

THE  
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JULY, 1847.

No. III.

- 
- ART. I.—1. *Collections of the New Jersey Historical Society, Vol. I.* (East Jersey under the Proprietary Governments. By William A. Whitehead.) pp. 351. 1846. Bartlett & Welford, New York.
2. *The Goodly Heritage of Jerseymen.* The first Annual Address before the New Jersey Historical Society. By the Rt. Rev. George W. Doane, D.D. LL.D. pp. 32. 1846.
3. *Proceedings of the New Jersey Historical Society.* 1845—1846. pp. 204. Newark, 1847.
4. *Collections of the New Jersey Historical Society, Vol. II.* (The Life of William Alexander, Earl of Stirling, Major General in the Army of the United States, during the Revolution. By his Grandson, William Alexander Duer, LL.D.) pp. 292. 1847. Wiley & Putnam, New York.

SELDOM has an association of the kind advanced more rapidly in public estimation, or made its existence known in a more acceptable manner within the circle of its influence, than has the New Jersey Historical Society. Although but little more than two years has elapsed since its organization, the publications

ever in their form or government, by superadding to the regular prescribed course of education, some provision for subjects not included in it, or for the further prosecution of others. These, forming no part of the curriculum required for graduation, would admit of being taught with all the freedom of the German method, both with respect to learners and teachers, both being left unshackled as to subjects. Even the principle of competition among teachers, which is so essential to the German system, might be recognised, as far as would be salutary either to the individuals concerned or to the progress of learning. The lecturers on this plan might be either the regular professors only, or these with the addition of such qualified coadjutors as might offer themselves and be approved by the competent authorities. By some such arrangement at a few of our oldest institutions, a great impulse might be given to the march of science, and provision made for supplying the deplorable defect of able teachers and professors. At the same time the literary standard of our educated youth would be raised, and many induced to tread the higher walks of learning, who, for want of such inducements, now waste their time and talents in doing nothing or worse than nothing.

With these crude suggestions we conclude a notice of the foreign universities which cannot but appear unsatisfactory and meager to those who are already familiar with the subject, but may possibly afford some interesting information to a larger class of readers, whose ideas, in relation to these matters, have been vague or founded on erroneous statements.

---

ART. III.—*An Earnest Appeal to the Free Church of Scotland, on the subject of Economics.* By Thomas Chalmers, D.D. First American from the Second Edinburgh Edition. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication. 1847. pp. 64.

THIS suggestive and teeming pamphlet has now been several months before the churches, and we presume in the hands of almost all our ministers. We cannot suffer ourselves to think that so much practical wisdom, enforced by the earnest eloquence of

Chalmers, can fail to influence for good a multitude of minds. We may not immediately see its effects, but the principles here suggested, the plans proposed, and the motives urged must commend themselves to the judgment and conscience of the readers, and must induce them to act, or at least prepare them to act with greater intelligence and zeal, in the prosecution of the various enterprises in which as a church we are engaged.

We propose to select from the numerous topics here discussed the support of the clergy, as a subject of a few remarks. That it is the duty of the church to sustain those who are engaged in preaching the gospel is not a disputed point. The apostle rests this obligation on the following grounds. 1. The general principle that labour is entitled to a reward, or, as our Saviour expresses it, the labourer is worthy of his hire. This principle the apostle reminds us, is recognized in all the departments of human life, and has the sanction of the law of God in its application even to brutes, for it is written: Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn. 2. It is a simple matter of commutative justice. If we have sown unto spiritual things, is it a great matter that we should reap your carnal things? If we do you a great good, is it unreasonable to expect you to do us a less? 3. In all countries and under all forms of religions, true or false—those who minister at the altar are partakers with the altar. 4. It is an express ordinance of Christ that they which preach the gospel should live by the gospel.

It is not however every one who preaches the gospel, who is entitled to the benefit of this ordinance. In many cases men, who by profession are lawyers, merchants, or mechanics, are at the same time preachers. Preaching, however, is not their vocation; it is not the work to which their time and talents are devoted. It is a service in which they occasionally engage as opportunity offers without interrupting their ordinary engagements. It is evident that such men, however laudable their motives, or however useful their labours, are not entitled by the ordinance of Christ to live by the gospel. Others, who by profession are preachers, who have been educated and ordained in reference to the sacred office, are at the same time something else, teachers, farmers, or planters. They unite with their vocation as preachers some lucrative secular employment. Sometimes this is a matter of choice; more frequently, perhaps, of

necessity; sometimes, as in the case of Paul, of disinterested self-denial, that they may make the gospel of Christ without charge. No one can doubt that there may be excellent and adequate reasons why a preacher should be a teacher or a farmer. Nor can it be questioned that every one has a right to judge of those reasons for himself, and to determine whether he will support himself, or throw himself on the ordinance of Christ. But he cannot do both. He cannot support himself and claim the right to be supported by the church. He throws himself out of the scope of the ordinance in question by devoting his time and talents to the work of self support. The plain scriptural principle is that those who devote themselves to the service of the church, have a right to be supported by the church; that those who consecrate themselves to preaching the gospel are entitled to live by the gospel. As this is a truth so plainly taught in the sacred scriptures, and so generally conceded, it need not be discussed.

A much more difficult question is: What is the best method of sustaining the ministers of religion? In attempting to answer this question, we propose first to state historically and very briefly the different methods which have been adopted for that purpose, and secondly to show that the duty in question is a duty common to the whole church.

As to the former of the two points proposed for consideration, it may be remarked that under the Mosaic dispensation, the Levites being set apart for the service of the sanctuary, had thirty-five cities with a circle of land of a thousand cubits around the walls assigned to them, and a tithe of all the produce of the ground, of the flocks, and of the herds. The priests were supported by a tithe of the portion paid the Levites; by the first fruits which, according to the Talmudists, were in no case to be less than the sixtieth of the whole harvest; by a certain portion of the sacrifices offered on the altar; by the price paid for the redemption of the first-born among men, and of those animals which were not allowed to be offered in sacrifice. They were moreover exempt from taxation and military duty. Such was the abundant provision which God ordained for the support of the ministers of religion.

Under the new dispensation, our Lord while explicitly enjoining the duty, left his people free as to the mode in which it

should be discharged. From the record contained in the Acts of the Apostles, several facts bearing on this subject may be learned. First, that a lively sense of the brotherhood of believers filled the hearts of the early Christians, and was the effect of the presence and power of the Holy Spirit. Secondly, that in consequence of this feeling of brotherhood, they had all things in common. 'The multitude of them that believed, we are told, were of one heart and of one soul; neither said any of them that ought of the things which he possessed was his own; but they had all things common; neither was there any among them that lacked. Acts ii. 41, 47. Such was the effect of the vivid consciousness of the union of believers as one body in Christ Jesus. And such is the uniform tendency of that consciousness, manifesting itself in the same manner in proportion to its strength. Experience, however, soon taught these early Christians that they were not perfect, and that it was not wise to act in an imperfect and mixed community on a principle which is applicable only to one really pervaded and governed by the Spirit of God. As the church therefore increased, and came to include many who were Christians only in name, or who had but little of the Spirit of Christ, the operation of this feeling of brotherhood was arrested. It would have been destructive to act towards nominal as towards real Christians, towards indolent and selfish professors as though they were instinct with the Spirit of God. This is the fundamental error of all the modern systems of communism. They proceed on the false assumption that men are not depraved. They take for granted that they are disinterested, faithful, laborious. Every such system, therefore, has come to naught and must work evil and only evil, until men are really renewed and made of one heart and of one soul by the Spirit of God. In the subsequent history, therefore, of the apostolic church, we hear no more of this community of goods. The apostles never commanded it. They left the church to act on the principle that it is one only so far as it was truly one. They did not urge the outward expression a single step beyond the inward reality. The instructive fact, however, remains on record that the effusion of the Holy Spirit, did produce this lively sense of brotherhood among Christians, and a corresponding degree of liberality.

A third fact to be learned from the history given in the Acts, is that the early Christians looked upon their religious teachers

as the proper recipients and distributors of the common property of the church. They who were the possessors of houses or lands sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold and laid them down at the Apostle's feet; and distribution was made unto every man according as he had need. It is obvious that this arrangement supposes an eminently pure state of the church, and would be intolerable in any other. It is also obvious that as the church enlarged an amount of secular care, would thus be thrown on the ministers of religion utterly incompatible with due attention to their spiritual duties. A new arrangement was therefore soon adopted. The apostles said: It is not reasonable that we should leave the word of God to serve tables. Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business. An example was thus early set of confiding to laymen, i. e., to those who do not minister in word and doctrine, the secular concerns of the church. And no man can estimate the evil, which in subsequent ages flowed from the neglect of this example. If in human governments, it is considered essential to the liberty and welfare of the people, that the sword and purse should be in different hands; it is no less essential that in the church the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God, sharper than any two edged sword, and the money power should not be united. It was this union which proved in after ages one of the most effectual causes of the secular power of the clergy and of the corruption of the church.

From what has been said, it is plain that during the lives of the apostles, the ministry was sustained by the voluntary contributions of the churches. As the church increased and became more compact as a visible society, this matter assumed a more regular shape. It seems from the beginning to have been the custom for the believers to bring certain gifts or offerings whenever they assembled for the celebration of the Lord's Supper. A custom which in one form or another is continued in most churches, our own among the number, to the present time. As in the early church the Lord's Supper appears to have been a part of the regular service of every Lord's day, those contributions were of course weekly. Besides this, there was from a very early period a regular and larger contribution made every month. It appears also that the early Christians inferred from the identity of the church under the two dispensations, that it

was no less the duty of the people of God now than formerly to devote the first fruits of the earth and a tenth of their income to his service. Long before the payment of tithes was enforced by law, it had thus become a common and voluntary usage. All these contributions were, in each church, thrown into a common stock, under the control first of the deacons, afterwards of the pastor. The amount of the sum thus raised of course varied greatly with the size and wealth of the several churches. And as the pastors of the chief towns gradually became prelates, having many associated and dependent congregations connected with the metropolitan church, this common fund was divided into three portions, one for the bishop, one for the clergy, and one for the poor. The bishop gradually acquired the control of this fund and in the Synod of Antioch, A. D. 341, his right to its management was distinctly asserted. Thus also in what are called the Apostolic Constitutions, can. 41, the right of the bishop in this matter is placed on the ground that he who is entrusted with the care of souls, may well be trusted with their money. *Si animae hominum preciosae Episcopo sunt creditae, multo majus oportet eum curam pecuniarum gerere.*

When the Roman emperor became a Christian and made Christianity the religion of the state, the state assumed the responsibility of supporting the ministers and institutions of religion. This has been done in various ways: 1. By the permanent grant of productive property to the church, and by authorizing the acquisition of such property by donations, bequest, or purchase. 2. By ordaining the payment of tithes and other contributions. 3. By empowering every parish to tax itself for the support of religion, and giving to such taxation the force of law. This was the method so long in use in New England. 4. By direct appropriations from the public treasury in payment of the salaries of ministers, just as other public officers are paid. This is the method adopted in France since the revolution.

In those countries in which the church and state are not united, the former is supported either by what may be called ecclesiastical law, or by voluntary contributions of its members. The Romish church in Ireland affords an example of the former of these methods. With the peculiar wisdom of silence for which that church is remarkable, it contrives to raise from that impoverished people an adequate support for its hierarchy and priest-

hood. The priests are supported by the imposition of a regular contribution upon all his parishoners payable twice in the year, at stated times; and by a regular tariff of charges for spiritual services, such as baptism, absolution, the mass, extreme unction and burial. The bishops derive their income from an annual contribution of ten pounds sterling from every priest in their diocese, and by holding as rectors some of the most important of the parishes. In this way, by the stringent coercion of spiritual power, an income more regularly paid than tax or rent, is readily secured.

Where the ministry is supported by the voluntary contributions of the people, it is done by the contributions of the particular congregation which the preacher serves, or from a common fund, or by a combination of the two methods. There are, therefore, three general methods by which the support of the clergy has been provided for. 1. Voluntary contributions. 2. Endowments and the law of the land. 3. By ecclesiastical law. In this country it is not an open question, which of these methods ought to be adopted. We are shut up to the first. And happily public sentiment both in the church and out of it, has sanctioned as the best, the only method which in our case is practicable.

Admitting that in this country the ministry must be supported by the voluntary contributions of the people, the particular question to which we wish to call the attention of our readers is; on whom does the responsibility of furnishing that support rest? Does it rest on the individual congregation, which the minister serves, or upon the church as one, and the church as a whole? Our object is to show that the obligation rests upon the church as a whole. To prevent misapprehension, however, it is proper to state; That nothing so visionary as that every minister in every part of the country should receive the same salary is contemplated. This would be at once unjust and impracticable. Much less that there should be any permanent fund from the interest of which all salaries should be paid. The principle which we wish to establish would be fully satisfied, if our Board of Missions, instead of giving a tantalizing pittance, were authorized and enabled to give an adequate support to every minister in its service, devoted to his work, i. e., not engaged in any secular employment but consecrating his whole time to the service of the church.



The first argument in support of the position here assumed, is drawn from the nature of the church. If according to the fundamental doctrine of the Independents, believers are the materials of a church, but a covenant its *form*; if a number of Christians become a church by covenanting to meet together for worship and discipline; if a church owes its existence to this mutual covenant just as a city owes its existence to its charter, so that we may as well talk of an universal city as of a church catholic, then there is no room for the discussion of this question. No one would think of contending that the obligation to support the municipal officers of any one city, rests on the inhabitants of all other cities. If, therefore, the relation which one congregation bears to all others of the same communion, is the same which one city bears to other cities, then of course every congregation is bound to take care of itself, and is under no obligation, other than that of general benevolence, to sustain the ministry in other congregations, any more than the people of Philadelphia are bound to support the mayor of New York. But such is not the scriptural, it is not the presbyterian idea of the church. It is not the idea which has been living and active in the minds of all Christians from the beginning. Every believer feels that he has a church relation to every other believer; that he is a member of the same body, partaker of the same Spirit, that he has with them a common faith, hope, and Lord, and that in virtue of this union, he is under the obligation of communion, obedience, and fellowship in all things, to believers as such, and consequently to all believers.

There are certain principles relating to the nature of the church, which though generally admitted in theory, are seldom fairly carried out in practice. Of these principles among the most important are the following: 1. That the church is one. There is one kingdom of Christ, one fold of which he is the shepherd, one body of which he is the head. 2. That union with Christ is the condition of unity in the church. We are one body in Christ Jesus, i. e. in virtue of our union with him; and consequently the church consists of all who are in Christ. 3. That the Holy Ghost, who dwells without measure in Christ, and from him is communicated to all his people, is the bond of union between them and him, and between the constituent members of his body. 4. That the indwelling of the Spirit in the

members of the church, as it is the ultimate ground of its unity, so it is the cause or source of outward union in all its legitimate forms. The church is or ought to be one in faith, in communion, in worship, in organization, and obedience, just so far and no farther than the indwelling Spirit is productive of such union.

5. There are certain duties which necessarily arise out of this relation of believers to each other as members of the same church, and which are coextensive with the relation out of which they spring. Among those duties are sympathy and mutual assistance. It is because believers are members of one body that they are expected to sympathize with one another just as the hand sympathizes with the foot, or the eye with the ear in the natural body. It is because believers are the organs and temples of the Holy Ghost that we are commanded to obey one another in the fear of the Lord, to bring our complaints to the church, and to hear the church on pain of being considered heathen men and publicans. It is because we are all brethren, *οἰκεῖοι τῆς πίστεως*, that we are bound to bear one another's burdens, and to distribute to the necessities of the saints. These are duties we owe to believers as such, and therefore not to those only who may live in the same place with us, or worship with us in the same house. Proximity of residence or association in worship, is not the ground of these obligations. They are founded on a far higher relation, a relation which exists between all the members of Christ's body, and therefore they bind every member in reference to all his fellow members.

This being the true idea of the church, it follows that if perfectly realized, all Christians would be united in one ecclesiastical body. That consummation is now hindered by their imperfection. Though one in faith, it is only within the narrow limits of essential doctrines. Though one in affection, it is not with that full confidence and cordiality necessary for harmonious action in the same external society. So long therefore as the inward unity of the church is imperfect, its outward union must be in like manner imperfect. This admission, however, does not imply that outward disunion is itself a good; or that unity ought not to be outwardly expressed as far as it really exists. Consequently those who are one in Spirit; whose views as to doctrine, worship, and discipline, are such as to admit of

their harmonious co-operation, are bound to unite as one outward or visible church.

It is universally admitted that those who are united in the same visible church owe certain duties to each other. In other words, there are certain duties which rest upon them as a church. It is also admitted that the support of the ministry is one of those duties. If, therefore, the church is nothing and can be nothing beyond a single congregation, then that duty and all others of a like kind which rest upon the church as such, are limited to the bounds of the congregation. The obligation of obedience does not extend beyond the list of their fellow worshippers in the same house. The obligation to support the ministry is confined to their own immediate pastor. But if the church consists of all believers, then the whole body of believers stand in the relation of church-membership, and the duties of obedience and mutual aid in the discharge of all ecclesiastical obligations rest on the whole united body; that is, on all who recognise each other as members of the same church. It follows, therefore, from the scriptural doctrine of the church, that the obligation to provide the means of grace for the whole church, rests on the church as a whole, and not merely or exclusively on each separate congregation for itself.

The second argument in support of this doctrine is derived from the commission given to the church. Christ said to his disciples: Go into all the world and make disciples of all nations. The prerogative and duty here enjoined, is to teach all nations. For the discharge of this duty the ministry was appointed. Christ, in the first instance personally, and afterwards by his Spirit, calls and qualifies certain men to be organs and agents of the church in the great work of teaching the nations. To whom then was this commission given? On whom does the obligation of discharging the duty it enjoins rest? Not on the apostles alone—not on the ministry alone—but on the whole church. This is indeed a very important point, much debated between Romanists and Protestants. It must here be taken for granted, that neither prelates nor presbyters are the church, but that God's people are the church, and that to the church as such, to the church as a whole, to the church as one, was this great commission given. It was originally addressed to a promiscuous assembly of believers. The power and the promise which it conveyed,

were connected with the gift of the Holy Spirit. The presence of the Spirit was the source at once of the power here conferred, and of the qualifications necessary for the discharge of the duty here enjoined. And as the Spirit was not given to the apostles, prelates, or presbyters as a distinct class, and to the exclusion of others, so neither was the commission which was founded on the gift of the Spirit confined to them. The power, the duty and the promise of the Spirit all go together. Unless therefore we adopt the Romish doctrine that the Spirit was given to the apostles as a distinct and self perpetuating order in the church, to flow mechanically through the channel of that succession, a living stream through a dead body, we must admit that the commission in question was given to the whole church. All the prerogatives, duties, and promises which it conveys, belong to the church as a living body pervaded in all its parts by the life-giving and life-impelling Spirit of God. This however does not imply that there is no order or subordination in the church; or that there is no diversity in the gifts, graces, and offices which the Spirit divides to each one severally as he wills. All are not apostles, all are not prophets, or teachers, or workers of miracles. God is not the author of confusion, but of order and peace in all the churches of the saints. The absence of order, subordination and peace in any body is an evidence of the absence of the Spirit of God. The Protestant doctrine that the commission so often referred to, was given to the whole church, is therefore perfectly consistent with the existence and prerogatives of the ministry, not only as a work, but as an office.

The application of the Protestant doctrine just stated, to the subject before us, is obvious and direct. If to the church as such and as a whole, the duty of teaching all nations has been committed, then upon the church as a whole rests the obligation to sustain those who are divinely commissioned in her name and as her organs for the immediate discharge of that duty. On what other ground do we appeal to all our members, young and old, male and female, to send forth and sustain our missionaries foreign and domestic? We do not merely say to them that this is a duty of benevolence or of Christian charity, but we tell them it is a command of Christ, a command addressed to them, which binds their conscience, which they cannot neglect without renouncing the authority of Christ, and thereby proving that they

are destitute of his Spirit and are none of his. In doing this, we certainly do right; but we obviously take for granted that since the commission to teach all nations has been given to the whole church, the duty of supporting those sent forth as teachers rests upon the whole church as a common burden. The command therefore which binds us to support the gospel in New Jersey binds us to sustain it in Wisconsin. All the reasons of the obligation apply to the one case as well as to the other. And we miserably fail of obedience to Christ if we content ourselves with supporting our own pastor, and let others provide for themselves or perish, as they see fit.

A third consideration which leads to the conclusion for which we are now contending is, that the ministry pertains to the whole church, and not primarily and characteristically to each particular congregation. When a man is ordained, the office into which he is inducted has relation to the church as a whole. All the prerogatives and obligations of that office are conveyed though he has no separate congregation confided to his care. A call to a particular church does not convey the ministerial office, it only gives authority to exercise that office over a particular people and within a given sphere. The office itself has far wider relations. If it were true that the ministerial office has relation primarily and essentially to a particular congregation, so that a man can no more be a minister without a congregation, than a husband without a wife (the favourite illustration of those who adopt this view of the matter) then it would follow that no man is a minister except to his own congregation, nor can he perform any ministerial acts out of his own charge; that he ceases to be a minister as soon as he ceases to be a pastor; and that the church has no right to ordain men as missionaries. These are not only the logical conclusions from this doctrine, they were all admitted and contended for by the early and consistent Independents. This view is obviously unscriptural. The apostle after teaching that the church is one,—one body having one Spirit, one faith, one Lord, one baptism, adds that to this one church, the ascended Saviour gave gifts, viz. apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers for the work of the ministry and for the edifying of the body of Christ. The apostles, prophets, evangelists and teachers were not given to particular congregations, but to the church generally. Of all

the preachers of the gospel named in the New Testament it would be difficult to find one who sustained a special, much less an exclusive relation to any one congregation. Paul did not, neither did Barnabas, nor Timothy, nor Titus. That there were pastors in every church is of course admitted, but even in their case, the relation they sustained was like that of a captain of a single ship in a large fleet. While each pastor had a special relation to his own charge, he had a higher relation to the whole church.

If the doctrine of the Independents on this subject, was true, it might be plausibly argued that the obligation to support a minister rested solely on the congregation who enjoys his services. It is altogether a private affair, analogous to the relation which a man bears to his own family. But if the true doctrine is that the ministry belongs to the whole church; the whole church is bound to sustain it. The relation which the officers of the navy and army sustain to the whole country, with propriety throws the burden of their support on the country as a whole. And such is the relation which ministers sustain to the church.

A fourth argument on this subject is, that all the reasons which are given in the sacred scriptures to show that the ministry ought to be supported, bear on the church as one body. Our Saviour says the laborer is worthy of his hire. But in whose service does the minister labour? Who gave him his commission? In whose name does he act? Whose work is he doing? to whom is he responsible? Is it not the church as a whole, and not this or that particular congregation? Again, to whose benefit do the fruits of his labour redound? When souls are converted, saints edified, children educated in the fear of God, is this a local benefit? Are we not one body? Has the hand no interest in the soundness of the foot, or the ear in the well-being of the eye? It is only on the assumption therefore of a most unscriptural isolation and severance of the constituent members of Christ's body, that the whole obligation to sustain the ministry can be thrown on each separate congregation. Again, it is an ordinance of Christ that those who preach the gospel should live by the gospel. This ordinance certainly binds those to whom the gospel is given, to whose custody it is committed, who are charged with the duty of sustaining and ex-

tending it; who have felt its power and experienced its value. They are the persons whom Christ honours by receiving gifts at their hands, for the support of his servants and the promotion of his kingdom. Consequently the whole body of his people have by his ordinance this duty imposed on them as a common burden and a common privilege.

In the fifth place, this matter may be argued from the common principles of justice. Our present system is unjust, first, to the people. Here are a handful of Christians surrounded by an increasing mass of the ignorant, the erroneous and the wicked. No one will deny that it is of the last importance that the gospel should be regularly administered among them. This is demanded not only for the benefit of those few Christians, but for the instruction and conversion of the surrounding population. Now is it just, that the burden of supporting the ministry under these circumstances, should be thrown exclusively on that small and feeble company of believers? Are they alone interested in the support and extension of the kingdom of Christ among them and those around them? It is obvious that on all scriptural principles, and on all principles of justice this is a burden to be borne by the whole church, by all on whom the duty rests to uphold and propagate the gospel of Christ. Our present system is unjust, in the second place, towards our ministers. It is not just that one man should be supported in affluence, and another equally devoted to the service of the church, left to struggle for the necessaries of life. As before stated we do not contend for anything so chimerical as equal salaries to all ministers. Even if all received from the church as a whole the same sum, the people would claim and exercise the right to give in addition what they pleased to their own pastor. We can no more make salaries equal, than we can make church edifices of the same size and cost. But while this equality is neither desirable nor practicable, it is obviously unjust that the present inordinate inequality should be allowed to continue. The hardship falls precisely on the most devoted men; on those who strive to get along without resorting to any secular employment. Those who resort to teaching, farming or speculating in land, in many cases soon render themselves independent. The way to keep ministers poor, is to give them enough to live upon. Observation in all parts of the country shows that it is the men with inadequate

salaries who become rich, or at least lay up money. It is not therefore because we think that the ministry as a body would have more of this world's goods if adequately supported by the church, that we urge this plea of just compensation. It is because those who do devote themselves to their ministerial work, are left to contend with all the harassing evils of poverty, while others of their brethren have enough and to spare. This we regard as contrary to justice, contrary to the Spirit of Christ, and the express commands of his word. Let the Presbyterian church ask itself whether it has ever obeyed the ordinance of Christ, that they who preach the gospel shall live by the gospel. It is obvious that this never has been done. And if we ask, why not, we can find no other answer than that we have not adopted the right method. We have left each congregation to do the best it can; the rich giving themselves little concern how the poor succeeded in this necessary work. We do not see how the command of Christ ever can be obeyed, how anything like justice on this subject ever can be done, until the church recognises the truth that it is one body, and therefore that it is just as obligatory on us to support the gospel at a distance as around our own homes.

Sixthly, the advantages which would be secured by this plan, are a strong argument in its favour. It would secure a great increase in the amount of time and labour devoted to ministerial work. We have no means of ascertaining with accuracy what proportion of our ministers, unite with their sacred office some secular employment, nor what proportion of their time is thus diverted from their appropriate duties. It may be that one-third or one half of the time of the ministry of our church, taken as a whole, is devoted to secular business. If this estimate is any approximation to the truth, and it has been made by those who have had the best opportunity of forming a correct judgment, then the efficiency of the ministry might be well nigh doubled if this time could be redeemed from the world and devoted to study, to pastoral duties, and the education of the young.

Again, it would exert a most beneficial influence on the character of the ministry. How many men, who from necessity engage in some secular work, gradually become worldly minded, lose their interest in the spiritual concerns of the church, and come to regard their ministerial duties as of secondary impor-



tance. It is a law of the human mind that it becomes assimilated to the objects to which its attention is principally directed. It is almost impossible for a minister whose time is mainly devoted to worldly business, to avoid becoming more or less a worldly man. A very respectable clergyman, advanced in life, who had felt this difficulty, recently said, there was nothing about which he was more determined than that if he had his life to live over again, he would never settle in a congregation that did not support him. It is very hard to draw the line between gaining a support and making money. It is difficult to discriminate in practice between what is proper, because necessary, and what all admit to be derogatory to the ministerial character. How often does it happen that the desire of wealth insinuates itself into the heart, under the guise of the desire for an adequate support. Without the slightest impeachment of any class of our brethren, in comparison with others, but simply assuming that they are like other men and other ministers, it is obvious that the necessity of devoting a large part of their time to secular employment, is injurious both to their own spiritual interests and to their usefulness. Every thing indeed depends upon the motive with which this is done. If done as a matter of self-denial, in order to make the gospel of Christ without charge, its influence will be salutary; but if done from any worldly motive it must, from the nature of the case, bring leanness into the soul. It can hardly, therefore, be doubted that few things, under God, would more directly tend to exalt the standard of ministerial character and activity in our church, than a provision of an adequate support for every pastor devoted to his work. How many of our most deserving brethren would the execution of this plan relieve from anxiety and want. Many of them are now without the ordinary comforts of life; harassed by family cares, oppressed with difficulty as to the means of supporting and educating their children. It would shed an unwonted light into many a household, to hear it announced that the Presbyterian church had resolved to obey the ordinance of Christ, that they who preach the gospel should live by the gospel. Such a resolution would kindle the incense in a thousand hearts, and would be abundant through the thanksgiving of many to the glory of God.

Again, this plan would secure stability and consequent power

to the institutions of religion in a multitude of places, where every thing is now occasional, uncertain and changing. Our church would be thus enabled to present a firm and steadily advancing front. Congregations too feeble to day to support the gospel at all, would soon become, under the steady culture thus afforded to them, able to aid in sustaining others. A new spirit of alacrity and confidence would be infused into the ministry. They would not advance with a hesitating step, doubtful whether those behind will uphold their hands. When a missionary leaves our shores for heathen lands, he goes without any misgivings as to this point. He has no fear of being forgot, and allowed to struggle for his daily bread, while endeavoring to bring the heathen to the obedience of Christ. He knows that the whole church is pledged for his support, and he devotes himself to his work without distraction or anxiety. How different is the case with multitudes of our missionaries at home. They go to places where much is to be done, where constant ministerial labour is demanded, but they go with no assurance of support. The people whom they serve may greatly need the gospel; it ought to be carried to them, and urged upon them, but they care little about it, and are unwilling to sustain the messenger of God. The church does not charge itself with his support. It is true he is labouring in her service and in the service of her Lord, but he is left to provide for himself, and live or starve as the case may be. This is not the way in which a church can be vigorously advanced. It is not the way in which Antichrist advances his kingdom. No Romish priest plants a hesitating foot on any unoccupied ground. He knows he represents a church; a body which recognises its unity, and feels its life in all its members. Is it right that we should place the cause of Christ under such disadvantage; that we should adopt a plan of ministerial support, which of necessity makes the church most feeble at the extremities, where it ought to have most alacrity and strength? Truly the children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light.

The great recommendation of the plan for which we contend, is that it is right. And if right it must be healthful in all its influences. If the church acts on the principle that it is one, it will become one. If from a conviction of the brotherhood of all believers, it acts towards all as brothers, brotherly love will

abound. The sense of injustice which cannot fail on our present plan to corrode the feelings of our neglected brethren, will cease to exist. The sympathies of the more prosperous portions of the church, will become more enlisted in the welfare of those less highly favoured. By acting on the principle which the Holy Spirit has prescribed for the government of the church, the church will become more and more the organ and dwelling place of that Spirit, who will pervade it in all its parts with the glow of his presence, rendering it at once pure and prosperous, instinct with the power and radiant with the beauty of holiness.

We do not anticipate much opposition to the principles which we have attempted to advocate. We do not expect to hear any one deny the unity of the church; nor that it is the duty of the whole church to sustain and propagate the gospel; nor that the ministry belongs to the church as one body; nor that every minister is engaged in the service of the whole church; nor that it is just, scriptural and expedient that they who preach the gospel should live by the gospel. Nor do we expect that any one will deny that it is a logical sequence from these principles that the obligation to support the ministry rests as a common burden on the church which that ministry serves. The objections which we anticipate are principally these. First, that there are many inefficient men in the ministry who ought not to be supported by the church, and who need the stimulus of dependence on their congregations to make them work. In answer to this objection we would say, that we believe the difficulty is greatly over estimated, and that the inefficiency complained of arises in a great measure from the necessity which so many of our ministers labour under of providing for their own support. There is indeed no plan which is not liable to abuse. But we have in this case all the security which other churches have who act on the principle for which we contend. We have the security arising from the fidelity of sessions in guarding admissions to the church; in the judgment of presbyteries in selecting and training men for the ministry, in ordaining them to the sacred office, and in superintending them when they come to discharge its duties. We have the security which the Board of Missions now have for the fidelity and efficiency of those who are engaged in its service. It will be observed that the plan contemplated does not propose to render the minister indepen-

dent of his congregation. The principal part of his support, if a pastor, must, in most cases at least, come from them. It is only proposed that the Board of Missions should be authorized and enabled so to enlarge their appropriations as to secure an adequate support to every minister devoted to his work.

A more serious objection is the expense. In answer to this, we would ask whether it would require as large a portion of the income of believers as by divine command was devoted to this object under the old dispensation? Is the gospel of the grace of God less valuable, or less dear to our hearts than the religion of Moses to the hearts of the Israelites? Would it require a tithe of the sum which the heathen pay for the support of their priests and temples? Would it cost Presbyterians in America more than it costs Presbyterians in Scotland, or more than it costs our Methodist brethren? What ought to be done can be done. What others do, we can do. What the cause needs are, with the blessing of God, two things, an intelligent comprehension of the grounds of the duty, on the part of the church, and some man or men to take the thing in hand and urge it forward.

- 
- ART. IV.—1. *History of the Israelites, from the time of the Maccabees to our days.* In six parts. By J. M. Jost. 1820—1826.  
 2. *General History of the Israelitish People.* By J. M. Jost. 2 vols. 8vo. Berlin. 1832.\*

THE modern history of the Jews reaches far back into the antiquity of other races. The dividing line between the old and new of their existence is the advent of Christ, or rather the destruction of Jerusalem. The later portion of their history, as thus distributed, has several distinct claims to attention. It is highly interesting in itself, including all the usual elements of historical effect, and some of them in a very high degree. It is also important as a conclusion to the earlier annals of the race,

\* Geschichte der Israeliten seit der Zeit der Maccabäer bis auf unsere Tage.

Allgemeine Geschichte des Israelitischen Volkes, sowohl seines zweimaligen Staatslebens als auch der zerstreuten Gemeinden und Secten, bis in die neueste Zeit, in gedrängter Uebersicht, u. s. w.