and sending its students into the common examinations, might carry on its special system of religious instruction and moral discipline within its own walls. But it would be impracticable now to appropriate the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge to different churches, and on this continent the practice of local separation has gone so far that a for-

mation of colleges on the Oxford and Cambridge plan appears beyond our reach. The progress of religious thought, if it continues in the present direction and at the present rate, will soon change the aspect of this question. In the meantime, one who has been a student and tutor in a religious college at Oxford, and who is now connected with a secular university in America, may be permitted to avow his conviction that, whatever may be the case with children, in those who are of an age to go to college spontaneity is the essence of religion; that compulsion breeds antipathy at least as often as it does the reverse; and that morally as well as intellectually the most industrious college is the best.

3. The curriculum both at Oxford and Cambridge, till about five and twenty years ago, was confined to classics and mathematics; and the study of classics at Cambridge was purely philological, while at Oxford it included ancient philosophy, with Aristotle for a text-book, and ancient history. Now, physical science, history, and jurisprudence are included as optional subjects for the final examinations, and admitted to equal honours with the old studies, though classics and mathematics are still retained as the general basis, and preserve their ascendancy to a great extent. Physical science, though it has immense attractions and will probably in time become the basis of education, does not lend itself very easily to the purposes of a university curriculum: lectures in it may be attended and notes of the lectures may be taken, but the real benefit of the study as a mental discipline cannot be reaped without going through a course of actual investigation and experiment which can scarcely be compressed into three years, even if the other studies are set aside. The system is in a state of transition and