

739
~~839~~
05

CHRISTIANITY

THE

PATRON OF LITERATURE AND SCIENCE.

AN ADDRESS

DELIVERED FEBRUARY 22, 1849.

ON THE OCCASION OF THE AUTHOR'S INAUGURATION
AS PRESIDENT OF WASHINGTON COLLEGE, VIRGINIA.

BY THE

REV. GEORGE JUNKIN, D. D.

WITH AN APPENDIX,

CONTAINING A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE COLLEGE.



PHILADELPHIA:

PUBLISHED BY ORDER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES.

1849.

At a meeting of the BOARD OF TRUSTEES of Washington College, at Lexington, Virginia, on the 22d day of February, 1849, it was unanimously

Resolved, That the President be requested to furnish, for publication, a copy of his Address, this day delivered.

SAML. McD. REID,
Secretary.

INAUGURAL CEREMONIES.

THE Board of Trustees of Washington College, appointed the 22d of February, 1849, the birth-day of our incomparable patriot, Washington, for the inauguration ceremonies of the President elect, the Rev. George Junkin, D. D. The day proved somewhat inauspicious, by reason of a heavy fall of snow; yet there was assembled in the Presbyterian Church a very respectable audience.

The exercises were introduced with prayer by the Rev. Dr. Ruffner. The anniversary speeches of the two Societies of the College, and of the two connected with the Virginia Military Institute, were pronounced, and were listened to with deep interest. These were characterized by vigorous, sound and noble sentiments, and uttered with stirring energy.

Rev. Dr. McFarland, by appointment of the Committees of Arrangements, then introduced the inauguration exercises, with a brief and appropriate address, delivered in his usual serious and dignified manner. He dwelt chiefly upon the importance of a religious and moral influence in a College—the impossibility of success without this element, and the vanity of mere

650A
506
(RECAP)

intellectual culture, if unconnected with right moral development.

Robert White, Esq., who has been an active Trustee for thirty-seven years, then administered the oath of office to President Junkin. Dr. McFarland then delivered the keys of the College to the President, accompanied with a solemn and impressive charge; in which he made beautiful allusion to the symbolic meaning of the ceremony, as setting forth authority to rule and govern; but always for edification—for unlocking the stores of knowledge, sacred and secular, and forming the youth of the Institution to intelligence, virtue and piety.

The President then deposited the keys on the Bible, which lay on the table before him, and proceeded to deliver his inaugural address, which it is the chief object of this pamphlet to lay before the reading and the thinking public.

ADDRESS.

GENTLEMEN OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES,
FRIENDS AND FELLOW-CITIZENS :

MORE than eighteen centuries ago, the Great Teacher uttered these memorable words, "My kingdom is not of this world." Such language might long since have led the human intellect to a clear and definite judgment on the great problem of Church and State. And yet, the problem is but very partially solved. Oceans of blood have been shed in the discussion all over Europe and Asia, and the question is still unsettled. What mean the death fires of the ten general persecutions, during the first three centuries? For what noble end did cruel Nero, and bloody Domitian, and ambitious Trajan, and pious Antoninus, and fierce Severus, and ferocious Maximinus, and unrelenting Decius, and amiable Vespasian, and "the good Aurelius," and the monster Dioclesian, steep the imperial purple in the richest blood of the empire, and set the colour in the tears of mourning millions? Did not all these persecutions arise out of the assumption of the pagan and modern Erastian idea, that the civil government has dominion also in matters of religion? And did not the Church herself, when, in the fourth century, the State coveted her embrace whom it formerly persecuted, forgetting her Master's doctrine, willingly

consent to the unholy alliance, and thus fall from the sublime independence of her virgin purity?

But the Church was not the only sufferer by this violation of her Master's precept. Civil society too, experienced many evils; for in little more than three centuries, it lost its independence, and the Church became mistress of the world, and the ruling spirit of despotism. Hence, many long and bloody persecutions of the true, by the corrupt, secularized Church. Here too, we find the cause of most of the wars that desolated Europe for ages; especially the bitter and sanguinary controversy concerning the right of investiture: and the most humiliating spectacle, in our own day, of ecclesiastical benefices exposed to public sale by various of the nobility of England.

But we Americans, it is often said, understand this perplexed subject much better than it is understood in the old world. It may be so: and if not, we must be slow to learn; for our fathers crossed the flood for the glorious privilege of worshipping God without molestation here in the wilderness. Still, it may well be questioned, whether even we have fully worked out the problem. To test this matter, let me propose a question very appropriate on this occasion. The inauguration of a President of a College, is it a religious, or a civil ceremony? Does it belong to the State, or to the Church?

If, my friends, you hesitate, as I perceive you do, in view of this inquiry, you feel at once, that the boundary line is not yet clearly defined, between the kingdom which is, and the kingdom which is not of this world. We have not yet—at least popularly, whatever the law may have done—decided, whether a college be a civil, or a religious institution. And this is the precise point to which I ask your attention, on this day of the auspices. Shall I not have your most

kind indulgence, in this present attempt to feel my way along an untrodden path? And should any mis-step betray my feet into the toils of error, shall I not obtain your forgiveness, both for the error and the temerity which may have occasioned it?

In this confidence, let us proceed, and let us begin with the very term *inauguration* itself. It is borrowed from the ancient Romans. Numa Pompilius, seven hundred years before the Christian era, instituted the order of priests called *augurs*. Here we see the blending of the civil and religious powers: in other words, here is the investiture of the religious officers by the civil authority—the same which caused such tumult and bloodshed in the eleventh century and onward. But when in office, the functions of the augurs were confessedly religious. They were both priests to offer sacrifices, and prophets to foretell coming events and utter divine oracles. No great enterprise could be undertaken, until and unless the augurs pronounced a favourable omen. And, “as the favourable signs were known to the augurs alone, their scruples were a pretext for the government to put off an inconvenient assembly.” Thus, virtually, they could prorogue parliament, arrest an army, and prevent an election. And thus, these priests were a necessary adjunct of introduction into civil office; and hence our ceremony of inauguration. Beyond question, it lies within the province of religious, rather than of civil affairs; and their intermixture among the Romans was a Church and State union. If a College, with us, were a civil institution—an affair of government—then the inauguration of a President, though a religious ceremony, would be under civil control, and involve the idea of a Church and State union. But, inasmuch as our highest legal authorities have decided, (as will hereafter appear),

that a College is not a civil institution—a governmental affair—such inauguration is a *religious*, and not a *civil* ceremony.

Let us now proceed to examine this subject upon the broad grounds of immutable morality. And, first, we lay down the doctrine, that man is under a twofold dispensation; the human race is under a dispensation of law—of pure, original, simple law: it is also under a dispensation of remedial law. A brief analysis of the functions of each, will furnish the data upon which our solution depends.

By law we mean, a *rule of duty*, accompanied with a penal sanction. Were our question more general, did it cover any part of physics, a wider definition might be requisite; we might say, “law is a mode of existence, or an order of sequence.” But, as it lies wholly within the sphere of morals, the entire ground is covered when we say, law is a rule of duty, attended by a penal sanction.

A rule of duty implies the relation of ruler and ruled. There must be an intelligent, moral being, clothed with authority, to prescribe to another intelligent, moral being, what he shall do, and what he shall not do. The latter is the subject, or person ruled over; the former is the sovereign, or ruler. In the premises, the latter is man, the former, God. The will of our Creator, made known to us for the purpose, is law to us. No higher obligation can be conceived; no deeper foundation of morals can be laid. All attempts to pass beyond the Supreme Lord, and to find a basis for moral obligation in the nature of things, is vain. Is there a nature of things independent of the Author of things? Who gave its nature to the universe? The nature of all things in general, and of every particular thing, is the sum of those qualities with which the Creator has

invested each and all. These are common ideas. Every where, men consider the will of the sovereign made known to the subjects, as law. "The will of the legislature," says Chancellor Kent, "is the supreme law of the land, and demands perfect obedience." Men often question the wisdom of a law, but never its reality and obligation; unless it contravene a superior authority. If a legislative body violate the constitution under which they act, their will is not law; and there is a recuperative energy in our system to declare its nullity. But, within the appropriate sphere, the sovereign's will is law.

Penal sanction is a necessary adjunct of law, and springs, really, from the benevolence of the legislator. It is the specification of punishment—of suffering, attached to the violation of precept, and is a prophylactic remedy against crime. The rationale of it—which also exhibits its benevolent character—is this: It appeals to self-love, in the shape of fear, for the purpose of enforcing obedience. Lest respect and love to the law-giver might not be adequate to secure obedience, it is strengthened by the *fear* of evil—of punishment, which is love to self.

Such are the common elements of moral laws: they characterize all legislation, human and divine; and in regard to both, it holds good, that man is under a dispensation of simple law. But a dispensation of law, where its subjects have transgressed, is necessarily a dispensation of wrath: and, that this is the condition of the human race, is every where admitted. The world's history is proof of it; and the revelations of God abundantly confirm the mournful truth. Hence is apparent, the necessity of some means to check the flood of vice and consequent misery, which must otherwise soon desolate the earth. Therefore, it has been common with

writers on ethics, to call civil government, a necessary evil. "Had we never apostatized," says one, "from our primitive innocence, nor transgressed the laws of our Creator, there would have been no use for government. If the impulse of conscience were uniform and sufficiently forcible, mankind would need no other law than the law of the Supreme Being, and no other governor than him, who is the *Prince of the kings of the earth*. An habitual and invariable disposition in all men, without defect, *to do justice and love mercy*, would have excluded the necessity of human rules for their direction, or human sanctions for their terror. Government, then, like dress, is a badge of lost innocence; and as our shame makes the one, so our wickedness makes the other necessary."* These words of truth and soberness, we are pleased to borrow from that profound thinker, and energetic actor, to whom history has awarded the honour of having laid the foundations of that Institution, whose interests have assembled us together to-day.

If then, the depravity of man render civil government necessary, the question may arise, whether it be remedial. And if by *remedial* were meant, an *abatement* merely, of some of the evils of this life—the checking of violence, injustice and oppression, the protection of the virtuous, and the encouragement of every good work, it must be apparent, that, in this sense, civil government is a valuable *remedy*. But this is not the sense in which we use the term. When we speak of a remedial dispensation, we mean, one which dries up the *fountains*, as well as the *streams* of corruption: one which does not merely repress, and thereby conceal, but which cures the moral maladies of man. What

* Rev. William Graham's Essay on Government, p. 4.

then, if it be not remedial in this higher sense, are the functions of civil government ?

In the first place, we answer, negatively, that to create moral laws and obligations, is not one of them. It has no power over moral principles, but to apply them in particular cases. In other words, God's moral constitution, overlooks and controls all the movements of man's legislation and administration. Whatever moral principles are contained in human laws, are derived from the divine. In matters of indifference—things neither right nor wrong of themselves—human legislation has free scope: but in matters of essential morality and religion, it has no power. "But, in the name of reason," says Mr. Graham again, "what has civil government to do with religious principles, or preachers either? If men transgress the laws by overt acts, let them be punished, without any regard to their religious principles, or the office they sustain. Actions, not opinions, are the immediate objects of human laws, and God alone is the judge of the religious principles of men, and to him they are accountable for their opinions, not to civil governors." This doctrine is universally received, at least in theory, over all this broad land.

In replying positively, we would say, that the whole functions of civil government may be summed up in a word—*the administration of justice*. If the generally received opinion be correct, that government is the creature of necessity—that it grows out of the disposition of man to oppress his fellows, then it must be evident, that to administer justice, is its main end. "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these, are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That, to

secure these rights, governments are instituted among men." To preserve the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, then, the American people have declared to be the end of government: that is, civil government is the agency which society appoints for the protection and guardianship of persons, property and freedom. This it does, not by prescribing in detail the duties of citizens, but by defining infractions of natural right, and affixing to them appropriate penalties, and inflicting the same by physical force. Nor let it be supposed, that the right to institute government, has its origin in the wrongs of humanity. Right cannot have its foundation in wrong: we mean this only, that the *occasion* and *necessity* then call for it. The *right*, and the *duty* have their proper basis in our social constitution, which is given to us by the Creator, so that in reality, man is created with the law of society in his very being, and the necessary result of this, is civil government, which is, therefore, an ordinance of God. "By me kings reign and princes decree justice." The Son of God is the Governor among the nations; it is by his authority, that "princes rule, and nobles, even all the judges of the earth." "For there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid? Do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: for he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain; for he is the minister of God, an avenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." To punish wickedness by physical force, to vindicate the justice of law, to protect virtue and innocence, to secure life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;—these are the great functions of civil govern-

ment. Its purview is limited to time: it has nothing to do with the destinies of eternity, except referring to them, for the purpose of strengthening the terrors of justice.

Quite different from these, are the functions of the law remedial; or that system by which all the evils incident to the former, upon its violation, are proposed to be remedied. The grand and formal object of its enactment, revelation and administration, is to dry up all the fountains of corruption in the human heart, and so, in human society; to rescue man from all penal evil and restore him to perfect purity and holiness, under the dominion of the law he had broken.

In order to this, it is clear, that the penal requirements of the law, to which this is a remedy, must be complied with. The divine attribute of justice must be vindicated, in the face of the moral universe. To meet this, the remedial law presents us with the great and fundamental doctrines of the Christian atonement; the Mediator renders perfect satisfaction for lost men, to the claims of immutable justice.

There must also be, a thorough enlightenment of conscience in the knowledge of his legal and moral relations, that man may be placed under its controlling influence, as an absolute rule, to whose authority, he will always bow, and whose dictates, he will always obey.

But now, in order to accomplish this, it is plain, there must be a thorough revolution in his moral feelings. All corrupt bias must be removed, and the soul's affections made to conform to the rectitude of his primitive perfection. In other words, the law of love must be reinstated, in all its original power and supreme dominion over the whole man.

These must be provided for in the remedial law, or

it is falsely so called: the head must be enlightened, the heart purified, the sins pardoned. Accordingly, when we open *the book*, the only book which contains the remedial law, we find, that the great business of those to whom its practical administration is committed, is *teaching*. "Ye are the light of the world." "Go and teach all nations." "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." Without fear of contradiction from any quarter, therefore, we affirm TEACHING, to be the leading, the all important function of the Church.

But teaching implies ignorance on the one hand, and knowledge on the other. Whence comes this knowledge? How is this darkness, which covers the earth, to be removed? Darkness cannot be the cause of light, though night precedes day. Ignorance cannot teach itself. Did ever an ignorant, depraved, and barbarous race of men, civilize, and reform, and enlighten itself, without any influence external to itself? If this anomaly no where appear on the surface of history, what, we ask, is the purifying, elevating, illuminating power? And the only true response is, THE GREAT TEACHER. Whence should truth descend to enlighten, purify, and elevate man, but from her own eternal source—the bosom of God? Whence comes light; but from the orb of day?

To the head, therefore, of the remedial dispensation, must we look for this knowledge. "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all." And the depository of this light is the sacred volume. "The commandment is a lamp, and the law is light." Now these lively oracles have been entrusted to the visible Church, with the King's injunction, to spread the light abroad. The question then very naturally arises, who are the Church. Who are meant in the language, "Ye are

the light of the world"? What is that agency, to which is entrusted, the momentous work of enlightening the world? Which of all the sects into which Christendom is divided, has received and holds this important commission?

To these, I answer, no one in particular, but all in general, who hold the Head. All men and women throughout the world, who receive and hold the doctrines of the Bible, and submit themselves to the laws therein contained, together with their children—"For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off; even as many as the Lord our God shall call." These, whatever be their sectional or denominational distinctions, and however sundered by geographical lines, and kept apart, physically, by national boundaries, all these, are the one Church visible, to which the Bible has been entrusted, and which the King in Zion holds responsible for *teaching* the world.

We delay not a moment on the question of method; and but a moment, on the question of official relations. This is unnecessary, for the obvious reason, that there is nearly a unanimous agreement in reference to official teachers. All sections of the Church find it necessary, to elevate some individuals to this special duty, and to enjoin it upon them, to give themselves wholly to these things. A ministry, the Church always has had, and always will have. "I have set watchmen upon thy walls, O Jerusalem, which shall never hold their peace, day nor night." Now, by this agency, every private member becomes a real teacher; for it is a plain truth, that what a man does by another, he does himself; he who supports a teacher, does himself teach. Thus, the entire mass of religious society carries out, and accomplishes her grand functions; and, if properly adjusted, there is no part idle.

It may be alleged, in opposition, that government and discipline are very important items in religious society, and therefore, teaching is not after all so pre-eminent. We admit and maintain, the high importance of these; but we also contend, that they are, nevertheless, subsidiary and subordinate to the master function of teaching. The government of religious societies, is merely the application of their rules to their members for the regulation of their conduct; and discipline is the same application, for the correction, or reclamation of offenders. There can be neither, where there is no law; and, consequently, to teach the laws of the society, is the first step towards government. And in this very act, there is necessarily involved an exercise of government; for the teacher must have control over the taught, in the very matter of communicating instruction.

Moreover, the punishments within the sphere of religious society, improperly so called, are wholly of a moral nature. Admonition, reproof, suspension, expulsion—these are all entirely distinct and separate from temporal pains and penalties. No church has any power to inflict corporeal, or pecuniary punishments. The severest censure is nothing more than a simple declaration, that the individual, having violated the rules of the society, is no longer a member of it. All church censures are *disciplinary*; none are *penal*. Every movement in this great school of instruction, is for edification—none for destruction.

Once more—the positive institutions of the religious society, have the same general end in view. The two sacraments are an embodiment, in significant symbols, of the two leading doctrines—regeneration and atonement. And how beautifully simple, and how efficiently practical, this method of teaching! This water in bap-

tism, how strikingly it holds up to view, life and purity, as the work of the gracious Spirit! This distribution of bread and wine, how forcibly it impresses the mind, with the grand conception of redemption by blood! Thus, all the energies of this great society, concentrate in the one object—the communication of the grand doctrines of Christianity to the minds of men, as the chief means of counteracting the evils of the fall, and of restoring them to a state of purity and felicity.

Mark now the particular functions of the State, and of the Church. The sum of the one, is the administration of justice: the sum of the other, is the teaching of truth. To the one, belongs the punishment of crime, by the infliction of physical evil—of pain: to the other, the reformation of the criminal, by teaching him the way of life, as exhibited in the love of God revealed in the Bible. The former checks evil with evil: the latter overcomes evil with good. The dispensation of simple law, is a dispensation of wrath: that of remedial law, is a dispensation of mercy. *Pœna* belongs to the one: *Pœnitentia* to the other. The one protects innocence, virtue and life, by appeals to slavish fear: the other, by all-conquering love.

We search in vain within the Bible, or in the book of true philosophy without it, for any evidence, that teaching was ever committed, by the Creator, to the civil magistrate, as one of the functions of his office: we cannot search at all for such evidence, as to the Church; for the light flashes forth every where, and carries the conviction intuitively, to every rational mind, that the Church is the light of the world—the teacher of mankind. Therefore, a college is a religious, and not a civil institution.

This *a priori* argument, we shall sustain, by full and ample proof historical: previous to which, however,

let me present the argument authoritative, by quotations from the highest law authorities of this nation and the world.

“Lay corporations,” says Chancellor Kent, “are again divided into eleemosynary and civil. An eleemosynary corporation is a private charity, constituted for the perpetual distribution of the alms and bounty of the founder. In this class are ranked, hospitals for the relief of poor, sick, and impotent persons, and colleges and academies established for the promotion of learning and piety, and endowed with property by public and private donations.”—“The uses may, in a certain sense, be called public, but the corporations are private, equally as if the franchises were vested in a single person. A hospital, founded by a private benefactor, is in point of law, a private corporation, though dedicated by its charter to general charity. A college, founded and endowed in the same manner, is a private charity, though from its general and beneficent objects, it may acquire the character of a public institution.”—“If the founder be private, the corporation is private, however extensive the uses may be, to which it is devoted by the founder, or by the nature of the institution.”*

A college, then, is not a civil, or governmental affair; nor a public corporation, but a private, charitable institution.

In the case of *Dartmouth College vs. Woodward*, Judge Marshall delivers the opinion of the court; all the judges, except Duval, assenting. He sustains the same doctrine; indeed, the Chancellor cites the case. We select a passage or two: “From the fact, then, that a charter of incorporation has been granted, nothing can be inferred, which changes the character of the institution, or transfers to the government any new

* Com. II. 274-5.

power over it. Neither, in reason, can the incorporating act change the character of a private, eleemosynary institution." Again: "A corporation's immortality, no more confers on it political power, or a political character, than immortality would confer such power, or character, on a natural person. It is no more a State instrument, than a natural person, exercising the same powers, would be. If, then, a natural person, employed by individuals in the education of youth, or for the government of a seminary, in which youth is educated, would not become a public officer, or be considered as a member of the civil government, how is it, that this artificial being, created by law for the purpose of being employed by the same individuals, for the same purposes, should become a part of the civil government of the country?"*

Judge Story gives a separate, but concurring opinion. "But private and particular corporations for charity," says he, "founded and endowed by private persons, are subject to the private government of those who erect them, and are to be visited by them, or their heirs, or such persons as they may appoint." "The authorities are full to prove, that a college is a private charity."† And, as to the founders, who have the right of visitation, he quotes Blackstone, thus: "But in eleemosynary foundations, such as colleges and hospitals, where there is an endowment of lands, the law distinguishes and makes two species of foundation, the one *fundatio incipiens*, or the incorporation, in which sense, the king is the general founder of all colleges and hospitals; the other *fundatio perficiens*, or the donation of it, in which sense, the first gift of the revenues is the foundation, and he who gives them is, in law, the founder; and

* Wheaton, IV. 544.

† Wheaton, IV. 557, 565.

it is in this last sense, we generally call a man the founder of a college or hospital."

With equal strength and clearness, Judge Washington gives a separate, yet concurring opinion. We forbear, however, further extracts. The law has for ever settled the question, and decided, that a college is not a civil institution—it is not a governmental instrument—it is not a political engine—but it is an eleemosynary, or charitable institution, "for the promotion of learning and piety." It is a private concern, and the visitorial powers vest in the first contributors who founded it, or in those to whom they may and shall have entrusted the same; and, though not an ecclesiastical, yet being truly and legally recognized as "established for the promotion of learning and piety"—*i. e.*, as religious, it falls clearly within the functions of the remedial law.

We now proceed with the historical argument. Chancellor Kent says, that, "Corporations or colleges for the advancement of learning, were entirely unknown to the ancients; and they are the fruits of modern invention. But in the times of the latter emperors, the professors in the different sciences began to be allowed regular salaries from the government, and to become objects of public regulation and discipline. By the close of the third century, these literary establishments, and particularly the schools at Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, and Berytus, began to assume the appearance of public institutions. Privileges and honours were bestowed upon the professors and students, and they were subjected to visitation and inspection, by the civil and ecclesiastical powers."* This language implies the undoubted historical fact, that schools did exist from the earliest ages of Christianity; not, indeed,

* Com. II. 269.

under state patronage, but, in despite of state persecution, under the protection of religious society. The four schools named were unquestionably religious institutions, nurtured by the Church, and watered with its richest blood. At Alexandria, for example, the father of Origen was executed, his property confiscated, and his widow and children left destitute. This, however, did not damp the spirit of the son, and prevent him from using the most vigorous efforts to promote the influence of the school, over which, at the early age of eighteen, he was appointed teacher, by Demetrius, Bishop of the Church; and history attests the abundant success of his efforts.

Mosheim condenses much matter into small compass. "The Christians," says he, "took all possible care to accustom their children to the study of the Scriptures, and to instruct them in the doctrines of their holy religion; and schools were every where erected for this purpose, even from the very commencement of the Christian Church." We must not, however, confound the schools designed only for children, with the gymnasia, or academies of the ancient Christians, erected in several large cities, in which persons of riper years, especially such as aspired to be public teachers, were instructed in the different branches, both of human learning and of sacred erudition. We may, undoubtedly, attribute to the Apostles themselves and their injunctions to their disciples, the excellent establishments in which the youth, destined to the holy ministry, received an education suited to the solemn office they were to undertake. St. John erected a school of this kind, at Ephesus, and one of the same nature was founded by Polycarp, at Smyrna. But none of these were in greater repute, than that which was established at Alexandria, which was commonly called, the *cate-*

chetical school, and is generally supposed to have been erected by St. Mark.*

Neander speaks nearly to the same purport: "But a peculiar institution of the Alexandrian Church—I mean the *Alexandrian Catechetical School*." Again: "We find, then, originally, at Alexandria, only one person appointed as a catechist by the bishop, whose business it was, to communicate religious instruction to the heathens, as well as to instruct the children of the place in their religion. Origen was the first, who, as catechist, divided with another person the duties of this calling, which had become too much for him, while he was prosecuting, at the same time, his learned labours in theology, and on that account, he formed his catechumens into two classes. But although, in other places, the catechist might not need to possess very high spiritual qualities and peculiar knowledge, the case was different at Alexandria, where they often had to instruct men of a literary and philosophical cast of mind, who had already investigated a variety of systems, in order to find a system of religious truth adapted to their wants, and where they were often obliged to converse with such men, on religious subjects and philosophical matters which are connected with them."†

As it was at Alexandria, so was it in all other places of importance. Wherever there was a Church, a catechist soon became necessary, and the pastor appointed one. This catechist taught the ignorant adult heathen and the children of the Church. Here begins the history of the schoolmaster and of schools. Never did the world, until it was Christianized, conceive the idea of teaching all the children, and never was there a true-hearted Church of God, which did not feel it incumbent upon itself to teach all the world. Moreover,

* Vol. I. 100.

† Church Hist. 336, 337.

wherever there were large churches, as in cities, and a number of youth desirous of preparing for the ministry, there some catechetical school rose to the eminence of an academy, qualified to teach the requisite philosophy and science. In the four cities named, these Christian schools were real colleges, not chartered and fostered, but crushed and persecuted by the civil powers. Thus, the Church of God, during the first three hundred years of the Christian era, wrote the history of her literature and the charters of her colleges in her own blood. Nor was it, until after the light of her science and the blood of her martyrs had extinguished the baleful fires of pagan persecution, and the tottering throne of the Cæsars had felt its need of support from a purer religion, that the Christian schools of Alexandria and Rome, of Constantinople and Berytus, of Cesarea and Antioch, of Ephesus and Smyrna, were patronized by the government. Now, a point, material to this discussion, is the fact, that the schools, academies, and colleges, which the pagan emperors persecuted, and the Christian emperors patronized, existed, long before the battle of *Rubra Saxa*, and the edict of Constantine, A. D. 325, which declared Christianity the religion of the empire. It was not the civil government, that created the schools; it was the Church, that, in the face of persecution, reared aloft these beacon lights to guide the nations through the darkness of time. And so hath it been ever since. Let the voice of history be heard.

The union of Church and State must necessarily be followed, by a controlling influence of government, in matters of literature and science, as well as of religion: still, the schools of learning belonged, of right, to the Church, as really as did the ordinances of religion; and governmental interference became as disastrous in the end to the one, as to the other. Learning suffered

equally with religion, in the unhallowed alliance. For the schools of the Church, now aided variously, and, of course, trammelled, by the government, sunk into slothfulness, and experienced all that paralyzing influence, which a religious establishment necessarily produces. In consequence of this supineness, there must have been a total loss of letters, but for the necessity of some little knowledge of them, in conducting her worship. "This state of general ignorance," says Hallam, "lasted, with no very sensible difference, on a superficial view, for about five centuries, during which, every sort of knowledge was almost wholly confined to the ecclesiastical order. But among them, though instances of gross ignorance were exceedingly frequent, the necessity of preserving the Latin language, in which the Scriptures, the canons, and other authorities of the Church, and the regular liturgies, were written, and in which alone the correspondence of their well organized hierarchy could be conducted, kept flowing, in the worst seasons, a slender, but living stream."* The secularized clergy, now too indolent to cultivate the sciences not indispensable to their daily routine of services, conceived a disgust toward them. "A prepossession against secular learning," says Hallam, "had taken hold of those ecclesiastics who gave tone to the rest. If, however, the prejudices of the clergy, stood in the way of what we more esteem than they did, the study of philological literature, it is never to be forgotten, that, but for them, the records of that literature would have perished—all grammatical learning would have been laid aside." Even Hume admits the Church to have been the depository of learning in the days of Alfred." "The monasteries," says he,

* Hallam's Liter. I. 26.

“were destroyed by the ravages of the Danes, the monks butchered or dispersed, their libraries burnt; and thus, the only seats of erudition in those ages, were totally subverted. Alfred himself complains, that, on his accession, he knew not one person, south of the Thames, who could so much as interpret the Latin service, and very few in the northern parts, who had even reached that pitch of erudition.”

But we are not prepared to admit the secularization of learning, any more than of religion, to have been universal. History stares us in the face, and inquires, Whither fled religion and her schools, when the sun of science descended to its nadir, as Hallam says, in the seventh century? When the death pall of secularization fell upon the Christian seminaries, which the blood of martyred millions had nurtured during the first three centuries, did Christian schools cease from the earth? By no means. Two streams from the original fountains of light, flowed westward. Dr. Smyth has presented clear evidence of the plantation of gospel institutions in Scotland and Ireland, near the beginning of the third century. “The Scots, says Buchanan, were taught Christianity, by the disciples of the Apostle John, and many churches of the Britons, fearing the cruelty of Domitian, took their journey into Scotland.” “In the year A. D. 563, the celebrated abbey, or rather theological college, was founded in Scotland, by Columba, at Iona, which continued to flourish for many ages, as the light of the western world, and to supply with ministers of the gospel, both Scotland and England.”* To this corresponds the testimony of Mosheim. “If,” says he, “we except some poor remains of learning which were yet to be found at Rome,

* Smyth's Hist. Pres. and Prelacy, p. 482, 3.

and in certain cities of Italy, the sciences seem to have abandoned the continent, and fixed their residence in Britain and Ireland. Those, therefore, of the Latin writers, who were distinguished by their learning and genius, were all, a few French and Italians excepted, either British or Scotch; such as Alcuin, Bede, Egbert, Clemens, Dungallus, Acca, and others."* It was from this pure source, that a ray of light was thrown into the darkness of a corrupt and secularized church, and thus the Christian seminaries, in Britain and Ireland, lent their force toward reviving learning in the empire of Charlemagne. Alcuin, his preceptor, and the projector of all the improvements in learning, which signalized and immortalized his reign, was a Briton. From the same source also, it can be shown, the rays diverged which penetrated the valley of the Rhine; and missionaries from the Scotch, English and Irish schools, kindled up the lights of religion, of literature and science, amid the forests of Germany.

Parallel to this, beamed forth another ray from Asia Minor, through Thrace, Illyricum, the valleys of the Adige, and the Po, into Piedmont and the higher Alps. After burning in the fires of Papal persecution for more than a hundred and fifty years, during which they supported their own churches and schools, independent of the civil government, the Paulicians of western Asia carried their bibles, their schools, and their religion to the confines of Gaul; where their descendants and successors, the Waldenses, have quite recently experienced severe sufferings, from that anti-Christian power, which seems naturally inherent in an established church. The history of the Waldenses, during the dark ages, is the history of light. They

* Mosh. I. 487.

maintained their own schools, and educated their own ministry, from the seventh century onward; and they would have left histories of their literature, had not their books perished with themselves in the same flames of persecution, by whose lights, almost alone, we trace their history.

But it is time we should inquire, what agency religion, religious men, and the Church had in the revival of letters, the resurrection of philosophy and science, in the eleventh century, and onward. Yet, it will not be at all practicable, within our limits, to enter upon details. And, happily for our purposes, it is not necessary; because, no one can glance his eye over that history, without the conviction flashing upon his mind, that the colleges and universities, as well as the Episcopal and Cathedral schools, were religious institutions, as really as the bishopricks themselves. The histories of the four great universities, Bologna and Paris, Oxford and Cambridge, with their various colleges, demonstrate their existence and high success, long before they enjoyed chartered privileges; and, that they were built up chiefly by men bearing various offices in the Church. Correspondent to this indubitable fact, Blackstone tells us, that the right of visitation over the English universities and colleges, was claimed "by the Popish clergy, under whose direction they were, as *ecclesiastical*, or, at least, as *clerical* corporations." And this question was only settled after the Reformation, when the canon law, and its counterpart, the Justinian code, contrary to the strenuous efforts of the clergy, were finally repudiated. Its ultimate adjustment took place, by the triumph of the common law, when, in the celebrated case of *Phillips vs. Bury*, the House of Lords, on final appeal, sustained the opinion of Chief Justice Holt. Since that time, a college has been held and deemed a lay corporation,

private and eleemosynary; subject to visitation according to its own statutes. But it is to establish the religious origin of these institutions, these facts of history are cited. All these colleges were called into being, under the direct influence of religion; they are a result of charity—often misguided, indeed, but still within the compass of the great commission, “Go and teach all nations.”

We come now to our own Hesperian clime. What says the voice of history in young America. Did the Mayflower contain the religion, the literature, and the science which make up a college? Did she drop these seeds on the rock-bound coast of New England, in the bleak December of 1620? Who founded Harvard College, and procured a charter in 1638? Who founded Yale in 1700? Who founded Nassau Hall in 1746? Who founded Brown University in 1764? Who founded Dartmouth in 1769? Who founded Liberty Hall Academy, now Washington College in 1774? Who founded Dickinson in 1783? Hampden Sidney in 1788? Randolph Macon in 1830? Emory and Henry in 1839? The same inquiry might be raised, in reference to the ninety-eight others, whose names and dates lie before me; and some fifty others, which Christianity has called into being, since this list was made out, nine years ago. If any person will take the trouble to ascertain a full detail of the facts, we venture the prediction, that he will not find ten, out of some hundred and fifty American colleges, which did not first light the torch of their science with rays from the Sun of Righteousness, converged to a focus in the lens of Christian charity. Of all the principles which nature and grace combined, have implanted in the human bosom, love to a world buried in the darkness of sin, alone operates with an energy sufficient to open the dark chambers of

the soul to the light of day. Religion alone has power to awaken the spirit of man to a consciousness of his own spiritual nature, and therefore, of his immortal destiny. Until a burning thirst for immortality is enkindled within the human spirit, how should it be nerved for those gigantic efforts, which are indispensable to its own capacious enlargement? Let youth entertain the conception, that their souls are only modifications of matter, and fall asleep with the body, to awake no more, and what hold have you on them? But, let religion implant in their minds, the deep conviction of their immortal nature; let them learn the higher metaphysics of the Bible; let them know the law of their interminable progression toward the perfection of God, and the felicities of everlasting communion with all that is glorious and holy in an endless heaven; or of all that is fearful in the terrible reverse—and you at once wake up the energies of the immortal mind, to efforts correspondent to its immortal destinies.

Let us for a moment, my friends, glance at facts analogous to the foregoing, now passing under our own eye. Who, at this hour, are the lights of science and literature to the Pagan world? Look to the mission schools and colleges at Serampore, at Calcutta, in Ceylon, at Madras, at Tanjore, at Allahabad, in the Isles of the great Pacific, over the whole earth, and tell me, whence come the lights of science? Who subdued the language of China? Who are now grappling with her literature, and upon the eve of throwing open her doors to the lights of European—of Christian science? Again I say, *Let the voice of history be heard.*

But this religious principle, so vital to literature and common to man every where, can, nevertheless, be found practically efficient for the highest good, only where the Bible throws its light into the soul. Will

any Hallam or Guizot solve for us, the historical problem of the five centuries, from A. D. 1000 to A. D. 1500? Wherefore, were five hundred years necessary to bring about such a change upon the intellect of Europe? Fifty years have done more for the Hottentots and the Sandwich Islanders, than five hundred did for the people of France and Germany. Why so slow, the mental movements? They had the religious principle—they had it in powerful action. They had mighty intellects. They had Christianity, in some sort. Who will solve this problem? Why so slow?

Ah! here is the answer. The Bible was absent—practically absent from the university, the college, the school:—absent from the church and the monastery: absent from the family and the closet. And how, pray, could they have light without the sun? How can darkness be expelled without light? But, lo! the monk of Erfurth, anointed of God for this very work, unchains the Bible. The eyelids of the morning lift up themselves, and a flood of light pours in upon the dark masses. The world's intellect is resuscitated:—learning is sanctified:—literature and science are once more baptized in the blood of Calvary: and all, all take their appropriate position at the feet of Him, who teacheth as never man taught.

Thus, my friends, our problem is solved: our task is accomplished. The ceremonies of to-day:—the essential nature of a dispensation of pure law on the one hand, and of remedial law on the other—the distinctive functions of civil society and government, and of religious society and government:—the highest legal authorities of the world:—and the loud voice of history for eighteen centuries, all proclaim, that teaching belongs to society, not in its civil, but in its religious

aspect—that it is the peculiar province of the Church, and not of the State—that a college is not a public, a civil, a political, but a private, a charitable, a religious institution.

One objection, it may be proper to notice before we draw to a close. We may be asked, where is your authority to confer degrees? Is not this given by the civil power?

I answer—No! That power which it never had, it never could communicate. And, if the preceding discussion is not a total failure, such a power cannot possibly, of *right*, vest in civil rulers. A college charter, as we have shown from Chief Justice Marshall, merely creates an immortal person to hold property, and transact business, necessary to the carrying out of the system of instruction prescribed by the founders. A diploma is simply a certificate of scholarship; and is it the province of the civil magistrate to testify to scholarship? On the contrary, such testimonial, it is the natural and unalienable right of the teacher, or association of teachers, to confer. The history of degrees and their certificates, is lost in the distant mists of time. But, as far back as they can be traced, they were merely testimonials of ability to teach. And, during the union of Church and State, the emperor, or king, sometimes arrogated the power of authorizing them: but more commonly, by an equal usurpation, the Pope did it. But to suppose, that we have found their origin in the twelfth century, is as great an error, as to suppose this the origin of colleges. From the earliest periods of the Christian Church, she required aptness to teach, and scholarship in her public teachers; and the testimonials of these were her diplomas. Were the Church now to lower the standard of education for her ministry, the general standard must sink also. Were she to cease

her requisition of classical literature, in a few years it would disappear from the college *curriculum* everywhere. To the great commission, "Go and teach all nations," the world is now indebted, as it was in the age to which Hallam and Hume refer, for classical literature and all its benefits.

This whole discussion, we close with two inferences, viz:—First, That college government must, necessarily, be the same in substance, as church government. Accordingly, an inspection of all college laws, and an inquiry into their application, demonstrate, intuitively, their identity with the laws of religious society, and, of course, their ecclesiastical origin. Slight modifications are found; no two colleges have precisely the same formal expressions in their code: and yet, no two colleges have any substantial difference. The college code is one, and is the collected wisdom of eighteen centuries of experience, as is the course of studies. The moral substance of the former is not less immutable, than the intellectual substance of the latter. No better system has ever yet been invented for training the intellect, than the ordinary college *curriculum*; and to set aside, or materially alter it, is to display folly, by scoffing at the wisdom of thirty generations; and the tendency is downward toward barbarism. No better system has ever been invented for training the moral faculties of youth, so associated, than the code of college laws; and equally disastrous consequences would follow any material innovation. One error we may delay here to correct, as to the nature of college government. The faculty are vested with parental authority. The civil law gives them no control over students, for the obvious reason, that it has none. But the parent, by sending his son to college, enters into a contract, and transfers his own authority to the Faculty; and by this

delegated parental authority alone, they rule. Of course, a faculty is no more a court of law, than is a family. It is purely and simply, a court of conscience.

Our other inference is, that the Bible must occupy the fore-ground in every prosperous College. None that throws the word of God into the back-ground, can secure the moral confidence of the community, or the blessing of Heaven. Religion there must be, and it must be prominent. Who expects a family, without a Bible and without religion, to rear up virtuous young men—men that fear God and keep his commandments—men that shrink from, and abhor profanity, Sabbath breaking, idleness, and all other vices? Is there any man so unreasonable, as to expect a harvest of virtue, where none of the seeds have been sown—good fruit, where the tree has not been nurtured, or even planted? We have seen most abundantly, that nearly all colleges owe their being to the Christian religion, and the founder has the everlasting right of visitation and control. Unless the star of Bethlehem rule the ascendant, no college can draw around it wise men from the east or the west, the north or the south. All parents, even those who themselves have no peculiar love for religion and the pure morality which it produces, nevertheless, desire better things for their sons: and the chief inquiry always is, “What facilities and appliances have you for the protection of morals? Can you give me reasonable ground of assurance, that if I commit my son, my most precious treasure, to your watchful care and guardianship, half a parent’s vigilance will constantly throw its eyes around him; half a parent’s anxieties, will keep those eyes ever awake?” If satisfied here, all else is easily adjusted. Now, it is to the controlling power of religious truth, that all wise men look for purity of morals. “And let us with caution,”

says our incomparable patriot, "indulge the supposition, that morality can be maintained without religion." Here then, we plant our banner. To the tearful vigilance of that eye, which looked down from the cross and wept over the obduracy of Jerusalem, and which never slumbers nor sleeps, we commend our most sacred charge. On him we depend, after all our vigilance is exhausted, for their protection. Our chief weapon, in our warfare against crime and ignorance, is the sword of the Spirit—the word of God. Light in the understanding, honesty in the conscience, and love in the heart—these are the infallible safeguards of virtue: and these, we rejoice to know, are the gift of heaven, and will come in answer to prayer. By Divine grace, then, it is our unchangeable purpose to move onward, and, in all our conflicts with error and delusion, our watchword shall ever be—*The sword of the Lord, and of Washington!*

APPENDIX.

A BRIEF SKETCH OF THE EARLY HISTORY OF WASHINGTON COLLEGE.

As the dark clouds of revolution seemed to be gathering on the mountain's brow, many sober and reflecting minds, on both sides of the Blue Ridge, began to feel deeply interested in the question of education. The state of alienated affection between them and the mother country, must diminish the influx of educated intellect: and men inquired, "Who shall be our teachers in the higher departments of learning, science and religion?" Various attempts at classical instruction were made by private persons, and with considerable success, in the *Valley*. But no movement resulting in permanency occurred until 1771: when the Presbytery of Hanover, (then embracing all the Presbyterians in Virginia,) took the subject into serious consideration, and after three years' consultation and experimenting, came to decided action, as appears by the following minute:

"Oct. 12, 1774. At a meeting of the Presbytery of Hanover, at Cub Creek, in Charlotte, Presbytery resumed the consideration of a school for the liberal education of youth, and unanimously judge it to be of great and immediate importance. We do therefore agree to establish and patronize a public school, which shall be confined to the county of Augusta in this colony. And we order, that at present, it be managed by Mr. William Graham, a gentleman, who has been well recommended to this body, and under the general inspection of the Rev. Mr. Brown. The Presbytery, however, reserve to themselves the liberty, at a future session, more particularly to appoint the person, by whom it shall be conducted, and the congregation in that county where it shall be fixed. This, they are induced to do, not-

withstanding a former Presbyterian appointment, because, there is at present, no person to undertake the management of it, at the place which was then agreed upon, and it is uncertain whether there ever will.

“In consequence, therefore, of this ordination, we do recommend it to the congregations subject to our jurisdiction, to make such liberal contributions as they find compatible with their circumstances, in order to provide a public library and other apparatus of learning, for the benefit of that Seminary—their contributions to be applied by the order of the Presbytery; and for this purpose we do appoint Messrs. Brown, Cummins, Leach, Rice, Irvin, Wallace, and Smith, to take the subscriptions of the several congregations annexed to their names; viz. Mr. Brown, in the Pastures, Providence, North Mountain, Cook’s Creek; and Mr. Cummins, in Fincastle; Mr. Rice, Botetourt, south of James’ River; Mr. Irvin, at Tinkling Spring, Stone Meeting House, and Brown’s Settlement; Mr. Wallace, in the Forks of James’ River, and Timber Ridge; and Mr. Smith, in any of these places at pleasure.

“Agreeable to the above order, and for the purposes therein mentioned, we, the subscribers, do promise to pay to the persons above mentioned, or to their order, on or before the 25th day of December, Anno Domini 1775, the sums annexed to our respective names. Witness our hands, dated this 13th day of October, 1774.”

Of these old subscriptions, there are eight on file in our archives. Mr. Graham was born in Paxton, near Harrisburgh, Pennsylvania, December 19, 1746; was graduated at Princeton, in 1773; came to Virginia under the strong recommendation of Samuel Stanhope Smith; he entered upon his duties promptly; was licensed by Hanover Presbytery in October, 1775; and in March following, having received the proceeds of the subscriptions, went to Philadelphia and purchased books and apparatus, as directed by Presbytery, and made his official report to Presbytery in May, 1776, when they met at Timber Ridge, in Augusta, now Rockbridge county; as stated in their Minutes thus.

“Mr. Graham informs us, that agreeably to the commission of Presbytery, he has purchased sundry books and apparatus, for the use of the Academy, to the amount of £160 10s. 9½d., which he has paid, and £2 4s. which he has lost in change; which monies, with the portage of the books, the apparatus, and all other reasonable expenses, the Trustees hereafter to be appointed, are desired to account with Mr. Graham for, and pay him the balance.

Mr. Graham informs, that the gentlemen appointed last fall, have collected and paid into his hands about £128, which he will be ready

to account or more accurately with the Trustees of the Augusta Academy, when they are appointed. — The Presbytery finding, that as the Augusta Academy is circumstanced, it is highly necessary now, to fix on the place for its situation, and the persons by whom it shall be managed; and as the congregation of Timber Ridge appears to us to be a convenient place, and they have obtained a minister whom we judge qualified to have the management; and as Capt. Alexander Stewart, and Mr. Samuel Houston, each offering to give forty acres of land for the purpose, convenient to the place for public worship; and the neighbours offering to build a hewed log house, 28 by 24 feet, one story and a half high, besides their subscriptions, and assuring us of the probability, that fire-wood and timber for the buildings will be furnished gratis for at least twenty years, we agree, that the Augusta Academy shall be placed in Timber Ridge, upon these lands, and we choose Mr. W. Graham, Rector, and Mr. John Montgomery, his assistant; and we appoint, the Rev. Messrs. John Brown, James Waddell, Charles Cummins, W. Irvin, and the Rector, *ex officio*, in conjunction with Gen. Andrew Lewis, Mr. Thomas Lewis, Col. William Fleming, Mr. Thomas Stewart, Mr. Samuel Lyle, Mr. John Grattan, Col. William Preston, Col. William Christian, Mr. Sampson Matthews, Col. John Bowyer, Major Samuel McDowal, Mr. William McPheeters, Capt. Alexander Stewart, Capt. William McKee, Mr. John Houston, Capt. Charles Campbell, Capt. George Maffit, Mr. William Ward, and Capt. John Lewis, at the Warm Springs, Trustees.” — “The Presbytery reserve to themselves for ever the right of visitation, as often as they shall judge it necessary, and of choosing the Rector and assistants.”

The institution, thus founded, moved onward, yet with great difficulty, on account of the irregularities incident to the revolutionary state of the country. About 1780, Mr. Graham, finding it necessary to depend upon farming, in part, for a support, purchased a farm near the present town of Lexington, and obtained permission to remove his family to it, with the express understanding and agreement with the Trustees, that he should spend three days in the week at the school. This, however, was found to be impracticable, and soon the students followed him and procured boarding as they could.

In 1781, when the Legislature of Virginia fled from Charlottesville, and subsequently from Staunton, upon the rumour of Col. Tarlton's approach toward Rockfish Gap, the Rector of the Academy—now called Liberty Hall—was very active in raising the militia, and marched with them to Rockfish Gap and Charlottesville, to repel the

invaders. The succeeding year, the Trustees petitioned the Legislature, as the cloud of war appeared to pass away with the legions of Cornwallis, for a charter. As this document has been invisible for sixty-six years, we hope the public eye will behold it with delight. It runs thus:

“ To the Honourable, the Speaker and Gentlemen of the House of Delegates, the Petition of the Trustees of Liberty Hall Academy, most humbly sheweth:

That your petitioners, very sensible of the great utility arising from the regular education of youth, have been for some time associated for that purpose; and finding our efforts attended with good success, are induced, from the experiment made, to believe, that a seminary may here be conducted to very general advantage. And are the rather inclined to be more fully of this opinion, when we consider the extensive fertile country around the place, the fine air, and fine water with which it is blessed, contributing so powerfully to health of body. Having also procured one hundred and twenty acres of land in the neighbourhood of Lexington for the use of the Academy, a valuable library of well chosen books, and a considerable Mathematical and Philosophical Apparatus. Under these advantages, and many more that might be named, we doubt not, should we be so happy as to obtain the approbation of the Honourable House, of being instruments, under the smiles of Heaven, of conveying down to posterity the most valuable blessings, and the surest plèdge of true patriotism we are capable of. We therefore pray the Honourable Assembly to take the matter under consideration, and grant us an act of incorporation, with such powers and privileges as will enable us and our successors more effectually to carry out the laudable design, and give all possible encouragement to a polite and solid education.

We hope, also, that a patriot Assembly will see the reasonableness of, and grant an exemption from militia draughts, to the Professors and masters of the said Seminary, and to all students thereto belonging, under the age of twenty-one years.

And your petitioners, as in duty bound, shall pray.

Signed in behalf of the Trustees,

WILLIAM GRAHAM, C. M.
JAMES LYLE, JR., Clerk.”

The latter petition about exemption, was suggested, no doubt, by the fact, that the school had recently been disconcerted by the draughting of Mr. Wilson, the tutor. The whole petition was promptly

granted, and is the first charter granted by free Virginia. No doubt, this promptness had an eye to the position of the Rev. Rector and his Rockbridge friends on the preceding summer, at Rockfish Gap, and as they hung on the rear of the victorious Tarlton down through Albemarle.

Thus made immortal by a liberal charter, the Academy laboured along with persevering industry and a goodly measure of success, until September 25, 1796, when Mr. Graham resigned the Rectorship, just ten days after General Washington had written to the Governor of the State, informing him in relation to the one hundred shares of James' River stock, saying, "I have, upon the fullest consideration of all circumstances, destined those shares to the use of Liberty Hall Academy, in Rockbridge county." This noble deed changed the name of the institution into that of the illustrious benefactor, and has proved the principal source of its permanent revenue.

Doctor S. L. Campbell held the office of Rector, (chiefly for legal purposes,) from October 17, 1798, until October 16, 1799, when the late talented, and much lamented, Rev. George A. Baxter, D. D. was appointed to the office which he so ably filled, until shortly before he was called to his still more important labours, in Union Theological Seminary.

With the history of later events—the Cincinnati donation, the Robinson Fund—the administrations of Presidents Marshall, Vethake, and Ruffner—the public are familiar. The retirement of Dr. Ruffner, after twelve years of active, laborious, and very acceptable service as President, and sixteen years as Professor, filled the friends of the College with emotions of deep concern, and brought the Board to a full sense of the sacred importance of their trust. After much and solemn deliberation, their choice has fallen upon the Rev. George Junkin, D. D., President of Lafayette College, Pennsylvania, as the most likely, among available individuals, to build up the interests of this time-honoured Institution.