

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

APRIL, 1847.

No. II.

ART. I.—*Horae Apocalypticae, or a Commentary on the Apocalypse, critical and historical; including, also, an examination of the chief Prophecies of Daniel, illustrated by an Apocalyptic Chart, and engravings from medals; and other extant monuments of antiquity.* By the Rev. E. B. Elliott, A. M., late vicar of Tuxford, and fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Second edition, with an Appendix, containing a sketch of the history of Apocalyptic Interpretation, &c. London: 1846.

WE have hitherto reviewed no books written in explanation of this mysterious portion of the inspired volume: deterred, chiefly, by the difficulty of the subject; and also by the vast discrepancy in the views of commentators. We feel, however, that this part of scripture ought not to be neglected; especially, as a blessing is pronounced on "him that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein." And of late, more than in former years, the attention of many learned men has been directed to the interpretation of the Apocalypse; and although, the disagreement among expositors continues as great as ever; yet, it is believed,

thousand years. He seems to be at a loss, however, to dispose of the Jews, whose return to Palestine is to occur after the saints are caught up into the air; and he is doubtful whether they will be converted to Christianity before or after their return; finally, he seems to be of opinion that a first-fruits of the nation will be converted before. There is, one pleasing trait in the character of these prophetic men; they generally appear to be truly orthodox and evangelical in their views of Christian doctrine.

The reflexions which have occurred to our minds respecting these various hypotheses, is, that it would be wiser to give less indulgence to an exuberant imagination—to leave secret things to God,—not to be wise above what is written, and to acquiesce with submission, in the declaration of the risen Saviour. “IT IS NOT FOR YOU TO KNOW THE TIMES AND THE SEASONS WHICH THE FATHER HATH PUT IN HIS OWN POWER.”

ART. II.—*Discourses and Addresses at the Ordination of the Rev. Theodore Dwight Woolsey, LL. D., to the ministry of the Gospel, and his inauguration as President of Yale College, October 21, 1846.* Published by order of the corporation.

THIS is a beautifully printed pamphlet, of exactly one hundred pages. The occasion of the various discourses it contains, as well as their general nature and respective authors, will appear in the following extracts from the preface, which, after stating that President Day resigned his office, August 18, 1846, proceeds thus:

“On the following day, the Fellows made choice of Theodore D. Woolsey, LL.D., Professor of the Greek Language and Literature, to be the President, and requested him, in the event of his acceptance of the office, to unite with the Prudential committee in making the necessary arrangements for his ordination to the Christian ministry, and for his inauguration to the Presidency of the College.

“The views of the President elect were entirely coincident with those of the Corporation as to the religious and ecclesiastical nature of the office to which he was elected. Accordingly he regarded his election as a call to ministering in the word of

God; and when after due deliberation, he had accepted the call, he united with the Prudential committee in requesting the ministers of the gospel in the Board of Fellows, to act as a council of ministers for his ordination.

"The corporation having been convened on the 20th of October, this arrangement was reported by the Committee and accepted; and the ordaining council was constituted accordingly. Dr. Woolsey was then presented to the council as a candidate for the ministry of the gospel; and having been examined by them, . . . he was unanimously approved.

"On the following day, at ten o'clock, A.M. the public solemnities of the ordination were performed. . . . The sermon was preached by the Rev. Leonard Bacon, D.D. . . . The charge was given by the Rev. Noah Porter, D.D., and the right hand of fellowship by the Rev. Theophilus Smith."

In the afternoon, "the ceremony of induction was performed by the Rev. Jeremiah Day, LL.D., D.D., late President, acting as senior Fellow, in behalf of the corporation; and the inaugurating address to the President was followed with a discourse to the audience. A congratulatory address in Latin was delivered by James L. Kingsley, LL. D., Professor of the Latin Language and Literature, . . . after which the President pronounced his inaugural discourse."

We find all the above mentioned performances in the pamphlet before us, except the Latin address by Dr. Kingsley. We regret that he has not seen fit to publish what seems to us as essential to a complete portraiture of the proceedings, as it was to the academic dignity, of the occasion. In the present state of classical attainment, a Latin address is far more likely to be appreciated and enjoyed, in the reading than the delivery; and the multitude not only of graduates who have been favored with his instructions, but of other educated men to whom he is honorably known, would have been glad to see another memento of this veteran scholar, *qui nihil tetigit quod non ornavit*.

We have taken the more copious extracts from this introductory narrative, because we wish to bring distinctly before our readers, one prominent and distinctive feature in this inauguration of a President over the largest, and with a single exception, oldest College in our country. We refer to his ordination to the ministry of the gospel, which appears to have been deemed and

made an indispensable preliminary to his induction to the Presidency. The candidate whom the corporation judged in all other respects most fit, being destitute of this qualification, was elected on the condition that he acquire it preparatory to his inauguration. Of course, such a body of men would not invite any one to go through the mere form of ordination to the sacred office, who was void of the essential gifts and acquisitions, which are requisite to the due discharge of it, and without which such a ceremony would be no better than a solemn farce. Dr. Woolsey in early life chose the ministry as his profession, and richly furnished himself therefor by laborious and various study; and although these aims were mysteriously frustrated, yet, when in maturer years, God gave him a more distinct and emphatic call to the work, that call found him furnished with the amplest theological erudition, and with a piety at once chastened and confirmed by severe and protracted trial.

But notwithstanding these high qualifications, that self-distrust which in his opening manhood, led him to shrink from the vast responsibilities of the sacred office to which he had aspired, rendered him, if possible still more unwilling to assume it, when having already spent a large portion of the prime of his life in another vocation, there was added the aversion to great and unlooked for changes in our habits and pursuits, which grows with years. Owing to his scruples on this point, he was disposed to decline—and despite the most importunate entreaties, did for some time anxiously delay accepting—the office to which he was elected, inasmuch as he agreed with the corporation, “as to its religious and ecclesiastical nature.” At length, being persuaded that duty required him, to accept what he calls “this undesired office,”* he became no less satisfied that his own personal scruples and preferences in regard to entering upon the work of the ministry were thereby overruled; that he, who would properly fulfil the duties pertaining to the presidency of such an institution of learning, must also have the relations and sympathies, the privileges and responsibilities of a Christian minister.

All this shows—and for this reason we thus dwelt upon it—how cardinal and indispensable it was deemed by all the parties concerned, that the President of the college should also be a

* *Inaugural Address*, p. 100.

minister of the gospel. But it has been contended by many, that to insist on such a prerequisite to office in an educational institution, savours of needless stiffness and gratuitous bigotry. Accordingly the ground taken and adhered to, in this instance, has been the subject of extensive criticism and censure. The question then arises, and it is one of no secondary moment; were the Trustees right in this case, in acting upon the opinion, that no one, whatever may be his other endowments, who is not a Christian minister, is qualified for the full and adequate discharge of the duties of the Presidency of the college. Ought this qualification, *ordinarily*, to be sought and insisted on in those who are called to preside over those institutions, to which our young men resort for a liberal education?

To these questions we do not hesitate to respond affirmatively. With regard to almost all our colleges, a single consideration is conclusive on this subject. They were founded, and the funds for their endowment were originally and sacredly bestowed, for the purpose of providing for the church a supply of educated and orthodox ministers. This was the great motive that led to the establishment of nearly, if not quite, all of our more ancient and prosperous colleges. This prompted by far the larger portion of the donations and sacrifices by which they were founded and built up. In a note by Dr. Bacon, (p. 35,) it is stated that the petition to the legislature for the charter of Yale College, set forth, "that from a sincere regard to, and zeal for, upholding the Protestant religion, by a succession of learned and orthodox men, they had proposed that a collegiate school should be erected in this colony, wherein youth should be instructed in all parts of learning, to qualify them for public employments in church or civil state; and that they had nominated ten ministers to be trustees, partners, or undertakers for the founding, endowing, and ordering the said school." The preamble to the charter, rehearses this representation and makes it the basis on which it rests. Similar was the origin of nearly all those great institutions planted by the wisdom and self-denying piety of our forefathers. Not only so, but the history of their subsequent growth and accumulation of funds, will show that they have drawn their main support from the benefactions of the pious, who cherished them chiefly in view of their being nurseries of young ministers. Substantially the same is true of the great mass of colleges of a

more recent origin. The grand motive which originated and has sustained them, in many cases at incredible sacrifices, was a desire to maintain and propagate the Christian religion, by rearing up an able ministry. Their benefactors, patrons, trustees, and instructors, have been for the most part Christian men. In almost all instances they are cherished and controlled by some single denomination of Christians; in some cases they owe their paternity and support to local ecclesiastical bodies. Leaving out of view that magnificent abortion of infidelity, which has sealed its own doom, by its suicidal exclusion of all Christian teachers, it may be safely said, that all the colleges in the country, would quickly expire, or preserve but a languid and sickly existence, if they were bereft of that support which they receive from the church in one form and another, on account of their agency in producing a supply of competent ministers, and otherwise promoting the cause of pure religion.

This being so, it is a plain breach of trust, a foul perversion and prostitution of the most sacred charities, if these colleges are not so administered and regulated, as to make Christianity the paramount and supreme interest, to which all their instruction and discipline are tributary. But the character of an institution is of course strongly represented by its presiding officer. If it be a primary object of it to advance the Christian religion, by imbuing the students with its doctrines and spirit, and through them, the world, over which they are destined, whatever profession they may select, to exercise a commanding influence, then he who presides over it as universal head and regulator, should be a minister of that religion. If it be a primary object for which its funds were bestowed, to train young men for the ministry, then surely he who has the universal supervision and lead of its operations, should himself exercise that ministry. Good faith with the pious founders and benefactors of these institutions forbids that they be so far secularized, that the Presidency or the ascendancy in their management, be in the hands of any others than accredited ministers and friends of the gospel.

But aside from any such special obligation, viewing the question as open, and to be decided on its intrinsic merits, we reach the same conclusion. The interests of these colleges, the great ends for which they exist, their government and discipline, the cause of sound learning and education, the highest good of the

student, of the church and the world, combine to demand that the President be authorised to preach the word, and distribute to each one a portion in due season.

As we have already seen, to whatever extent it is important that religion be ascendant in the college, to the same extent is it desirable that it have in the President an official expounder of its truths, and steward of its mysteries. Now, aside from the direct claims of Christianity, which in comparison with every rival interest, are transcendent and uncompromising, its indirect bearing on science and education themselves, entitle it to a lofty pre-eminence in the University. None can deny that its truths are the most vast, sublime, and inspiring, that can engage and occupy the human mind. Nor can it be questioned, that they have a peerless eminence, a centrality in the sphere of human knowledge, so that they wholly eclipse all other departments of science, by their own overshadowing immensity, excellence and grandeur. How then can that education, or learning, or instruction, or intellectual development, be otherwise than unbalanced, distorted and morbid, if not positively effeminate and puerile, in which this "science of sciences," the knowledge of the supreme, elemental truths which revelation discloses concerning the Soul, God, Eternity, Redemption, are either obliterated, or slightly and incidentally brought forward, or lowered from that supremacy over all other teachings, which they ought as surely to maintain, as the sun its rank above the moon and stars? Leaving this fruitful topic which may be adverted to again, when we notice Dr. Bacon's discourse, we proceed to observe, that

This ministerial character of its chief officer is needed in order to bring it into proper contact and sympathy with ministers, churches and the whole Christian community. A college is no abstraction. If it have any vitality it lives in the persons of its officers. By them, and also by the students they educate, it becomes known among the people. Especially is it by the chief officer, that it is known abroad among men, and that they communicate with it. Now, in order that the ministry may have the most cordial and confiding intercourse with him, it is requisite that he be of the same office, that so he may be of one heart and soul with them. And in his ministerial character, Christian people have the strongest pledge that the concerns of the institution will be administered in strict fidelity to the paramount

claims of religion. But experience as well as reason show that, as our American colleges are situated, they cannot long thrive, when bereft of the active sympathy and confidence of the Christian community.

Moreover the successful government of an American college, requires the enthronement of religion in its just supremacy. In this country we have no police, which of itself can avail in the least to save our thousands of students from utter ruin. Nor will the democratic feeling which is among the people like a very atmosphere, suffer aught that is harsh, imperious or despotic in the management of young men. Hence college government, which for the time being takes the place of the parental, must, as President Day observes, p. 63, be chiefly "one of influence;" and it becomes "essential to its preservation that there be a majority of the students on the side of good order and assiduous application." But what can be so effectual to generate and nourish this correct feeling on the part of the students, as a conscientious fear of God, a just sense of religious and Christian obligation? In other words, this feeling in favour of order and industry, will prevail in proportion to the amount of morality and religion among the students. These will be somewhat in proportion to the prominence which Christianity obtains in all its affairs and proceedings. We believe, that as a matter of fact, no colleges have been harassed with such desperate insubordination, as those which are most thoroughly divorced from religion.

But aside from these secondary and more utilitarian grounds, the great reason why Christianity should be enthroned in the college, and made its presiding genius in the person of its presiding officer, is that, on account of which it ought to reign every where, in all things, over every heart and every life, viz., its inherent, eternal, infinite excellence, its universal and absolute obligation. Here as well as elsewhere, it must be sought as a supreme good in itself, or it loses its essential character, and ceases to be itself, and thus fails to yield any of its secondary and consequential worldly benefits. It must be first, or it cannot be at all. "Seek ye *first* the kingdom of God and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you." All but infidels must concede that the reception of the gospel by men, is immeasurably the greatest good which can be imparted to them. This being so, it is plain that it ought to have a com-

manding eminence in that course of liberal education, which is of such power in shaping the minds and hearts, the career and destiny of multitudes of young men, of the highest talents and promise. Moreover, it is through their influence that the minds of the people universally are moulded. With few exceptions they constitute our physicians, lawyers, clergymen, editors, authors, statesmen, in short the teachers and guides of the race. The influence of these leaders and commanders of the people must be immense, whether it be enlisted for or against true religion. How unutterably important then is it, that they be the friends and supporters of evangelical piety? How plainly should all the fundamental arrangements and regulations of our colleges be adapted to promote so blessed a consummation? What can more happily tend towards it, than that the head of the institution be a minister of this holy religion? How desirable, that his vast influence be felt upon the students, not only in exemplifying, but in formally inculcating its doctrines and precepts? that, in addition to other means of influencing his pupils, he may avail himself of the solemn and tender relation sustained by the Christian pastor and teacher to his flock, to exercise a purifying influence upon them? How important, that he be able as occasion may require, to "rebuke, reprove and exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine," by the use of the *sermon*, which, notwithstanding the hackneyed allegation of its dullness and impotence, beyond all other kinds of instruction and entertainment, widely and permanently interests and improves mankind, being God's great ordinance for saving them that believe, that he have access to the pulpit which must ever stand acknowledged,

"The most effectual guard,
Support and ornament of virtue's cause"?

And on the other hand how does the fit discharge of these solemn duties add to his weight and dignity, his claims to affection and reverence? While our colleges under such auspices will be likely to send forth hosts of pious young men ready to every good work, to become leaders in "the sacramental host," and blessings to the church and the world, what better than a pest and scourge of society, is that literary institution which is annually pouring out its throngs of young men equipped with that knowledge which is power, while their principles and tastes

are so depraved, that they will exert power only in polluting and ruining their fellow-men?

Such are the considerations which vindicate the practice which has been almost universal in our more reputable colleges, of choosing none but Christian ministers to their highest office. They are ordinarily conclusive, colleges in our largest cities, are indeed so peculiarly affected by their location as to escape the force of much of the foregoing reasoning. Their students are derived chiefly from the cities in which they are located. Hence they reside in their own families, are under the guardianship of their own parents, with whom they "go up to the house of God in company." Thus they rarely meet their instructors except at recitations and prayers. In these cases many of the peculiar elements and traits of ordinary college communities are wanting. Many parts of the ordinary academic regimen may here be dispensed with, since the moral and religious impressions of the students are mostly imbibed elsewhere than at the college. Nor need we refrain from adding, that one of our city universities is favoured with a chancellor, who though a layman, needs only a formal investiture with the office of the ministry to adorn it; who makes his Christian influence felt in every sphere and relation he fills, with a felicity and power seldom equalled by clergymen; who would be disqualified by ordination for various high posts in our country, and who has the rare merit of having demonstrated in his own example, that Christian piety consistently acted out by public men, sheds a lustre and dignity upon the highest offices in the state. So remarkable an exception to the general class of men to which he belongs, presents also an exception to ordinary rules and reasonings about them; and it would be as preposterous to argue from this instance to a general principle, as to reason that because Dr. Witherspoon was a great statesman, and swayed even the Congress of the revolution by his eloquent wisdom, without tarnishing his ministerial character, therefore it would ordinarily be safe for clergymen to enter actively into political contentions.

While we thus cordially sustain the policy which led to Dr. Woolsey's ordination, there is one feature of the proceedings which we do not understand. He was ordained by Congregationalists to be a Congregational minister in a Congregational college. We suppose of course that the ceremony was intended

to be performed in the Congregational way. But we also have supposed it to be a settled and cardinal principle of Congregationalism, that all rightly constituted councils whether for ordination or other public ecclesiastical business, consist of ministers and lay-delegates of the churches, and that no council is regular, of which such lay-delegates are not members, at least by appointment, whether they attend or not. We believe this to be the view sanctioned by the practice, and the standard writers of that denomination.* Indeed if it be otherwise, much as it glories in its republican characteristics, it is so far forth less democratic than Presbyterianism; whose church courts are invariably composed in part of laymen who are the representatives of the people; and while all concede that the structure of any of these courts would be fatally vitiated, if laymen were not at liberty, and appointed to attend them, others go the length of making it well nigh *articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiae*, that there can be no quorum in these bodies for the lawful transaction of business, without the actual presence of ruling elders. This being so, we wonder that the council for the ordination of Dr. Woolsey was composed exclusively of the clerical Fellows of the College, no churches being invited to send delegates to it. We marvel the more at this, in consideration of the standing of the men concerned in it, and especially as some of them are prominent as champions of Congregationalism, particularly, its popular and democratic features. We think that, in these days, when so much labour is spent to prove that ministerial authority is a kind of charm transmitted by "tactical succession" from hand to head and from head to hand, every unprelatical denomination should abide by its principles, lest they afford occasion to such as seek occasion, to say they have no principles.

The rightful supremacy of the Christian religion in seats of learning, being the great truth, that had been rendered prominent in all the transactions connected with Dr. Woolsey's elevation to the Presidency, it very naturally became prominent in the different discourses and addresses delivered in connection with his ordination and inauguration.

Dr. Bacon's sermon is characterized by his usual vivacity and brilliancy; and by more than his usual depth of thinking and

* Upham's Ratio Disciplinae, Chap. xv. Sec. 146.

scholarship. Indeed it bears every mark of a carefully studied and elaborated performance. Such it ought to have been. Anything short of this would have been unjust to himself and to the occasion. His subject founded on the text, Acts xvli. 18, was, the truths before unknown or in doubt, which the Bible reveals and makes certain; the relation of these truths to science; or generally, "the bearing of the Christian revelation on the intellectual progress of mankind." Without implying an assent to every position taken in this discourse, we do not hesitate to avow our strong approbation of the main doctrine it sets forth, and of the ability with which it is unfolded and vindicated.

The new truths which Dr. Bacon specifies as brought to light by Christian revelation, he finds "included either expressly or by some strong implication, in the outline which we have of Paul's discourse" on Mars-hill. They are, 1. "The existence of one God the creator of the universe; 2. The universal presence and perpetual providence of God, caring for the happiness of men; 3. The unity of the human race; 4. The true dignity of human nature as made in God's image for intelligent communion with God; 5. God's interposition to recover men from the degradation and misery of their universal apostacy; 6. God's moral government over the world." These truths thus declared by the Apostle to the Athenians, had they heartily received them, Dr. B. observes, "in their confused chaotic minds, would have been, if I may borrow the strong phrase of another, 'like a sun shot into chaos.'"

Dr. B. next proceeds to trace out the relations of these truths, thus disclosed or first made certain to us, to the whole circle of sciences.

The views advanced in this discourse, were peculiarly appropriate to the occasion of its delivery—the ordination of one to the Christian ministry as a prerequisite to his induction to the presidency of a great literary institution. Well was the theme chosen, and well was it handled by a Christian minister in connection with, and in vindication of this solemn transaction, which, according to his own representation of it, signifies, "that he who is to preside over all these studies and teachings, may not enter into that high place, till he has given to Christ and the church those pledges, and taken upon his soul those vows, which are involved in his being set apart, in the apostolic form, to the

ministry of Christian truth, and the defence of the gospel." p. 36.

Well does he state the two opposite, but equally fatal results of that science which isolates itself from the truths of revelation. "On the one hand, it becomes gross materialism and atheism. On the other side it runs off into pantheistic views; and is sublimated at last into the transcendentalism which makes every thing subjective, and which regards God and the universe as a mere phantasmagoria produced in its own addled brain.

"In like manner, the science which disconnects itself from Christianity, is liable to either of two opposite tendencies in relation to utility and the welfare of society. On the one hand it is in danger of shutting its eyes to all that is moral and spiritual in the universe, all that concerns man's highest and most substantial interests; and so it degenerates into a coarse, sensual, Epicurean utilitarianism. Or if it falls under the opposite influence, it withdraws from sympathy and friendly connection with mankind at large; it grows ashamed of ministering to the homely wants of human nature; it seeks its own elegant amusement and intellectual enjoyments; it discusses trifles with a languid and gentlemanly air; and it sinks into contempt in its proud seclusion." p. 33.

If the doctrine of this discourse be true—if it be so, as for the most part, we assuredly believe it is—that the philosophy which is unenlightened by revelation, is unavoidably erroneous and incapable of progress: that "the world by wisdom knew not God," and not knowing the central and supreme object in the universe, knows nothing else aright; if Christianity pours its light, as Dr. Bacon contends into all other, not excepting even the physical sciences, and corrects their aberrations; then there is one conclusion from all this that is irresistible. That Christianity which illuminates and rectifies every other science, cannot itself be corrected, improved, overruled, or in any manner modified, by such science. This, by the very supposition, except as it is regenerated and illuminated by this same Christianity, is ever vain and erratic. It walks in darkness and knows not at what it stumbles; or in the emphatic and reiterated phrase of Dr. B. it "knows nothing." This makes an end of all alleged improvements in theology and the science of interpreting scripture, by means of human speculation, discoveries in metaphysics, especially mental and moral philosophy, and more than all, by enthroning

the human mind under the specious title of the Reason, over the Bible, with powers plenipotentiary to decide oracularly what it may, and may not teach. If the doctrine of the discourse under review is correct, all attempts to amend or perfect the obvious teachings of the Bible, by the supposed discoveries of human philosophy, are like attempts to illuminate the sun by rays shot up to it from the earth. It is essaying to illuminate that which gives light to all, and borrows it from none. Dr. B. justly says that religion, "renouncing, (at the reformation,) in part at least, the usurped dominion of metaphysics, had fallen back on God's facts in the Bible for the knowledge of God and things divine." We hope that these intruders into the hallowed precincts of divinity will never be permitted to resume this "usurped dominion," and that the boastful genius of innovation now glorying in its metaphysical astuteness, and now in its "common sense" simplicity and palpableness, will be speedily exorcised from the church; that we shall not soon be again annoyed with those vaunted improvements in theology, which have been the fruitful source of aggravated disorders and divisions, and have circulated the counterfeit fervors of artificial excitement, for true celestial fire, till the feverish fanaticism they kindled, has subsided into the chill of spiritual lethargy and death.

The interest of the discourse is heightened by the address to the candidate for ordination with which it closes. This was the more impressive from the fact, that Dr. Woolsey and Dr. Bacon, having been schoolmates in boyhood, and then classmates in college, and now for many years, neighbours and intimate friends, were also the two most prominent candidates before the public for the Presidency.

After adverting to Dr. W's. peculiar superiority as a scholar in youth at school and in college, so that if "it had been announced that one of the class of 1820 would be President, all eyes would have been turned to him *facile princeps*;" to his subsequent opportunities for enriching his mind with the largest learning and perfecting it by the finest culture; his experience in the instruction and government of the college, his foreign travel and consequent personal knowledge of the great seats and men of learning in Europe; nay, to the severe discipline of excruciating affliction, which is of the highest utility in preparing men for great stations and services, in all of which he had incon-

sciously been furnishing himself for this high and unexpected vocation. Dr. B. proceeds, to tell him "some particulars in which his preparation might have seemed more perfect." Having supposed him to have known in boyhood "the harsh discipline of poverty;" to have been taken "while yet a stripling to some high post of militant service for the church;" and then to have suffered the hatred and reproaches usually awarded to able and faithful ministers by all sorts of unreasonable and wicked men—he proceeds to say, "then though doubtless you would have had some qualifications which as yet you have not, you would have gained these qualifications at the expense of something of that accurate and thorough scholarship; and not only so, but you might have been, perhaps, in some respects too much of a man for us; we might have feared and wisely feared, to put you in this place; we might even have thought, and you might have thought with us, that your influence had grown too high to be transplanted, and that you had shaped for yourself a sphere of light and power from which you could not well be spared." pp. 38-9.

This leads us to ask, who is "too much of a man" to preside over the largest college in the country, the education of multitudes of young men, some hundred of whom are annually sent forth, and distributed over the land, and destined ultimately to fill its highest places of influence and power? A Dwight did not deem himself "too much of a man" for it, nor did the Trustees "fear to put him" there, even when the college had not grown to half its present magnitude. What other "sphere of light and power" can be compared to this, if properly filled, as it has been, by the illustrious series of men who have hitherto adorned it? Is any man so "great" that the corporation would have "feared" to summon him to it, if they had judged him best qualified for it? Moreover, how does it appear, that the new President could have acquired more of that high sort of manhood which his office needs, by any different training? That his abilities and opportunities have been of the highest order; that he has faithfully made the most of them; that he has long been employed in the instruction and government of the college, the best possible training for his office; that he has had the rugged discipline of affliction, and profited thereby; that he has endured the still severer ordeal of ample pecuniary resources, and

instead of being enervated by them, has made them tributary to the perfection of his scholarship and other accomplishments for his high calling, appears from Dr. B's representation. What process then could have made him more, above all, "too much of a man" for his station? On the whole, we think this closing address to Dr. W. the least felicitous part of the discourse.

As we pass onward to the charge by Dr. Porter, we find it a well-wrought production, replete with just views of the nature, and judicious counsels as to the right discharge of the sacred office, when conferred upon the President of a college. We should be glad to make some extracts, if we had space. The address by Mr. Smith in connection with giving the right hand of fellowship, is as happy as it is brief.

Next we come to the brief inaugurating address to the new President, followed by an address to the audience on "the appropriate duties of the President of a college," by Dr. Day, the ex-President. It is characterised by that mellow wisdom which has distinguished his whole career. After showing what a college is in the American sense; that its object is not to *finish* but merely to lay the foundation of a liberal education; that this object is much thwarted by the imperfect preparation of many of the students who enter college; that the whole course should be brought, as far as practicable, under the guidance of moral and religious principle; that the finances of the institution demand the strict and ceaseless vigilance of the presiding officer, to prevent the accumulation of expenditures exceeding its income; that all empirical expedients in education must in the end be disastrous to the college that adopts them, whatever transient popularity and patronage they may command by their dazzling and meteoric glare; he comes to what he evidently most burdens his mind in leaving, as it had done during his administration of the college. He says, "the most difficult problem by far, in the management of a college, is its discipline. Were there no necessity for this, the business of the instructors might justly be ranked among the most eligible of all employments. . . . There was good reason for the deep solicitude of that most distinguished instructor and guardian of youth, President Dwight, on this subject. When, in his last hours, he was inquired of, whether he had any directions to give respecting the

college, he merely expressed his desire that its discipline might be preserved." p. 66.

All who have any acquaintance with colleges, will feel that Dr. Day has not overstated the importance of the subject. The very extensive prevalence of idleness and dissipation in our best regulated institutions; the vast number of bright, hale, and promising young men, who are sent to colleges to be educated, and are sent away from them absolute wrecks, with shattered constitutions, debilitated minds, depraved appetites and profligate habits, renders this whole subject unutterably important. He who should devise any method of rendering college discipline more efficient in its working and benign in its results, who should contrive a way of effectually preserving from contamination, the bands of ingenuous and inexperienced young men that enter our academic halls, would in our opinion, achieve a triumph more glorious than the inventor of the cotton gin or the steam engine. But as there neither is, nor is likely to be any such specific discovered, it devolves on the trustees and instructors of colleges to task their wisdom, and exercise the utmost vigilance and assiduity on this subject, that so the evil may be abated, if not eradicated.

Dr. Day justly maintains that as the government of colleges takes the place of that of the families from which the students are withdrawn, so like this latter, it is "not mainly a government of restraint and terror, but of mild and persuasive influence, . . . yet this is not to be relied on as superseding *entirely* the necessity of punishment. In seminaries of learning, as well as in political communities, there are refractory spirits, which nothing but the penalties of the law will restrain. . . . It has been said, by an eminent philosopher and statesman, with a near approximation to the truth, that the great art of government consists in *not governing too much*. It would be more correct to say, that it consists in governing *just enough*; neither too much nor too little; and still more exactly true, that it consists in conducting the government in *such a way*, that it shall be as *little felt* as possible, except in its successful results. . . . All *display* of power, all discipline proceeding from the love of power, is to be scrupulously avoided." pp. 67-8-9.

These sage maxims, which may be taken for the conclusions, reached after a long career of successful experience, speak their

own importance. There is another resource on which Dr. Day evidently places great reliance in the government of a college. It consists in multiplying the inducements for poor students to resort to it for a liberal education. "The best materials for a seminary of learning, are the youth who are dependent on their education for professional success, and elevation in society. The point in which a college, situated as ours is, is in most danger of failing, is in the preservation of good order, sobriety, industry and economy. . . . As the government is one of influence, not of restraint and terror, it is essential to its preservation, that there be a majority of the students on the side of good order and assiduous application. It is the wise policy of our Northern colleges, to give special encouragement to those who are in moderate or indigent circumstances." p. 63.

While we heartily approve of the general system advocated in these extracts, we question whether there is not sometimes an infelicity in carrying it into practice. Are not "moderate and indigent circumstances" sometimes treated as being an almost sufficient and exclusive ground of favour, irrespective of industry, scholarship, and character? In addition to the qualification of indigence, ought there not also to be a fair measure of talents, diligence and general propriety of deportment, as a condition of receiving "special encouragement?" We suppose that it cannot tend to put the majority of the students "on the side of good order and assiduous application," to encourage those who have not these qualities, however indigent they may be. We do not suppose this to be the theory of Dr. Day, or the intent of any of the special provisions made for the assistance of poor students in any of our colleges. But we think we have some times observed, in the carrying out of the system, a too exclusive regard to the sole qualification of poverty, which of course defeats the very end in view.

Last in order—as it is inferior to none of them in merit—among these productions, is the inaugural discourse by Dr. Woolsey. As his tastes and pursuits have been those of the scholar, and he has never been addicted to popular speaking, although he has never secluded himself from sympathy and intercourse with the world, his high gifts and qualifications, if known to scholars, have been unknown to the people at large. But we think that this discourse has satisfied those who have read it, however ignorant

of him they may have been before, that the corporation have not misjudged in the selection they have made. It is every way of a high order. It shows a depth and scope and justness of thought, a thoroughness and refinement of culture, a strength and warmth, a purity and delicacy of moral and Christian feeling which put its author in the first rank of our literary men.

We limit ourselves to a few extracts which will serve for a brief synopsis of the discourse. The object of the discourse is to show the result which a Christian teacher should seek to accomplish by his instructions; or in other words, that a sound education produces an intellectual state at once analogous and propitious to that moral and spiritual state which genuine Christianity fosters. He first shows that religion may be viewed as spending itself either in self-purification, or in exertions for the good of others; as self-discipline or benevolence; as consisting either in active or passive virtues; but maintains that the true idea of it comprises and blends into harmony both these views; and that it becomes morbid and degenerate, when it has its being in one of these things to the exclusion of the other. In the man of well-balanced piety,

“Neither the passive nor the active element will predominate. He will feel that passive virtue is not the whole of virtue; that contemplation and solitude not being the state for which man was made, will prevent rather than further his perfection; that truth itself needs the contact of society to be tested and rendered impressive. And yet, on the other side, we will feel that self-purification in itself considered, is a most important thing, that deep principles and frequent meditation upon them, are necessary even to sustain active habits of an elevated range; and that perhaps, the worst state into which a man or a nation can be brought, is to become exclusively practical; since without constant recurrence to fundamental truths, the good pursued becomes earthly instead of heavenly, and the mind loses its faith and its power.

“If our remarks are just, the Christian teacher will try to avoid both of these extremes—that of over valuing theory and the improvement of the individual; and that of ascribing value only to the practical results of education in society. . . . For let it not be imagined that Christianity, in its highest manifestations, despises the useful. Even the philosophy of Plato did

not go so far as that. The useful properly understood, is the very point at which Christianity aims. The truly useful is the good, or the means to attain the good." pp. 78-9.

In this view of Christianity, which puts true goodness first, making the useful a means to, and happiness a fruit of its supremacy, and which discards that grovelling utilitarianism, that debases morals, religion, science, literature, education, indeed whatever it touches, we see the great features of that teaching which corresponds to it. These Dr. W. points out and advocates with great ability. He says,

"In the first place, the Christian instructor will value training more than knowledge. For every use which we can make of our minds, a principle is worth far more than the knowledge of a thousand applications of the principle; a habit of thinking far more than a thousand thoughts to which the habit might lead; the increase of a power far more than a multitude of things accomplished by that power. . . .

"The mind too, as trained, is fitted to explore higher truths with safety, while mere knowledge puffs up, leads to nothing better, and indeed in the early periods of life, tends to exclude better things. The highly disciplined man never thinks that he knows every thing, never thinks that every thing can be known, and is therefore modest, teachable, and believing. The man who has stores of knowledge without a well trained mind can hardly escape from self-conceit, and is liable to credulity or skepticism. It is needless to say which of these habits is most allied to the truly philosophical spirit or most favourable to Christian faith—to the reception of the gospel as a little child." pp. 80-1.

These principles he applies to correct some contrary views of education more or less current in society. Among these he specifies the aristocratic notion that the great end of a liberal education is to acquire a certain polish of mind derived chiefly from familiarity with the ancient classics; the proposal of some to have taught and studied, "chiefly or exclusively, the natural sciences on account of the stores of knowledge they contain;" the idea of many students, that "the reading of works of genius, rather than study is to be the occupation of each passing day." Such persons "bear blossoms when they ought to be gathering

internal strength. They not only do not grow, but positively weaken their minds and moral powers."

Dr. W. next insists that the Christian teacher will study to improve all the parts of the mind. "If God has formed all the powers and capacities of the soul, Christianity must evidently recognize it as his will, that they should all be cultivated so as to go on toward perfection together."

To a want of this symmetrical culture, he justly attributes much of that "*one-sidedness* in religion, politics and taste" which mark the present age. "What we call ultraism in this country—where the abundance of the thing seems to have given birth to the name—is but the one-sided tendency of minds not fully educated in all their parts, in which truths have not yet found their order and due proportion." (p. 84.) That part of the mind which he considers now most neglected is the sense of the beautiful, the taste, the faculty of "literary criticism." The evil as yet admits of no "complete remedy." But he would make it felt, in order that the cure may be attempted. A radical difficulty lies in the want of satisfactory treatises on the true principles, and in the various departments of æsthetics. There is great and striking truth in the following passages.

"The result of all this is, that the logical faculty has too much preëminence in our education; we train up those who will reason correctly, and it may be forcibly at the bar and the pulpit; but they become hard dry men, men who will neither receive nor give pleasure from their elegance of taste, and refined appreciation of art. This evil is not likely soon to be corrected, as is made probable by its universality and by the fact that the still reigning philosophy has another end—the useful—almost exclusively in view. But we still can make some resistance, even if it be an imperfect one, to the evil. We can teach the classics more with reference to style and artistic arrangement. We can bring the fine arts within the range of education. . . . A body of men, of tastes at once delicate and healthy, would mitigate the fierceness of political and theological strife in our country, and by their elevated standard would tend to make us feel that kind of cultivation to be necessary in which we are now most deficient." p. 88.

Dr. W. next applies the principle of his discourse to refute the low utilitarianism, which is so widely corrupting and degrading education. As according to the Christian system, true goodness is

to be prized for its own sake, even if we could suppose it would be followed by no rewards, so according to our author, the Christian teacher "will value science to some extent for its own sake. He will value it also as a necessary means for the formation of a perfect mind, and of an individual fitted for high usefulness. As for such results as success and reputation he will by no means despise them, but regarding other ends as nobler and more important, he will believe that according to the system of God in this world, the attainment of the better will involve that of the less worthy. Just as we secure our happiness when we are most willing to sacrifice it, while he who saveth his life, shall lose it, just so do we make most certain the lower purposes of education when we aim at the higher. And if we fail of the lower, there is still remaining after all, the priceless mind, all ready for usefulness, strong in its love of truth, imbued with the knowledge of principles, unwilling to stoop to what is low, and containing within itself a fountain of happiness.

"Few will question, I think, that these views are in accordance with the principles of Christianity." p. 89.

As the heresy that virtue or holiness is valuable not in itself, but only for the sake of the happiness or gratification of self-love, of which it is a means, goes to vitiate and destroy all moral goodness, inasmuch as the end will re-act upon, and determine the means employed to gain it; so Dr. Woolsey justly argues, that if science and the knowledge of the truth be not counted a good *per se*, but be prized solely as means to other ends, especially such ends as worldly success, honour, and emolument, they themselves will grow corrupt and wither and die. Thus, if knowledge be prized only as a means of self-aggrandizement, then falsehood will be quite as readily espoused as truth, if it be found more conducive to the same end. Thus the great object of desire and pursuit becomes not what is true; but as with the analogous heresy in morals, what is profitable. Of course all science which is nothing else than the knowledge of truth, and with it all real education, expire. Dr. W. adduces a fine illustration of these views in the case of the Grecian sophists who shaped their instructions solely with reference to making them subservient to such mercenary ends. In this aim they succeeded. "But then they educated in such a way, that the young lost all moral principle under their instructions, and became frivolous

shallow and skeptical; that ancient reverence and fidelity disappeared; that chicanery increased; that the creative principles of literature died out." p. 93.

The discourse detects the mischievous effects of these degrading views of science and education, in the extravagant estimation in which many hold "ready and fluent speaking and writing." He objects to making such attainments a prominent and paramount object before the mind is qualified by sufficient training and knowledge to make a just use of them. He contends that acquired thus prematurely, they will lead the youth to undervalue truth, and over value the instrument by which he can flourish at once. "And with his reverence for the truth, must he not lose his modesty, seeing that he has an instrument that he can wave about and make glitter in every body's eyes? And with the two, must he not lose his solidity of mind and character, his patience of labour, his faith in the far-reaching value of a thorough education?" p. 94.

However, some may deem all this too sublimated, too ideal, too contemptuous of the practical, we have no doubt of its justice. We have known the education, and ultimate practical efficiency and success of many young men impaired by their excessive and premature cultivation of this fluency of speaking and writing. They were betrayed by it into the neglect of more solid acquirements, and in after life were outstripped in this very respect, by those more thorough students, who in college, were far behind them in every thing pertaining to rhetoric and oratory. We remember the remark of an eminent jurist, that it is a great calamity to a young man to be able to appear to advantage without effort, and our observation has confirmed its truth.

The same cause, according to Dr. W., "inclines many to introduce into the college course, studies which belong to the professional life." This premature studying of principles, which students have not as yet been qualified by academic training to master, fills the professions with unripe, superficial men, who lament their error when it is past remedy. With a similar spirit, some contend that a professional man, if he would succeed, should pay no attention to any branch of study but his own. Against this course Dr. W. protests with great earnestness as tending to narrowness and illiberality. He insists that the pursuit of other knowledge, "as a subordinate thing," need consume no time, because it may serve for relaxation from the monotony of one

pursuit; and that it "need not interfere with progress, by cultivating other habits of mind, for every power of mind is needed in every profession for the highest usefulness." We think these suggestions of great importance to all professional men, and they may be verified by striking examples within the sphere of every man's observation.

We cannot forbear transcribing a part of his answer to the objection, that such a system of education as accords with the foregoing views, does not fit men for successful political manoeuvring. "Far be from us such a tendency in education. Rather than train so, I would—to use Plato's words—whisper to two or three young men in a corner, or even walk through empty halls. I should not like to die with this weight on my soul, that I had taken into my hands a block of the finest marble, and cut it into the form of a demagogue." p. 92.

He concludes with the position, "that a Christian instructor will, as far as lies within the range of his department, lead the minds of his pupils up to God. . . . He will connect science or learning, wherever it has a connection with the author of science and our minds." Thus, "nothing appears fortuitous or arbitrary or irrational. The perception of great designs in the universe, makes the mind unwilling to act without a plan worthy of its capacities. It is unable any longer to feel astonishment at the puny efforts of man; and instead of that hero-worship, that stupid gaze at men of genius, which is so common and so much fostered at this day, it worships the almighty architect, the author of beauty the law-giver of the creation." p. 98.

It surely augurs well for the interests of sound science, morality and religion, when men of principles so elevated, are selected to preside over our largest colleges. We see in this discourse religion enthroned over science, while science becomes the handmaid of religion. We see conservatism without stagnation, and enterprise which perfects without destroying whatever is good in existing systems. We see a noble elevation of moral principle which will not stoop to debase the culture of the mind for mercenary purposes. We see broad and profound views of the true nature and ends of a liberal education. We close with one extract, which suggests various reflections, while our limits oblige us to leave it to speak for itself.

"It might be asked here, whether a corps of Christian teachers having thus guided their pupils in the study of divine wisdom,

as displayed in the universe, ought not to go beyond the vestibule, and enter in procession into the inner temple, which is full of the presence of Christ. Or must they, as profane, stop without, and leave it to other guides, whose calling it is, to show the wonders within? Is it a fruit of the lamentable jealousies among Christian sects, that instruction *ex professo* in the Christian religion cannot be given in colleges unless we seem to make them sectarian, and thus increase distinctions, which are great enough already. These are grave questions, which it comports not with this time to answer fully. At present, the science of sciences lies neglected by almost all except ministers of the gospel. It forms, properly speaking, no branch of education; even the scriptures themselves are little studied out of voluntary classes. Meanwhile, causes are at work to undermine the religious faith with which young men have been imbued by their fathers, causes too, which must have the more influence, as the literary cultivation of our young men increases. The tendency to materialism on one side, and to pantheism on another, the literature of atheistic despair and sensualism, and the historic engines battering the walls of facts, must cause a multitude of minds in the next age to be assailed by religious doubts; and snares seem to be set for faith in revelation on every side. How desirable, if all this be not mere alarm, if the fears of many portending some crisis, in which the old shapes of things shall be broken up, be not entirely idle; how desirable, I say, that our educated young men should be taught a theology so liberal if that might be, as not to pertain to the party, but to universal Christianity, and so majestic in its outlines as to recommend itself to the consciousness, and make it own the presence of God." pp. 98-9.

ART. III.—*History of Romanism, from the earliest corruptions of Christianity to the present time, &c.* By John Dowling, A. M., Pastor of the Berean church, New York. New York: Edward Walker, 114 Fulton Street. Sixth edition. pp. 671.

So widely extended is the reading, and even the religious, public in this country, and composed of so many different classes, that there is a demand for books on all subjects and of very