

less an Atheist; we think he ought to be a Christian in the strictest sense of the word, one heartily attached to religion, and in earnest to patronize and promote its faith and influence among his pupils, so far as it may, without any violence, or any departure from his appropriate functions, be in his power to do so. But while we admit all this, we do think it would be altogether from the purpose of his office and the nature of his duties, to become *ex-cathedra*, the advocate of any particular set of doctrines or form of worship, or to endeavour directly or indirectly, to make impressions on the minds of his pupils in favour of any Church, or in any manner or degree to set himself to prepossess the minds of the youth under his charge, for or against any system of religious faith, in a College which was professedly open to pupils of all denominations."—p. 37.

These extracts, we believe, contain the sum and substance of our author's opinions on the subject of incorporating Religious instruction with a Collegiate education; and we must admit that they contain some general observations differing widely from the doctrine which we have already deduced from a Pamphlet printed, some months ago, under the same auspices. But so trifling a discrepancy does not surprise us where there is so much at variance with all sound principle. Let that therefore pass. From the above extracts we gather the three following propositions.

1st. Religious instruction ought to form a main object in the education of youth.

2d. The management and controul of the Religious education of youth, should not be vested in the hands of the Clergy of any particular Church.

3d. The Chairs of Universities should be open only to those who are Christians, and in earnest to propagate the faith and influence of religion among their pupils;—but they must scrupulously avoid making impressions on their minds *for or against* any Church.

To the first of these propositions, we yield our most cordial assent—but the other two are so novel and extraordinary, that we scarcely know how we are *seriously* to apply ourselves to their refutation. But we shall endeavour to be serious.

Does the author of the essay mean to assert that a Clergyman can be found who is decidedly attached to no "form of sound words," or to the doctrines of no *particular Church*? Or does he mean to assert that a Clergyman may be found who, while he believes the doctrines of one sect, will not scruple to preach those of another; that he may, for example, have embraced the opinions of Socinus, and yet be so far infected with the spirit of modern liberalism as to preach the doctrines and eat the bread of the Kirk of Scotland? Or does he mean to assert that a Professor can be found who is "heartily attached to religion, and in earnest to patronize and promote its faith and influence among his pupils," but who is a member of no