

be one who was fully impressed with the dogma that "ethics unconnected with the church is a fundamental fallacy;" that "man without the church has no right to educate man\*;" that "youth is too apt to delight in the inductive, instead of the deductive, reasoning;"—"to prefer novelty to antiquity," investigation to obedience to authority, &c.

As an example of the deductive process, as applied to my own favourite science, by a college tutor and public examiner of this period, I may cite a passage from lectures delivered in the university at the era under consideration, and since published:—

"A geologist, deeply impressed with the mystery of baptism, by which a 'new creature,' *καὶνὴ κτίσις*, is formed, by means of water and fire, would never have fallen into the absurdities of accounting for the formation of the globe solely by water or solely by fire. He would not have maintained either a Vulcanian or a Neptunian theory."† The reader may well imagine, that, if other departments of science were "christianized" after the like fashion, the scholar might run some risk of emerging into the world, from his academical career, with his reasoning powers enfeebled, and his intellects mystified.

But to conclude our historical sketch. After the year 1839, we may consider three-fourths of the sciences, still nominally taught at Oxford, to have been virtually exiled from the University. The class rooms of the professors were some of them entirely, others nearly, deserted.—Chemistry and botany attracted, between the years 1840 and 1844, from three to seven students;

\* See Sewell's *Christian Morals*, ch. iv. and x.

† *Ibid.* ch. xxii.