

THE  
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1871.

---

No. I.

---

---

ART. I.—*The Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review. Index Volume.* Philadelphia: Peter Walker, 821 Chestnut Street.\*

THE immense development of periodical literature during the present century, and in a ratio almost geometrical during each successive decade, is already among the tritest common-places. A large part of the reading of most men is in dailies, weeklies, monthlies, and quarterlies. The great majority read little else. Prodigious numbers read little besides the Bible (if, indeed, they read that), and the daily or weekly newspaper. The mightiest thinkers, who do most to shape the opinions and principles of society, communicate their thoughts to men through the periodical press, some largely, and others exclusively. Many of the most celebrated authors first became known to the public and to fame in the pages of some periodical. Here their initial and tentative au-

\* We again invite attention to this index volume, and its great importance to those having any considerable number of back volumes of this Quarterly. It is published wholly by Mr. Walker, former publisher of the Review. The present publishers have no pecuniary interest in the Index. But we deem the work important and valuable, and trust that the publisher will be encouraged and rewarded.

ART. V.—*Preaching the Gospel to the Poor.*

ONE of the evidences of our Lord's Messiahship was that the Gospel was preached to the poor. "God hath chosen the poor." "Look at your calling, brethren, not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble are called, but God hath chosen 'the foolish, the weak, the base, the despised, those who are nothing, that no flesh should glory in his presence.'" In the Old Testament, "the poor," and "the people of God" are almost equivalent expressions. They constitute much the larger part of mankind. They have the same right to the Gospel as other classes of men. It was intended for them as well as for others. The command to preach the Gospel to every creature of course includes them. They have special need of its consolations and supports: no Christian, therefore, has ever doubted that it is the duty of the church to preach the Gospel to the poor. To preach the Gospel, and to teach the Gospel, are interchangeable expressions. The thing to be done is to bring the poor to the knowledge of the Gospel, and therefore every means of communicating that knowledge is included in preaching the Gospel, in the scriptural sense of the words.

It being admitted that it is the duty of the church to preach the Gospel to the poor, it must also be admitted that any church which fails to bring the Gospel to bear upon the poor, fails in its duty to Christ. It refuses or neglects to do what he has specially commanded; and sooner or later its candlestick will be removed out of its place. In spiritual things at least, those who fail to communicate fail to possess. A candle under a bushel soon goes out.

The most superficial survey of the Christian world is sufficient to satisfy any one that some churches are much more faithful, or at least much more successful, in bringing religion within reach of the poor, than others. Such survey also proves that, in some cases, those churches which are in other respects most what they ought to be, are most deficient in this

one duty. It will further prove that the degree in which a church succeeds in reaching the poor depends quite as much, if not more, on the principles which underlie its organization and modes of action, than upon the character of its ministers or members.

The Roman Catholic Church, for example, does reach the poor. In Roman Catholic countries, as in France, in Spain, in Italy, the poor are in the church. They are all baptized in the name of Christ. They are all confirmed. They all participate in the ministrations of the priesthood. They crowd the sanctuaries, even when the houses of worship are forsaken by the educated and rich. This one thing the Romish Church does do. This, however, does not counteract the evils flowing from the false doctrines and superstitious observances of that church. But as to the point in hand, it is an example to the whole Christian world.

The same may be said of the Church of Scotland during a long period of its history. It is a clear proof that John Knox was one of the greatest men of his own, and perhaps of any age, that, in that period of the world's history, he formed and carried out the plan of having an university in each of the great divisions of Scotland, an academy in every county, and a school in every parish. These schools were under the care of the pastor or the elders of the church. The children were all instructed in the principles of religion. The population being to a great degree homogeneous, the mass of the people were brought under the power of the Gospel. After its adoption by the Church of Scotland, the Westminster Catechism was taught in all the parish schools. A people imbued with the truths and spirit of that matchless compend of Christian doctrine, could not fail, under the ordinary blessing of God, to be intellectual, moral, religious, energetic, and independent. And such were the Scotch as a nation. The late Archbishop Hughes, of New York, had good reason for what he is reported to have said in one of his public addresses, viz.: That if Ireland had been peopled by Presbyterians, they would have driven the English into the sea two hundred years ago.

Immigration and political causes have in a measure changed this state of things in Scotland; but still, both in the estab-

lished and free churches of Scotland, the poor are reached to a greater extent than in most other Christian countries.

The Church of England has in a great measure failed in preaching the Gospel to the poor. Nearly one half of the people of England are outside of the established church; and in the larger cities the great mass of the population live and die in ignorance of the first principles of Christianity. In the rural districts and among the peasantry that church has been more successful in the accomplishment of its mission. It is foreign to our present purpose to inquire into the reasons why that richly endowed establishment has not more successfully accomplished its work.

In Prussia the poor are effectually reached by all the ministrations of the church. There are two ways in which the religious character of a nation may be determined. The one is, the character of the people; the other is, the character of its institutions. If we adopt the former standard, the United States may be pronounced to be one of the most Christian nations on the face of the earth; if the latter, we must admit that it is one of the most irreligious. Prussia, if judged by her institutions and laws, must be regarded as the most thoroughly Christian nation in the world. The law requires that every one born in the land (unless of Jewish parents), shall not only profess, but be taught the Christian religion. A certificate of baptism and confirmation is required before any citizen of Prussia can be received as an apprentice, before he can marry, or enter upon any profession. In confirmation he makes a profession of faith in Christianity. And he cannot be confirmed unless he is familiar with the Old and New Testament history, and can repeat the Apostle's Creed (which he must adopt as his own), the Ten Commandments and Luther's Catechism. These laws are not obsolete or inoperative. As the Prussian system secures that every man shall be a soldier, so it secures that every man shall be a Christian, so far as knowledge and profession are concerned. No child, although barefooted, of twelve years of age, can be found in Berlin or Halle who cannot read and write, and who is not familiar with Scripture history. The experiment has been often made. The children are all required to go to school. The pastors are

required to devote so many hours a week to their religious instruction. The churches are all free, and whatever may be the character of the sermons, the Scriptures are read, an evangelical liturgy is used, and devout hymns are sung. The hymnology of Germany is probably richer than that of any other Christian people, if not than that of all other nations combined. The Germans are a musical people, and these hymns are sung not only in the churches but in the homes of the poor all over the land. Hence, while the French soldiers are roused by the Marseillaise, the Germans nerve themselves by singing the grand old hymn of Luther, "A sure defence is our God, a trusty shield and weapon." The churches throughout Prussia, as a general thing, are crowded with worshippers. The rich and titled may or may not be there in curtained stalls, but the body of the church is thronged by the common people. While, therefore, in Prussia, as elsewhere, many of the educated, and especially of the scientific class, have given themselves up to scepticism, the nation, as a nation, is eminently Christian.

In this country the work of evangelization is not in the hands of any one denomination, and things seem tending to the result that one denomination will address itself principally to one class, and another to a different. But this is anti-Christian. No church can afford systematically and of set purpose to neglect the poor, or, in point of fact, fail to reach them.

Of the Protestant denominations in the United States, it must be admitted that the Methodists have been the most successful in accomplishing this great object of the Christian church. Wesley began his career by preaching to the poor, and he employed his great constructive genius in organizing a system that should secure that object. His followers, especially in this country, have followed his example; and the good which has thus been accomplished is beyond all estimate.

It is with great reluctance that we are constrained to acknowledge that the Presbyterian Church in this country is not the church for the poor. It is not meant that they are excluded, nor that we fail entirely to reach them. But it is true that our system does not make adequate provision for their

instruction. In purely agricultural districts, where the poor hardly exist as a class, this evil is not felt; but in all our larger towns and cities it is great and apparent. Great efforts are, indeed, made to accomplish the object by means of city missions and chapels. But these means are inadequate. A very small part of the poor, much smaller than is our proper portion, belong to the Presbyterian Church. We, as a church, are not doing, and never have done, what we were bound to do, in order secure the preaching of the Gospel to the poor. We are not disposed to refer this neglect to any special want of intelligence or zeal in the ministry or members of our church. They may compare favorably in these respects with the ministers and members of any other church in our land. The evil is to be referred to our system. The Presbyterians early adopted in this country, and have always adhered to the principle, that, as a general rule, a minister should look for his support to the particular congregation to which he preaches. We have, indeed, never been unmindful of the wants of those who were not able to sustain the Gospel by their own resources. Our church from the beginning has labored in the field of domestic missions, and made systematic efforts to aid feeble congregations in the support of their pastors. This, however, was regarded as a temporary expedient, and at one time the rule was adopted by our Board of Missions that if, in the course of a few years a church did not become self-sustaining, it should be dropped from the list. The error, however complained of, is not in the Board of Missions, either in its principles or its operations. It is in the church itself. The error is that no general provision has been made for the support of the preachers of the Gospel. Every minister has been left to depend on those to whom he preached. The inevitable consequence of this system is, that those who are unwilling or unable to support the Gospel are left in ignorance. Had those who went before us acted on this principle we should be without the Gospel to this day.

There are two principles which have been generally recognized in the church, but which we, as a denomination, have not adequately carried out into practice. The one is, that every minister, devoted to his work, is entitled to an adequate sup-

port. The other is, that the obligation to furnish that support does not rest exclusively on the particular congregation which he serves, but upon the church as a whole.

The first of these principles does not admit of dispute. Our Lord says in reference to his ministers, "the laborer is worthy of his hire." He has a right to it. To withhold it from him is an act of injustice. It is dishonest. It is not very euphonious to speak of ministers as hirelings, and of their salaries as their hire. But it is the idea, not the word, with which we are concerned. The principle is of universal application, in all departments of life, and among all classes of men; emperors, statesmen, generals, have their "hire" as well as poor ministers. "Who," asks the Apostle, when speaking of this subject, "goeth a warfare at any time at his own charges? Who planteth a vineyard, and eateth not of the fruit thereof? or who feedeth the flock, and eateth not of the milk of the flock?" This principle, he tells us, is recognized in Scripture even in its application to brutes, for it is written: "Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn." "If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things?" "Do ye not know, that they which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple? and they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar? Even so hath the Lord ordained, that they which preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel." There is no need of arguing this question. This the Apostle has done for us. He has not only argued it on the general principles of justice and of established usage, but announced it as an express command of Christ; that they who preach the Gospel shall live of the Gospel.

As to the amount of a minister's salary, there is no other principle laid down in Scripture than that it should be adequate, *i. e.*, adequate to enable him to "live of the Gospel" without resorting to other means of support. This scriptural rule is rarely carried out. Even in the most richly endowed churches, while there are princely incomes for the few, the mass of the working clergy have an utterly inadequate support. In England it is said that the average income of the lower clergy is only a hundred and fifty pounds. In our own

church there are whole synods in which not one minister in twenty is supported by his salary. A distinguished gentleman from New England told us he had two brothers: one, an able and highly educated man, had preached for years to a church in Massachusetts, on a salary of six hundred dollars; the other, of whom he spoke as a "chub of a boy," who had only received a common-school education, was in a Boston store, where he received fifteen hundred dollars a year for rolling out carpets. When this circumstance was mentioned to a merchant of Boston, his reply was: "A thing always brings what it is worth!"

We do not intend to dwell on this subject. The inadequacy of ministerial support has always been an evil in the church, and we presume it will continue to be so. All we have to say is, that it involves a violation of the express command of Christ, and that it is a great injury to the church itself. Ministers must be supported. If they are not supported by their salaries, they must earn money for themselves. This demands a large part of their time and attention, which is so much detracted from their official work; and its tendency, and in many cases its effect, is to secularize the ministry itself. God no doubt will carry on his work, whether his ministers are supported or not. He may furnish men, as he did Paul, with such a plenitude, not only of grace, but of knowledge, and of gifts, that they may, as he did, labor night and day with their own hands, and yet preach the Gospel in season and out of season. But this is not God's ordinance. He requires the church to do its duty, and ministers to do theirs, in sending and preaching the Gospel to every creature.

The second principle above-mentioned is more open to debate, or, at least, is less generally recognized and adopted, and that is, that it is the duty of the church, as a whole, to sustain those of its members whom God calls to preach the Gospel. The grounds on which this obligation rests are:—

1st. That the command of Christ to preach the Gospel is given to the whole church. The obligation which it imposes does not rest exclusively on the clergy. Nor is it satisfied when a man does what he can to secure the knowledge of the Gospel for his own family, or for his immediate neighbors, or for those who

may choose to unite with him in the support of a minister. In times of pestilence and famine, no man feels justified in confining his efforts for relief to those immediately around him. Why then should he not be bound to send the Gospel to those perishing for the bread of life? Not only, therefore, the command of Christ, but the moral obligation which rests upon every man to do what he can to secure the salvation of his fellow-men, prove that our obligation to sustain the Gospel is not limited to the narrow sphere of the congregation to which we happen to belong.

2d. The church is one. It constitutes a body more intimately and permanently united than any other association on earth, not excepting even the family. Believers have not only one Lord, one faith, one baptism, and one God and Father of all, but they are members of the mystical body of Christ by the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, so that, as the Apostle says, if one member suffer, all the members suffer with it, and if one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it. The consciousness of this unity, sympathy with our fellow-believers, a readiness to help them, is laid down in Scripture as a principal evidence of our own union with Christ. "Hereby we know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren." "He that seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?"

3d. Ministers are ordained to the service of the whole church, not to that of a particular congregation. When a man receives a commission in the army of the United States, he is a servant of the general government. He may be sent first to one place and then to another. He receives his support, not from the particular community whom he may be sent to protect, but from the general government, whose servant he is, and whom he is bound to obey. In like manner the minister is the servant of the church as a whole. He is bound to obey the church. His obligation is not limited to the particular congregation to which he is sent to preach. And, therefore, the obligation to provide for his support is not limited to that congregation. It rests upon the body to whom his service belongs, and to whom it is rendered.

4th. This principle has been generally recognized in the church, although it has not always been carried into effect. During the Apostolic age the effective operative laborers, those at least of whom we have any special mention in the New Testament, were not pastors of particular churches, but men without charge, who went wherever the Providence of God presented an open door, and who were supported by the general contributions of the churches. The idea, borrowed from congregational independency, that local pastors are the only real ministers of the church, and are alone authorized to exercise the prerogatives of ministers, is utterly foreign to the New Testament economy. So far as we know there is not a single local pastor named in the New Testament, unless James of Jerusalem be an exception. Such pastors may be mentioned in the salutations appended to some of the Epistles, but they were not the men that did the great work of the church during the Apostolic age. This fact is not referred to to depreciate the pastoral office. In the present state of the church it is indispensable, and its value above all estimate. The fact referred to is here adduced simply as evidence that the Apostles gave no sanction to the principle that the preachers of the Gospel were to rely for their support on the congregations to whom they preached. The great work of extending the Gospel was carried on by men who had no such congregations, and, therefore, were supported by their own labor or by general contributions. Even Paul acknowledges the contributions which he received time and again from churches with which he had no pastoral relations.

As under the old dispensation the priests and Levites were supported by a sustentation fund derived from the general contributions of the people, so throughout the greater part of the history of the Christian church the clergy have not been left to depend upon their several separate congregations. Their support was derived either from the resources of the church or of the state. The entire separation of church and state is a modern idea. A Christian community organized in one form and for one purpose was a state, and the same community organized in another form and for a different purpose was a church. The functions of these organizations

were not sharply defined or distinct, as the community as such felt bound to uphold both tables of the Decalogue, and, therefore, to provide for the maintenance of the true religion. We, in keeping the two organizations distinct, have, in a manner, lost sight of the idea that we are a community, a united whole, having common obligations, and especially the obligation of securing the preaching of the Gospel to all classes of the people.

5th. Apart, however, from all other considerations, it is decisive in support of the principle in question, that no church can fulfil the great duty of preaching the Gospel to the poor, which adopts the plan of making the preacher depend for his support on those to whom he preaches. This is almost self-evident. It is, at any rate, an historical fact, that no church does, or ever has, effectually reached the poor which acts on that plan. The opposite plan is adopted by the Romanists, in the Church of Scotland, in Prussia, and by the Methodists. The illustrious Chalmers knew that it would never do to allow the free church to depend exclusively upon their separate congregations, and, therefore, before the separation, he had, with a constructive genius equal to that of Wesley, organized an effective plan for a sustentation fund, so that those who left their pleasant manse and fixed stipends, were assured of at least an adequate support. We cannot shut our eyes to this fact. We have our Board of Domestic Missions to aid feeble congregations; we send missionaries to the heathen, and assume the responsibility of supporting them. We know and admit that we cannot do our duty to the poor without departing from the principle of making our ministers dependent on the people to whom they preach. The complaint is, that we cling to that principle to a degree which prevents our doing our whole duty. We fail in adequately reaching the poor. We fail to a far greater degree than those churches which boldly recognize the opposite principle. We cannot deny the fact that in our cities and larger towns the poor are not in our churches. We cannot get them in. They will not occupy "free seats" set apart for their accommodation. They instinctively go with their class.

How is this evil to be remedied? How is the Presbyterian

Church to be made a church which eharacteristically and pre-eminently preaches the Gospel to the poor? Without pretending to give an exhaustive answer to this question, this much may be safely assumed:—

1st. We must adopt and faithfully earry out the principle that every man who is ealled of God to the work of the ministry, and devotes himself to his work, shall receive an adequate support. This does not mean that every man ordained to the ministry shall be supported by the chureh. Many men thus ordained are found disqualified for the office, and should be allowed to demit it. Others are disabled by sickness and infirmity. These should, perhaps, be plaeced on the retired list (as is done in the army), and suitably provided for. Others, again, are in whole or in part engaged in secular pursuits, and get a support in that way. Others are professors in our literary institutions, although often effective and diligent preachers of the Gospel. These limitations greatly reduce the number of ordained ministers who are entitled to look to the church for their support. But the principle remains, that all whom God calls to preach the Gospel, and who are devoted to that work, the church, as a whole, or in its eollective capacity, is bound to support, provided that support be not otherwise secured.

2d. A support being thus provided, the Presbyteries should exercise the prerogative, which belongs to them, of assigning a field of labor to all their unoccpied ministers and licentiates.

3d. There should in all our large cities, and wherever necessity ealls for them, be established absolutely free churches. To these the people may come without restraint; and when made the subjects of grace, they will gladly of their poverty aid in sending the Gospel to others. Not long since a minister who had declined the most flattering ealls elsewhere, determined to try and establish a church among the most degraded class of the population of Glasgow. Such a chureh was gathered, and in a few years became the parent of several others in the same neighborhood.

4th. Besides such free churches, there should be a class of itinerant missionaries going from place to place within a given district, and even preaching the Gospel from house to house.

Forty or fifty years ago this was the principal mode in which our Board of Missions conducted its operations. As a general rule every young man on his licensure took a commission from the Board, and travelled about preaching in destitute places for six months, or a year, or for a longer period.

5th. This plan requires no new organization to carry it into effect. All that is necessary is that the Board of Domestic Missions should be authorized and enabled to promise every man, approved by the church, and devoted to the work of preaching the Gospel, an adequate support; and that the several Presbyteries should see to it, that all their ministers and licentiates, capable of service, should be diligently employed.

6th. The location and control of ministers and licentiates being thus distributed among the Presbyteries, there would be no concentration of power in one central Board, which is not only inconsistent with the principles of Presbyterianism, but, as experience teaches, is liable to great abuse.

We do not see that any formidable objections can be urged against this plan. It does not propose any equalization in the salaries of ministers. Every church would remain at liberty to give its pastor what salary it pleased. This might be done while enough was given to others to enable them to live. There are rich and poor in every other department of life and always have been. The same is true with regard to the ministry. Such is the will of God as revealed in his providence, "The poor ye have always with you." It would be chimerical to attempt to change this ordinance. It is a consolation to know that the poor are often as happy and as useful as the rich. It has been urged as an objection to this plan, that if a minister is independent of his people as to his support, he will not work. It is a sufficient answer to that objection that our foreign missionaries are independent of the people to whom they are sent, and yet they work. There are other principles of action in all men than the desire of support; and ministers are no exception to that rule. Besides, ministers are responsible to their Presbyteries, whose duty it is to see that all their members are faithful. The dependence therefore would only be shifted from the people to the Presbytery.

The ideas contained in this short paper, have been long be-

fore the churches. At the time of the disruption of the Church of Scotland, Dr. Chalmers published a pamphlet on "Church Economics" in which all these ideas are stated and expanded. Mr. James Lenox of New York caused an edition of that pamphlet to be printed in this country, and a copy to be sent to every minister of our church. It is to be hoped that the seed thus sown will yet bring forth its appropriate fruit.

---

ART. VI.—*Jonathan Dickinson and Dickinson Hall.\**

It is a saying of Lord Bacon, that "the works or acts of merit toward learning are conversant about three objects: the places of learning, the books of learning, and the persons of the learned." A distinguished act of merit toward the places of learning has brought us together for this dedicatory service. A building, in the Baconian phraseology, "beautiful and adorned with accomplishments for magnificence and state as well as for use and necessity," has been reared by the bounty of one patron and friend of the college. Not to mark such an event in the academic history of the time with appropriate ceremonies, would be to show a most unscholarly indifference and a most culpable insensibility to a very munificent act, and to miss a fine opportunity for cultivating a spirit of generous loyalty to this honored institution. For, as the spirit of loyalty to the state is educed and strengthened by the observance of national occasions, so the spirit of loyalty to seats of learning is ever promoted by proper academic occasions and ceremonial. Not to mark such an event by religious rites—by an act of solemn and prayerful dedication to Almighty God—would be alike untrue to the spirit and aims of the founders, and to the genuine academic spirit itself, since that is rooted and grounded in Christian faith,

\* An Address delivered at the dedication of Dickinson Hall, in Princeton College, by the Rev. J. O. Murray, D. D., New York City, and published here by our request.—EDITORS.