

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1842.

No. IV.

ART. I.—*The works of Nathanael Emmons, D. D. late Pastor of the Church in Franklin, Mass., with a Memoir of his life.* Edited by Jacob Ide, D. D. Boston: Crocker & Brewster. 1842. Six volumes, 8vo.

Archibald Alexander with J. Addison Alexander x

EMMONISM, or Emmonsism, for the names are equally barbarous, denotes a theological system which took its name, if not its origin, in New England, during the latter half of the last century, and which may be regarded as a monstrous growth from the trunk of Calvinism; such, that if let alone, the supplanting fungus would leave at length no grace in the parent trunk. Or, if critics will allow us still further to mingle our metaphors, it is a frightful child of a comely parent, with just enough of the family likeness to make one avert the face in dread. Its great leading features are so repugnant to universal feeling, reason, and scripture, that, after having agitated for one generation the clergy of Connecticut, and vexed the souls of simple Christians, after having driven some to distraction and others to infidelity, it was in a fair way of dying a natural death, after bequeathing its least horrible but most seductive qualities to New Haven, when an attempt at revivification is made, in the shape of

ART. II.—*The Works of Thomas Chalmers, D. D., and L.L.D., Professor of Theology in the University of Edinburgh, and Corresponding Member of the Royal Institute of France.* Glasgow: William Collins. London: Hamilton, Adams & Co. 1835—1842. Twenty-two volumes, 12mo. *James W. Alexander*

IT is not to return upon our former track, that we resume the consideration of this great writer's labours; nor shall we treat of any of the subjects which occupied us in reviewing his theological publications. The fact is, the American reprint comprised only seven of the twenty-two volumes lying before us; nor is it likely that the American public will demand more, until the completion of the Commentary on the Romans. This however furnishes, of itself, a cogent reason why we should give our readers some account of our author's opinions, in regard to several important subjects, which, though treated in their relation to Great Britain, are in several of their aspects greatly interesting to America.

The three points on which an American will at once seize, in looking over these volumes, are Education, the Church Establishment, and Pauperism.

The first of the topics which awakens our lively interest in these volumes, is that of Popular Education. To this, Dr. Chalmers applies the argument of which he has for many years been the great propounder, in regard to church affairs. Briefly stated, it is this: 'It is not with the desire of knowledge, as it is with the desire of food. Generally speaking, the more ignorant a man is, the more satisfied he is to remain so. But the more hungry a man is, the less satisfied he is to remain so.' Turned in a hundred different ways, this distinction is the fulcrum of his whole system. The picture which he draws of education in Presbyterian Scotland is pleasing, and serves to explain the long acknowledged, but, to some, unaccountable intellectual superiority of that race.

"The people are not taught gratuitously; for by a small quarterly payment, they are made to share in the expense of the education of their families; but the remaining share is, by the law, devolved upon others. It consists of a salary which enables the schoolmaster to teach upon moderate terms, and of a school and school-house, with a garden, by which education is visibly obtruded upon the notice of every little vicinity. To this extent, the offer of education may be said to have been made; and it is an offer that has been met by the nearly unexcepted consent and co-operation of the Scottish peasantry."—"We now

see that the parochial establishment of schools not only provided, in part, the learning; but, what was of greater importance still, created the appetite for it in the minds of the people. Nor is this an appetite that would go suddenly into extinction, even were the establishment swept away. The people now do what they would not have done a few generations ago. Independently of the establishment, and without any aid from its provisions, but on the strength of their own payments alone, they defray the whole expenses of their children's scholarship. But it is in virtue of a taste which the establishment has created. Its endowments have thus elevated our plebeian classes, and given them this higher mental ambition."

We feel irresistibly impelled to ask attention to certain parts of this seventeenth volume, from that numerous class of persons in America, who cry out loudly against university and college endowments, invested funds for literary purposes, great libraries, ample edifices, and salaried instructors, and who act the part of demagogues by insinuating to the people, ever and anon, that these are monopolies of the aristocratical, that the poor are nowise benefited, and that learning, like trade, had better be left to take care of itself. On this subject, the author's favorite principle is made to bear. When people are at zero, he tells us, in the scale of knowledge, it is not by any native buoyancy of theirs, but by the application of a force from without, that they are elevated one degree in the scale; and when raised thus far, it is still not by any inherent buoyancy, but by an external power, that they are brought and upheld higher in the scale. It is to endowed colleges, that Dr. Chalmers refers us for this external power.

"A people, though universally accomplished by schools in elementary learning, will not lift up themselves by any inherent buoyancy of their own, to the level of that learning which should be taught in colleges. *Over the whole country there is not enough of spontaneous demand for the higher mathematics, to guarantee a sufficient maintenance for even so much as one teacher.* There is an effective demand, we are aware, for as much of the science as is popular and practical, and of which the uses are quite palpable and immediate. A man without the aid of endowments will gain a livelihood, by teaching any thing that is of obvious application either to an art or a calling which is gainful. But, for all that is arduous and sublime in mathematics, for the methods of that higher calculus, the uses of which lie far remote, or are wholly invisible to the general understanding, for those lofty devices and inventions of analysis, by which we may hope to accomplish solutions hitherto impracticable, or to unravel mysteries in nature, which have yet eluded the keenest search of philosophy,—for all these, we contend, there is no such public request as might foster the growth and the production of them to the extent that is at all desirable. The science which germinates these in sufficient abundance, can flourish only under the shade of endowments. Without this artificial encouragement, the philosophy of our land would wax feeble, and dwindle at length into evanescence; and in all the prouder and nobler walks of discovery, we must content ourselves to be outrun in glory by other nations."

“There are,” adds he shortly after, “five college classes of natural philosophy in Scotland; and by a statute of apprenticeship in our church, every aspirant to the ministry must pass through one or other of these, ere he can be admitted to his theological studies. We feel quite confident in affirming, that but for this statute, with salaries to professorships, *there would not be enough of attendance from the whole land for securing a decent livelihood even to one professor of the science.* And this scarcity of pupils would be aggravated, just in proportion to the pure, lofty, and philosophic character of the course. If, for example, it were the transcendental aim of the professor, to accomplish his students for the perusal of La Place’s *Mécanique Celeste*, we doubt if all Scotland together would furnish him with so many as twelve, that would listen to his demonstrations. At this rate, it is obvious, that no class could be formed, just because the proceeds of it could afford no adequate maintenance to a teacher. This arduous and recondite philosophy behoved to disappear, simply by ceasing to be transmitted from one generation to another. The record of it in unknown hieroglyphics, might still be found in our libraries; but it would have no place in the living intellect of our nation.”

“When a distinguished professor of this country hazarded the assertion, that there were not twelve British mathematicians who could read La Place’s great work with any tolerable facility, we fear, that, alive as the whole nation is to its honour in the field of war, or political rivalry, there are but few indeed of the nation who felt the affront of being left so immeasurably behind in the highest of all intellectual rivalry, both by France and Prussia.—Yet it is refreshing to observe in what quarter of the island it was, where the quickest sensibility was felt for the honour of British mathematics. It was in the academic bowers,—the lettered retreats of Cambridge. *There*, the somewhat precipitate charge of our Northern Collegian met with a resentment in which so few can sympathize; and there also, we rejoice to believe, that it met its best refutation. And if, in that wealthy seat of learning, even twenty individuals could be found to master the difficulties of the French analysis, this in the midst of surrounding degradation and poverty, of itself speaks volumes for endowments.”

Our author writes like one at home in his subject, and he ventures the opinion, that but for a statute of apprenticeship, as some are fond of naming it, Dr. Thomas Brown could not have upheld a class of fifty students, even in the metropolis of Scotland. He informs us that Lacroix of Paris taught a class of the higher mathematics, where he was often attended by not more than eight students. Such a class could not be sustained by fees alone. To this we may add, that, a few years ago, de Sacy was lecturing to not more than half a dozen, and Bopp to a number smaller still. It is mortifying to observe the same distaste for the severer studies in our own country, and the consequent disposition to exchange the useful but herculean tasks of real scholarship, for the delusive and acceptable methods of our superficial age; to find even the lectures of some colleges and other schools yielding somewhat every year of their masculine, disciplinary character, and courting the temporary applauses of the crowd. This evil is almost necessarily incident to a system which proposes to draw all the emolument of the teach-

er from the fees of his class. It has been hurried on with double rapidity, by the extraordinary impulse given within a year or two to public lectures, *de omni scibili*, in which, before Lyceums, Institutes, and companies of gentlemen and ladies, the evolution of scientific truth has been made the occasion for the clapping of hands, and all the applausive tokens of the play-house. We speak, we are sure, the sentiment of every professional man of science or letters, when we deprecate this histrionic degradation of public instruction, which is daily subjecting the character of sound teachers to a stigma due only to itinerants and charlatans.

At pulcrum est digito monstrari, et dici: Hic est.

Ten' cirratorum centum dictata fuisse,

Pro nihilo pendas?

It is no doubt pleasing, both to the teacher and the taught; but whether it is advantageous to sound learning and solid instruction, to college-methods or public taste, is quite another question. Should the rage for popularizing all knowledge extend much further, we shall see one branch of rigid study after another given away, and their places supplied by others more suited to the demands of labour-hating lads and a utilitarian public.

The testimony of Dr. Chalmers is strong and valuable, touching the services derived to national literature from the labours of truly learned professors in colleges. More than half the distinguished authorship of Scotland is professional; and 'till the present generation,' says he, 'we scarcely remember, with the exception of Hume in philosophy and Thomson in poetry, any of our eminent writers who did not achieve, or at least germinate, all their greatest works while labouring in their vocation of public instructors in one or other of our universities.' And he appeals to the works of Colin Maclaurin, Robert Simson, Matthew Stewart of Glasgow, Dr. Black, Professor Robison, the Monros, the Gregories, Cullen, Playfair, Leslie, Hamilton of Aberdeen, Hucheson, Hill the theologian, Adam Smith, Reid, Miller, Blair, Campbell, John Hunter, Beattie, Dngald Stewart, Tytler, Ferguson, and Brown. With one or two exceptions, the great works of these men were all originally part of their instructions to their classes. That the case is very different, where church-benefices are more lucrative than university-places, is an undoubted fact, stated, in a well-known passage, by Adam Smith. 'It is observed,' says he, 'by M. de Voltaire, that Father Porrée, a Jesuit, of no great eminence in the republic of letters, was the only professor

they had ever had in France whose works were worth reading. In a country which has produced so many eminent men of letters, it must appear somewhat singular that scarcely one of them should have been a professor in a university. The famous Gassendi was, in the beginning of his life, a professor in the university of Aix. Upon the first dawning of his genius, it was represented to him, that by going into the church he could easily find a much more quiet and comfortable subsistence, as well as a better situation for pursuing his studies; and he immediately followed the advice. The observation of M. de Voltaire may be applied, I believe, not only to France, but to all other Roman Catholic countries. We very rarely find in any of them an eminent man of letters, who is a professor in a university, except, perhaps, in the professions of law and physic; from which the church is not so likely to draw them. After the church of Rome, that of England is by far the richest and best endowed church in Christendom. In England, accordingly, the church is continually draining the universities of all their best and ablest members; and an old college-tutor, who is known and distinguished in Europe, as an eminent man of letters, is as rarely to be found there, as in any Roman Catholic country. In Geneva, on the contrary, in the Protestant cantons of Switzerland, in the Protestant countries of Germany, in Holland, in Scotland, in Sweden, and Denmark, the most eminent men of letters whom those countries have produced, have, not all indeed, but the far greater part of them, been professors in universities.'

Dr. Chalmers goes so far as to defend the lordlier endowments of Oxford and Cambridge, maintaining that their fellowships and bursaries or scholarships have not been thrown away, inasmuch as they have produced 'those men of might and of high achievement—the Newtons, and the Miltons, and the Drydens, and the Barrows, and the Addisons, and the Butlers, and the Clarkes, and the Stillingfleets, and the Usshers, and the Foxes, and the Pitts, and Johnsons, who within their attic retreats, received their first awakening, which afterwards expanded into the aspirations and the triumphs of loftiest genius. This'—he adds with a glow which many of our readers will appreciate—'this is the heraldry of colleges. Their family honour is built on the prowess of sons, not on the greatness of ancestors.'*

* The following catalogue of alumni of Oxford and Cambridge, whose names

American statesmen, clergymen and scholars, would do well to ponder the remarks of this liberal man, upon the failure of so many dissenting academies and colleges, so called, in England. Some have dwindled, some have passed

are most familiar, as connected with the learning or the politics of England, we borrow from Dr. Chalmers:—

OXFORD. 1. Merton College.—Bishop Jewell, Bishop Hooper, Shute Barington Bishop of Durham, Duns Scotus, Wickliffe, Anthony Wood, Steele.

2. University College.—Thomas Kay or Caius, Lord Herbert, Hurd, Radcliffe, Sir William Jones.

3. Baliol College.—Bishop Douglas, Keil, Bradley.

4. Exeter College.—Prideaux, Conybeare, Secker, Lord Shaftesbury, Maundrell, Kennicot.

5. Oriel College.—Bishop Butler, Sir Walter Raleigh, Dr. Joseph Warton.

6. Queen's College.—Henry V., Bernard Gilpin, William Gilpin (on the Picturesque), Wingate, Wycherley, Mill (Prolegomena), Halley, Addison, Tickell, Seed, Shaw (Travels, &c.), Collins (Poet), Burn (Justice).

7. New College.—Lowth, Young, Pitt (Poet).

8. Lincoln College.—Archbishop Potter, Tindal (Deist), Hervey, Wesley.

9. All Souls' College.—Sir Christopher Wren, Jeremy Taylor, Blackstone.

10. Magdalene College.—Bishop Horne, Wolsey, Hampden, Hammond, Sacheverell, Yalden, Gibton, Chandler.

11. Brazen Nose College.—Fox (Martyrs), Burton (Melancholy), Petty (Political Arithmetic).

12. Corpus Christi College.—Pococke (Traveller), Twyne, Hooker, Dr. Nathaniel Foster, Day, Sir Ashton Lever.

13. Christ Church.—John Owen, Atterbury, Horsley, Lord Littleton, Lord Mansfield, Ben Jonson, Otway, Gilbert West, Cambden, Gunter, William Penn, Desaguliers, Lord Bolingbroke.

14. Trinity College.—Chillingworth, Denham (Poet), Blount (Traveller), Harrington (Oceana), Derham, Whitby, Lord Chatham, Thomas Warton.

15. St. John's College.—Archbishop Laud, Briggs, Sir John Marsham (Chronologist), Josiah Tucker.

19. Jesus' College.—Ussher.

17. Wadham College.—Walsh (Poet), Admiral Blake, Creech (Lucretius), Dr. Mayow, Harris (Hermes).

18. Pembroke College.—Bishop Bonner, Pym, Whitefield, Shenstone, Dr. Johnson.

19. Worcester College.—Sir Kenelm Digly.

20. Hertford College.—Richard Newton, Selden, Dr. Donne, Charles Fox.

21. St. Alban's Hall.—Massinger.

22. Edmund Hall.—Sir Richard Blackmore.

23. St. Mary's Hall.—Sir Thomas More, Harriot.

24. New Inn Hall.—Scott (Christian Life).

25. St. Mary Magdalene Hall.—Sir Henry Vane, Lord Clarendon, Sir Matthew Hale, Theophilus Gale.

CAMBRIDGE. 1. Peters' House, or College.—Law Bishop of Carlisle, Dr. Sherlock Senior, Garth the Poet, Gray the Poet.

2. Clarehall.—Archbishop Tillotson, Cudworth, Langhorne, Dodd.

3. Pembroke Hall.—Dr. Calamy, Spenser, Mason, Pitt.

4. Granville and Caius' College.—Jeremy Taylor, Titus Oates, Dr. Harvey (Circulation of the Blood), Dr. Clarke, Lord Thurlow.

5. Trinity Hall.—Dr. Horsley.

6. Corpus Christi, or Benet College.—Dr. Briggs, Fletcher the Dramatic Poet, Dr. Sykes.

from one sect to another, and some have passed away entirely. We lament the cause; it was the want of suitable endowment; but our countrymen seem disposed to renew the fatal experiment, in a multitude of instances, and, young as we are, we can already show the ruins of some colleges, and the tottering decrepitude of others.

Living as we do in a country where the demand for gospel labour is such as all our colleges together cannot supply, it strikes us strangely to learn from such an authority as Dr. Chalmers, that there is an excess of licentiates or probationers in the established church. In the Scottish Establishment, there are, at a fair estimate, not quite thirty nominations to churches yearly, to supply which demand, two hundred theological students would be amply sufficient. But in 1824, there were upwards of seven hundred. Dr. Chalmers considers the profession as greatly overstocked. We cannot but express our conviction, that in this state of the case, our Scottish brethren have not begun a day too soon to send off their sons among the Gentiles. The method of remedying this evil, which he proposes, is to raise higher the demands of intellectual discipline and preparation. Whether right or wrong in this application of his principles, he certainly speaks to our convictions and echoes our experience when he declares the radical error of such a system to be the too early admittance of youth to the Universities. We know less of Scotland, but we can answer knowingly of

7. King's College.—Pearson, Oughtred, Gouge, Walsingham, Waller, Collins the freethinker, Sir Robert Walpole, Horace Walpole.

8. Queen's College.—Bishop Patrick, Erasmus, Wallis, Thomas Fuller.

9. Catharine Hall.—Lightfoot, Sherlock Junior, Hoadly, Reay.

10. Jesus' College.—Archbishop Cranmer, Elliot the Missionary, Flamstead, Fenton, Jortin, Hartley, Sterne, Gilbert Wakefield, Henry Venn.

11. Christ's College.—Latimer, Bishop Porteus, Milton, Mcde, Quarles, Howe, Sanderson, Paley.

12. St. John's College.—Gauden, Stillingfleet, Roger Ascham, Cecil, Lord Burleigh, Ben Johnson, Otway, Cave, Prior, Bentley, Ambrose Phillips, John and Thomas Balguy, Ogden, Soame Jenyns, Theophilus Lindsey, Horne Tooke, Charchill.

13. Magdalene College.—Waterland, Lord Stafford, Waring.

14. Trinity College.—Wilkins, Barrow, Smith (Optics), Tunstall, Newton (Prophecies), Bishop Watson, Bacon, Newton, Middleton, Dryden, Lord Essex, Donne, Coke, Cowley, Pell, Cotes, Conyers Middleton, Atwood, Maskelyne, Porson.

15. Emanucl College.—Farmer (Shakspeare), Bishop Hall, Chandler, Hurd, Horrox, Matthew Poole, Charnocke, Sir William Temple, Law (Scrivous Call), Martyn (Botany).

16. Sidney Sussex.—Ward (Mathematics), Cromwell, Wollaston.

It would be very easy to draw up a list far more complete and striking; but we choose to avail ourselves of Dr. Chalmers's own selections.

America, that this single evil has been the mother of thousands. We are surprised indeed to observe that students are admitted to the Scotch universities on a stock of classical preparation much smaller than what is demanded by those of our colleges which merit the name : we know of no institution, for instance, which would receive a youth, ' without the first elements of Greek.' But we have learnt from the professors of more than one seminary, how much of the brief four years' course, is often absorbed in the attempt, generally futile, to inculcate into college lads, that which they should have gained under the ferula of a master. The reference of our author to the Gymnasia of Germany, seminaries namely between the grammar-school and the college, is one which has suggested itself to many practical teachers in this country ; but such is the burning haste of youth to be men, and of tiros to be in professions, that parents are hoodwinked, schoolmasters are almost constrained to infund the tiny accomplishment which shall be a viaticum to the Freshman seats, and professors find themselves bringing up the rear, with such a retinue of scholars as they would dismiss instanter, if it were practicable to carry on the work of education without them. Our older and more established colleges have for some years been increasing the pains requisite for initiation, but, to judge by the classical attainments of graduates from a number of institutions, whom we have had occasion to hear examined, we should think the emendatory process only half complete.

To escape these inconveniences, some have prescribed a certain age, under which no one should be matriculated ; a wise method, if the attainments were always in the ratio of the years, but one which would have excluded a Bacon, an Ussher, a Milton, an Owen, a Grotius and a Barratier ; and one which Dr. Chalmers very justly rejects. He suggests, as a better plan, that no youth should be entered of a college, without competency to execute certain prescribed versions, to translate the easier Latin authors *ad aperturam libri*, or above all without acquaintance with the syntax and grammar of the language, together with as much Greek as might be expected from two years' study. In England, young men receive a far higher preparation for the university than we give in America ; our practice being in this respect too much like that of the Scotch. Dr. Chalmers freely admits the advantages derived in the 'class room of the English tutor, with its perpetual task-work and over-

hanging vigilance ;' while he claims benefits for the Scottish system of instruction by lectures, in which last particular again our best colleges resemble those of Scotland.

"We maintain, that by our peculiar methods, students can be effectually prepared for such a trial," that, namely, of public examinations, "and that from the lecture-rooms of our Scottish professors, there might issue youths as thoroughly accomplished in the principles of the ethical and intellectual philosophy, in political economy, and the various branches of a theological education, as if they had been made to undergo that more elaborate distillation which is imaged to take place in the tutor's class-rooms of Oxford and Cambridge. There is doubtless a certain style of close and almost compulsory tuition by which every doctrine of a text-book might be infused into the scholar's mind, and which can be better accomplished by a Fellow in his chamber, with a few pupils, than by a Professor, in his lecture-room with many. But, then, however needed by boys, it is not needed by young men who have outgrown their boyhood. For example, a class might thus be most minutely and thoroughly lessoned in every chapter and paragraph of Paley's Moral Philosophy : and yet we are confident that, by the ordinary collegiate methods of Scotland, and more especially if an hour of examination were superadded to the hour of lecturing"—a method familiar to American professors—"a tenfold number of youths could not only be instructed, but soundly instructed, and that within half-a-year, not in the doctrine of this book only, but in all the doctrines of any worth or prominence which are to be found in the most distinguished works on ethical science. In that space of time, the professor could take a wide compass over the whole literature of his subject ; and he could deliver with fulness and effect all the truths of permanent importance which have been expounded by our best writers, from Bacon and Butler, to Brown and Dugald Stewart of our own day ; and he could make full exposure of the scepticism and the infidel sophistries by which the orthodox system of morals has been assailed ; and he could sit in judgment on all his predecessors ; and without either trampling on that which is precious, or going wildly astray after the novelties of wayward speculation, he could nevertheless cast the science in the mould of his own understanding, and transmute it into his own language, and throw all the freshness of an original interest over the lessons of his course ; and with these lessons he could thoroughly imbue the great majority of his pupils, traversing along with them the whole length and breadth of his department, and giving them, we are sure, a far greater amount of instruction than they ever could acquire by conning over the dicta of any single author, in the pages of an established text-book. For giving effect to this high professional mode of teaching, all that we require is a sufficient age for our pupil. This is the great reformation wanted ; and not that we should exchange the methods of Smith, and Stewart, and Playfair, and Jardine and Black, for the mere pedagogy of the English colleges."

The second subject which has attracted our particular attention in these works, is that of Church Establishments. We do not propose to investigate the general question. Even the potent arguments of Dr. Chalmers do not move us. But in so far as our own country is summoned as a witness, and set forth as an example, we certainly have a word or two to say. We have never happened to meet with an American Presbyterian who was in favour of an established church ; we expect not the sight of such a one. But while this is

true, and while we further believe that the occasional outcry about church and state is, in regard to our country, a most senseless and a most hypocritical clamour, and that the very antagonism of the several sects will alone serve for ages to come to preclude such a connexion, it is no less true, that in regard to the existing establishments of the old world, there is more to be said, than is apparent at first view, to every declaimer on the subject. Dr. Chalmers, it is well known, is the champion at once of Church Establishments, and of the Headship of Christ, the defender of endowments and the opposer of patronage. It is for him, and no man is better able, to clear the paradox of these positions.

There are those who talk of destroying the English Establishment as coolly as if it were the taking down of a scaffold, or the bouleversement of a paper constitution by a primary convention. Let such hear a powerful but perverse master of English idiom and of native logic,—let them hear William Cobbett, as quoted by Dr. Chalmers; and first as to the probable permanency of the Establishment: “Go upon a hill, if you can find one, in Suffolk or Norfolk; and you can find plenty in Hampshire and Devonshire and Wiltshire; look to the church steeples, one in about every four square miles at the most on an average—imagine a man, of small learning at the least, to be living in a genteel and commodious house, by the side of every one of these steeples, almost always with a wife and family; always with servants, natives of the parish, gardener, groom at the least, and all other servants. A large farm-yard, barns, stables, threshers, a carter or two, more or less of glebe and of farming. Imagine this gentleman having an interest, an immediate and pressing interest in the productiveness of every field in his parish—being probably the largest corn-seller in the parish, and the largest rate-payer—more deeply interested than any other man can possibly be in the happiness, harmony, morals, industry and sobriety of the people in his parish. Imagine his innumerable occasions for doing acts of kindness; his immense power in preventing the strong from oppressing the weak; his salutary influence coming between the hard farmer, if there be one in his parish, and the simple-minded labourer. Imagine all this to exist close alongside of every one of these steeples, and you will at once say to yourself, hurricanes and earthquakes must destroy this island before that church can be overthrown. And when you add to all this, that this gentleman,

besides the example of good manners, of mildness, and of justice, that his life and conversation are constantly keeping before the eye of his parishioners—when you add to all this, that one day in every week he has them assembled together, to sit in silence ; to receive his advice, his admonitions, his interpretation of the will of God as applicable to their conduct and affairs ; and that, too, in an edifice rendered sacred in their eyes, from their knowing that their forefathers assembled there in ages passed, and from its being surrounded by the graves of their kindred—when this is added, and when it is recollected that the children pass through his hands at their baptism, that it is he alone who celebrates the marriages, and performs the last sad service over the graves of the dead—when you think of all this, it is too much to believe that such a church can fall.”

“Yet fall it will”—adds Cobbett. And as the obverse of the medal, he gives us his opinion of the actual working of the establishment.

“This is an Established Christian Church ; and this, the parsons will tell the people that they actually have ; and you will tell the people who have no house and land, that in calling for the abolition of tithes, they are in fact calling upon the rich to take from them, the poor, the only property that they have in the country. Alas ! you will tell them this in vain. They know that the church is not this thing now to them ; they know that you do not visit their houses and comfort them when they are sick, except in instances so rare, that they hardly ever hear of them ; they know that you do not teach their children, and that, though the churchwardens annually certify the bishop that the children *communicate*, hardly a workman in the kingdom ever saw or heard of such a thing being done ; they know that you are frequently on the bench, perched up as justices of the peace ; they know that you frequently sentence them to punishment without trial by jury, and sentence to transportation for what is called poaching. This is the capacity in which they now know you ; and to induce them to stir hand, foot, or tongue, in defence of this establishment, is no more possible than it is to induce a Jew to give a farthing of his interest.”

We say Dr. Chalmers quotes these and other like passages from Cobbett, and he quotes them in order to show that this able but prejudiced writer saw clearly how to distinguish between the machine and the working of it. But is

not the same distinction equally available, nay a thousand times more available, on behalf of the voluntary system, or, if you please, absence of system, in our own country? And may not an American Christian take a vantage ground to ask, If you, our elder brethren, after centuries of settled institutions plead the ill-working of these institutions, how much the more shall we, in a new country, with a domain scarcely yet reclaimed from its aboriginal condition, plead the impossibility of showing any adequate results from our system? It is common for the advocates of Establishments to cite the extensive wastes in the territory of the United States; and Dr. Chalmers shows the melancholy effect of leaving religious instruction to be originated by the native and spontaneous demand of the people, as most strikingly exemplified in the southern and western sections of the United States of America, by citing the late Rev. Samuel J. Mills, who declares the whole country from lake Erie to the Gulph of Mexico, to be as the valley of the shadow of death, having a 'little more than one hundred Presbyterian or Congregational ministers in it.' Now not to say, that a country may have neither a Presbyterian nor a Congregational minister in it, and yet not be as the valley of the shadow of death, and not to say, further, that bad as the fact is, it is not, even after the great increase of population, bad enough to justify these expressions,—we respectfully ask of such as would found an argument on the want of gospel instructions in the west—How would they go about to supply it? By an establishment? The very proposition is ludicrous, for its insufficiency and its impracticability. Were it possible, which may God forbid, that our Government should chequer the whole valley of the Mississippi with parishes, where shall the houses, the stipends, and the men be found. We too could 'call spirits from the vasty deep.' We could perhaps find a thousand fox-hunting, horse-racing, godless clergymen, who would scramble for a benefice as men now do for a place; but surely these are not the means by which our British brethren would have us to evangelize our Continent. Be it further observed, that even without an establishment, it is undoubtedly true of the whole population of these United States, that as large a proportion attends divine service as of the whole population of Great Britain; that of our people no portion is more remote from divine culture, than that which we derive from the land of church endowments; and that in the land of

church endowments itself, the Establishment has utterly failed to do what it professes; the like want among us, being charged as the grand delinquency of the voluntary system. For how does the Establishment succeed in evangelizing the poor of Britain? To answer this question, we shall not go to England, where the lowest classes (an extensive appellation) are lower in Christian knowledge and immeasurably lower in comfort than the slaves of America;* we shall not go to St. Giles, or the factories, or to the collieries, where males and females work together in a state of nudity, and female children, in chains, drag loaded carts for hours through avenues fully equal in darkness and filth to common sewers;† we shall not go to that part of the island in which thirty millions of dollars are expended annually on the support of paupers, who, for such support are made slaves, and all of whom have equal rights in the great church establishment. But we shall go to Scotland, a country which we love, and to Edinburgh the most picturesque of cities, and the very seat of Presbytery; and we shall take as our witness no voluntary nor seceder, but the greatest of Scots churchmen, even Chalmers himself. What, then, is the amount of Christian instruction actually afforded by the established church of Scotland to the poor in Edinburgh?

To understand the answer, let it be noted, that Edinburgh proper, within the royalty, had, at the date of Dr. Chalmers's work on church extension, a population of 55,232. For these there is a provision of eighteen ministers, who officiate in thirteen churches. Now, we are astounded at the news, that in the old town of Edinburgh, chiefly occupied by the common people, and consisting of 28,196 inhabitants, *only 727 attend the parish churches of the city.* This is brought about "in virtue of the seat-letting being in the hands of the magistrates."

"So that, practically, the matter proceeds thus: the seats are as good as put up to auction; for it is altogether tantamount to this, that they are held forth at a price calculated and determined by the known acceptance and popularity of the minister."—"The families, and more especially of the Old Town, have

* If any one doubt the statement, let him read what we have published, in our number for July, 1841, article iv. pp. 427, 441.

† Anticipating the denial of these facts, by interested persons, we are almost tempted to subjoin the evidence, as given to the Commissioners, disgusting as are its details; but we forbear. Sufficient to say, the allusion in the text gives but a feeble impression of the fact. That the case is somewhat brightened, is due to the philanthropic zeal of Lord Ashley. For particulars, see the Quarterly Review for June, 1842, p. 158, et seq.

been ousted from their own proper churches; and the clergymen of these parishes, saddled with general congregations, have been dismissed from their own parish families. The working-classes have been shouldered out of the Sabbath-places which belonged to them by richer competitors from all distances, and from all points of the compass. *I always understood it as a great argument for our establishment, that in providing for the support of the minister, it provided a cheap, if not a gratuitous Christian ministrations*; so as to make the services of the minister and the accommodation in his church a sort of common good to the folk of his parish. But the Magistrates and Council of Edinburgh have taken another way of it, and still, however, make they a common good of it. After having wrested from the parishioners of the Old Town their proper and original intention, the sittings of their own churches, and exposed what they thus wrested to general sale—the proceeds of the unhallowed merchandise still go to a common good, it would appear, and that is to the common good of the city corporation. This sounds patriotically; but, in plain English, they have turned, and in what numbers, I shall presently tell—they have turned the working-classes adrift into the outfields of heathenism; and with the price of these Sabbath-places from which they have ejected them do they enrich their own treasury. They have in effect planted a toll-gate, a most expensive toll-gate, at the entry of each of the city churches, by which to keep the poor of its parish out, and to let the rich, not of the parish, in.”—“They, (the Magistrates and Town Council) have as good as driven the lower classes from the occupancy they once had in the city churches, and hold out to them instead some stately architecture to gaze at. The families in thousands have been plundered of the bread of life, and instead of bread their plunderers have given them a stone.”

One of these very council-men made it his charge against the establishment in Edinburgh, that it was of no further use than *to furnish sermons to ladies and gentlemen*. Under the auspices of another, the following poem appeared in Tait's Magazine: for both statements, Dr. Chalmers is our authority.

THE POOR CHRISTIAN AND THE CHURCH.

“He has incurred a long arrear
And must despair to pay.”—COWPER.
“To the poor the gospel is (not) preached.”

“How glorious Zion's courts appear,”
The pious poor man cries:
“Stand back, you knave, you're in arrears,”
The manager replies.

POOR CHRISTIAN.
“The genius of the Christian code
Is charity, humility;”

MANAGER, (*in a rage.*)
“I've let your pew to ladies, Sir,
Of great respectability.”

POOR CHRISTIAN.
“And am I thus debarred the house
Where erst my father prayed?”

Excluded from the hallowed fane,
Where my loved mother's laid?"

MANAGER.

"Their seat-rent, Sir, was never due;
The matter to enhance,
As duly as the term came round,
They paid it in advance."

POOR CHRISTIAN.

"The temple of the living God
Should have an open door,
And Christ's ambassadors should preach
The gospel to the poor."

MANAGER.

"We cannot, Sir, accommodate
The poor in their devotions;
Besides we cordially detest
Such antiquated notions.

"We build our fanes, and deck our pews
For men of wealth and station;
(Yet for a time the thing has proved
A losing speculation.)

"Then table down your cash anon
Ere you come here to pray;
Else you may wander where you will,
And worship where you may."

POOR CHRISTIAN.

"Then I shall worship in that fane
By God to mankind given;
Whose lamps are the meridian sun,
And all the stars of Heaven;
Whose walls are the cerulean sky,
Whose floor the earth so fair,
Whose dome is vast immensity;—
All nature worships there."

True it is that the magistrates, not the clergy, of Edinburgh, are chargeable with these abuses. But true as this is, it is no less true, that while great destitutions in American wildernesses are attributed to the want of an establishment, greater destitutions in Scotland, yea, in the 'modern Athens,' are open to day in enormous extent; at the very focal point of the very best establishment extant, and that by the showing of the greatest living defender of establishments; and further that if the 27,469 who are thus extruded from their rightful gospel means, enjoy any such means, they enjoy them in independency of the establishments, as entire of that of Wisconsin, Florida, or Oregon. It is not the establishment which aids them. Thus much we felt constrained

to say on this topic, not as discussing the expediency of church endowments in general, but as vindicating the name of American Christianity, which has been unjustly dealt with by almost every European defender of establishments; all concurring in pointing to our unevangelized thousands, as demonstrating the impotency of a church separate from the state, and all agreeing to forget the amazing and almost immeasurable expansion of a rapidly increasing and widely emigrant population. Least of all, it strikes us, does such an argument comport with the published views of Dr. Chalmers, a zealous Malthusian: and we are bound, in leaving the subject, to say that he has of all writers laid least stress upon it.

If, instead of considering the case of Scotland, where after all, the gospel is more adequately preached than in any country in the world, we had chosen to dwell upon the condition of the English poor, we might have astonished our readers in no ordinary degree. How far the Anglican establishment has vindicated its arrogant claim of preaching the gospel to the poor, may be judged from the facts, that in England and Wales there is a population of three millions destitute of pastoral superintendence; and that, taking the country at large, the actual church-room varies from one in eight to one in thirty.*

The third topic of great interest, which is discussed in these volumes, is the Support of the Poor. Two methods have divided the favour of philanthropic legislation. The first is the system of compulsory poor-rates; the second is the system of voluntary relief. The former prevails in England and Wales, the latter, till lately, has been the general method in Scotland; and it is this which Dr. Chalmers supports. In this cause his zeal is great, and he has laboured in it indefatigably for more than twenty years, in sermons, lectures, speeches in church-courts, reviews, pamphlets, and separate volumes, as may be seen in his 'Political Economy,' his 'Christian and Economic Polity,' his 'Church Extension,' and his 'Parochial Economy,' comprised in eight of these volumes.

Of the English system, by which two millions of paupers are aided, in whole or in part, a full account has already been given, by an abler hand, in former pages of our

* Our authority is the Archbishop of Canterbury. See London Record, July 30, 1840.

work.* We shall therefore assume, on the part of the reader, a general acquaintance with the history and actual state of English Pauperism; premising, that no patriotic American will wisely refuse his attention to the subject, as a transatlantic one, since the inevitable tendency in our elder states, and especially our older towns, is to a condition of things which nothing can prevent or relieve so well as the lights derived from the experience of the Old World.

It is maintained by Dr. Chalmers, that the English method of relief fails of its object, tends to magnify the evil, and generates new abuses, greater than those which it would relieve. These evils are now almost irremediable, so that, as he says in his Memoir read before the Royal Institute of France, ‘Foreigners are more likely to profit from the history of this great and memorable delusion than the country itself which has been the victim of it, and which at this moment makes striking display of the tenacity of inveterate and long-established error, in extending the same hurtful policy to Ireland—thereby to aggravate the distempers of that unhappy land.’ And he reasons thus. Providence has constituted man with reference to an alleviation if not prevention of extreme want. There is the urgent principle of self-preservation—there is the principle of filial and parental piety—there is the principle of mutual compassion, operating between rich and poor, and yet more strongly between poor and poor. But each of these is injured and enfeebled by the influence of a public charity for the relief of indigence: and of this proposition, the facts in proof fill these volumes. The English Poor-law has created more misery than it can by any possibility relieve. Many a single parish holds forth in miniature the example of an over-peopled world. Again, the affection of relationship is undermined. Aged parents are abandoned by their children, and children by their parents. Thousands, every year, abscond from their dwellings, and consign their families to the public. One newspaper contained no less than forty advertisements of runaway husbands from the town of Manchester. ‘This unnatural desertion is the epidemic vice of England.’ Again, the poor-laws tend to shut up the springs of humane charity. ‘*All which the rich give to the poor in private beneficence, is but a mite and a trifle when compared with what the poor give to one another.*’

* See Princeton Review, for 1841, pp. 99, and 417.

For example, the legal allowance of bread to prisoners varies at different places. In Bristol it was below the par of human sustenance. The allowance was too small for the criminals; and for the debtors there was no allowance at all. When the latter, therefore, must have inevitably perished of hunger, the former, namely, the criminals, shared their own scanty pittance along with them. Dr. Chalmers's own testimony is, that, when, as a minister in Glasgow, he had a parish of ten thousand people, the poorest of the poor, the spontaneous charity of neighbours for each other was a more certain as well as more abundant source of relief, in cases of extreme indigency, than that legal charity, by which, when in full operation, the other is well nigh superseded. The system, further, arrays the rich against the poor, erecting them into great opposing castes. 'In every way then,' he concludes, 'it is better for a nation to keep clear of any legal enactment for the relief of indigence; and more especially for a government not to take out of the hands of its people, the duties which they owe either to themselves or to their relatives or to their neighbours. The great lesson to be learned from the example of England is, that the economic condition of the lower classes is not improved but deteriorated by the establishment of a compulsory provision for the destitute—which provision too, besides aggravating the miseries of their state, has, by introducing the heterogeneous element of an imagined right into the business of charity, turned what ought to have been altogether a matter of love into a matter of angry litigation, and greatly distempered the social condition of England, by the heart-burnings of a perpetual contest between the higher and humbler orders of the commonwealth.'

Among the abundant testimonies cited, is that of Thomas Clarkson, the philanthropist, concerning his own parish, and touching particularly the actual influence of the poor-law upon the English mind and manners:

"The spirit of independence is not entirely, but nearly gone. It is not, I believe, to be found in nine cases out of ten, among the poor. Here and there an old-fashioned labourer remains, who would suffer much, rather than ask for relief.—Among the persons born of late years, all hang on the parish for support.—I have been frequently at Vestry Meetings, where applications have been made for clothing. I have told the father,—'The children are yours, and it is your duty to provide for them, or you ought not to have married.' The answer has always been, 'the children belong to you (the parish); I cannot get for them what they want; you therefore must.'—I have often been inclined to think that they have no natural affection for their children, and I have told them so.—They will tell you at once, 'I have brought up the boy so

far. I wish to get rid of him. He belongs to you.'—In fact the poor-laws have taught the paupers to discard all dependence upon themselves, and to look to the parish for every thing they want."

The testimony is universal throughout England, in regard to the perfect unconcern with which the nearest kinsfolk abandon each other to the poor-house. (vol. xv. p. 149.) And with all these evils the system is inadequate.

"There is, perhaps, no parochial history in England, that more demonstrates the inefficacy of poor-rates,—than that of Darlaston, in Staffordshire. Its population in 1821, was 5585; and of its thousand and eighty families, one thousand and sixty were employed in trade, handicraft and manufactures. Comprehending only about 800 acres of land, it has almost no agricultural resources; so that the rate falls almost entirely on those householders who are not paupers themselves. The chief occupation of the people was mining, and the firing of gunlocks, which latter employment failed them at the termination of the war. The distress began to be felt in 1816, at which time the poor-rate amounted to £2086 15s. 7d. It was now that the resources of a compulsory provision arrived at its limit—for the continued occupation of the land would have ceased to be an object, had the holders of property been compelled to provide for the whole emergency. So that the grand legal expedient of England, was in this instance, tried to the uttermost, and its short-comings had just to be made up by methods that would be far more productive, as well as far less needful, were there no poor-rate, and no law of charity whatever. Mr. Lowe, the humane and enlightened rector of this parish, succeeded, by great exertion, in raising the sum of £1274 14s. 8d. from the benevolent in various parts of the country; besides which there was the sum of £1157 10s. contributed by a society that was formed, we believe, in London, to provide for the extra distress of that period. In all there was distributed among the poor in 1816-'17, the sum of £4523 3s. The parish work-house was quite filled with them. Its rooms were littered down for the reception of as many as could be squeezed together. Some were employed to work upon the roads—and in the distributions that took place of soup, and potatoes, and herrings, the gates were literally borne off the hinges, by the pressure of the starving multitude.—We have the distinct testimony of Mr. Lowe, that it lay within the means of the people in good times, to have saved as much as would have weathered the whole distress."

"— In all parts of England, the shameless and abandoned profligacy of the lower orders is most deplorable. It is, perhaps, not too much to say, that the expense for illegitimate children forms about a tenth part of the whole expense of English pauperism. We do not deduct, however, the sums recovered from the fathers, our object not being to exhibit the pecuniary burden that is incurred, but, what is far more serious, the fearful relaxation of principle which it implies.—In the parish of Stroud, Gloucestershire, whose population is 7097, there now reside sixty-seven mothers of illegitimate children, who are of an age or in circumstances, to be still chargeable on a Poor-Rate. In the In Parish of St. Cuthbert, Wells, with a population of 3024, there are eighteen such mothers. In St. Mary's Within, Carlisle, a population of 9592, and twenty-eight mothers. In the parish of St. Cuthbert's Within, of Carlisle, there is a population of 5884, and also twenty-eight mothers of illegitimate children now on the parish. In Horsley, Gloucestershire, there is a population of 3565, and, at present, twenty-nine illegitimate children regularly provided for. In St. Mary le Bone, the number of these children on the parish, is four hundred and sixty. But it were endless to enumerate examples: and perhaps, the far most impressive evidence that could be given of the woful deterioration which the Poor-Laws of England are now working on the character of its people, is to be

gathered, not from the general statement of a political arithmetic on the subject, but from the individual displays that are afforded, either in parish vestries, or in the domestic habitations of the peasantry; the unblushing avowals of women, and their insolent demands, and the triumph of an imaginary right over all the tremors and delicacies of remorse which may be witnessed at the one; and in the other, the connivance of parents, and sisters, and natural guardians, at a prostitution now rendered creditable, because so legalized, as at least to be rendered lucrative. Instances do occur, of females who have so many illegitimate children as to derive a competency from the positive allowance given them by the parish."

The public charity of Scotland is less pernicious than that of England, because it less violates the constitution of human society. The difference between the two countries in this respect is wide. In the one, we read of a Scots parish supporting its paupers for twenty pounds a year; in the other, of many an English parish of equal population expending fifteen hundred pounds a year for the same object. There is indeed in Scotland a number of parishes in a transition state from one method to the other. The general plan, however, is, to raise a fund, chiefly by collections at the church-doors, which is administered by the Kirk-Session. Through all the parishes where this mode is resorted to, Dr. Chalmers estimates the average expense of pauperism at less than forty pounds a year.

In the support of spontaneous rather than compulsory charity, Dr. Chalmers entrenches himself on scriptural ground, and takes the Bible as the surest directory of beneficence. The lesson here learnt is, that the poor of each separate congregation should be supported from church-offerings alone. And here, we freely admit, is the particular point at which it seems impossible to apply his principles in all their extent to the nascent pauperism of America; inasmuch as his whole scheme presupposes a parochial division of territory, such as is rendered impossible by the intermingling of sects under our free constitution. Yet, even in the working of a plan of which the principle may never be adopted by us, we may learn much that is valuable from the details; we shall not fail therefore to give a succinct view of the remarkable experience of our author, for eighteen years, chiefly as pastor of two churches in the most populous city of Scotland.

Dr. Chalmers was successively the minister of two parishes in Glasgow, four years of the first, and rather longer of the second. In the Tron-church parish, the poor were sustained partly by compulsory assessment, and partly by collections at the church-doors. In St. John's, the Session

stipulated for a separate and independent management of their own collections ; engaging, in return, to send no more paupers to the fund by assessment, and to provide for every new applicant by church-alms alone. They succeeded in extricating the parish from the city-system, in spite of opposition from the General Session, the Town Hospital, and the Presbytery. It was with difficulty, and only by personal vindication before the General Assembly, that Dr. Chalmers obtained the privilege of trying his experiment. These, he often states, were the only difficulties: ‘When,’ says he, ‘instead of the old managers of the poor, we had but the poor themselves to deal with, all went on smoothly and prosperously.’

The population of the parish, in 1819, was 10,304 ; it has since reached 14,000. It was and is the poorest as well as the largest parish in Glasgow. The annual expenditure for the whole city sometimes exceeded £14,000. The produce of the church-door collections at St. John’s, had averaged £400 a year : with this Dr. C. agreed to meet all future claims for relief, besides laying out an annual sum of £225 on the actual pauperism. He further engaged to secure the Town Hospital from the burden of any new pauperism from his parish. There were these conditions, however, which were very equitable, that in those rare seasons of general depression, such as call for a general subscription to eke out wages, the St. John’s parish should be left to provide for its poor as in ordinary times ; that paupers from other parishes should not invade theirs ; and that when surviving hospital-paupers died off, the parish should be relieved from further assessment : ‘a most advantageous bargain, truly, for the administrators of the old system with the poorest parish in the city.’ Not one of these conditions was ever fulfilled. The scheme was by many regarded with disdain ; but it was executed, and the method was this : the parish was divided into twenty-five parts, under the management of *twenty-five deacons*, each of them having charge of about four hundred persons. No case was brought before the deacons, as a body, till the individual to whom it belonged had made sure what each applicant could do for himself. The Sabbath collection amounted to £600 a year ; but this whole sum went, in the first instance, towards the expenses of the old pauperism, with which they had charged themselves. The deacons were concerned solely with the new pauperism. The only fund at their disposal was

from a small evening-collection of half-pence at the church-doors, from a worshipping assembly of poor people, altogether distinct from the wealthier congregation which assembled in the morning from all parts of the town: it fell short of £100 a year. The grand difficulty, it is obvious, must have been in the disposal of the new cases, but the success of the trial was triumphant. At the end of four years, in a population at that time of about ten thousand, the whole of the new pauperism, in this the poorest parish, never exceeded in expense, £66 6s., or, deducting cases of lunacy, disease and the like, never exceeded £32. The number of new paupers was thirteen. And what is far more extraordinary was the facility of the operation, as discovered when an inquiry was made by circular of the deacons themselves, the answers to which are given, at length, in the sixteenth volume. The time spent by each deacon in this matter did not average more than three hours a month. The system was by far the most popular among the indigent classes. The enemies daily predicted failure: but it did not fail. When, in 1823, Dr. Chalmers left Glasgow, they predicted that the loss of his personal influence would be fatal to the system; but the recorded testimony of his successors, Dr. M'Farlane and Dr. Brown, shows that its vitality was undiminished and effective. Surely we do not wonder at the enthusiasm of Dr. Chalmers, nor at his repugnance to a change of the Presbyterian method. 'If England,' says he, 'will so idolize her own institutions, as to be unwilling to part even with their worst vices, she must be let alone since she will have it so. But let her not inoculate with the vices of her own moral gangrene, those countries which have the misfortune to border on her territory, and be subject to her sway: and, more especially, let not the simple and venerated parochial system of our own land lie open to the crudities, or be placed at the disposal of a few cockney legislators.'

We have gone into these statements, notwithstanding our clear apprehension of the disregard with which details so foreign and so dry will be treated by some even of our own readers; but with the encouraging hope that the number of Christian economists is perpetually on the increase, and that to such as merit the appellation, discussions of this kind will never be unwelcome.