

while the gospel can barely keep body and soul together, and is a genteel beggar, by whom "the smallest donations are thankfully received." "Indemnity, not compensation!"

Now this may be all right, just as it ought to be, the best plan for the churches and for the ministers, and the most acceptable to the Master. If so, it will bear looking into, and it will be better for all parties to "know the reason why." Some discontented labourers may be satisfied, and some uneasy consciences among the givers quieted, by an examination of the matter.

We do not know that the Scriptures will positively settle the question. It does indeed lay down the broad general law,—“The Lord hath ordained that they which preach the gospel should *live* of the gospel;” but how much that “live” means, we are not told. Some light may be found in the provision made for the priests and Levites of old, which in the passage just quoted (1 Cor. ix., 3–11) is made the argument and pattern for the gospel-preacher’s maintenance. That provision was very liberal, one-tenth part of the produce of the land, besides other gifts and privileges. And does not the burden of proof lie on those who may say that the new dispensation is less generous than the old? Again, as ministers are servants of the churches “for Jesus’ sake,” not mere hirelings of these companies of fellow-christians, it is in place to ask,—How does the Master reward His servants? Does He weigh deserts exactly? Does He give no more than bare subsistence? or does He “give freely,” “as a King?” And again, as it is said that “a bishop must be the husband of one wife,” “given to hospitality,” and “one that ruleth well his own house,” it would seem that his scale of household expenditure should hardly be framed on the model of a workhouse or almshouse, but rather on that of the establishment of any other industrious and useful citizen.

It is a first principle in the right understanding of the Bible, especially of the New Testament, that it presupposes “an honest heart” in those to whom it is addressed; the spirit which says, “Lord, what will Thou have me to do?” It lays down general principles, and confides their application to “sanctified common sense.” If any one desires to wriggle out of a particular duty, nothing is easier than to “wrest the Scriptures” to please himself. Now, if there be no specific rule on this subject, in what direction does the Bible point? in that of liberality or parsimony? How does it speak of the service rendered? does it put work done for the soul in a lower place than that done for the body or estate? How does it speak of the office? is it high and honourable, or one of inferior degree? How does it speak of the regard due to the teacher by the taught? is it generously grateful, or suspiciously grinding? We could answer all these questions by Scripture quotations, but we do not deem it needful. Our readers surely know their Bibles well enough to do that for themselves.

Is there anything in the nature of the case that requires the adoption of the “not compensation” principle? In that of the member of Parliament