

# THE HOME MISSION JOURNAL

VOLUME V. No 13

ST. JOHN. N. B., JULY 9, 1903.

WHOLE No 117.

## An Interpret'd Letter.

From the Reverend John Hopkins to his True Son in the Faith, the Reverend Timothy Going, A. B., A. M., Ph. D.

### PART II.

But, if you will pardon an obvious remark, Timothy, new methods are one thing and new standards are another. It is with your new standards that I make my quarrel. "Ministers must consent to be judged by something like the commercial standard of success nowadays," you say. My dear Timothy, I am afraid I do not at all know what you mean by that. Or, rather, I am afraid I do know. Have you perhaps, been attending some Christian workers' convention and heard from the general secretary of the A. B. C. D. Society that the minister who is not a "hustler" is a failure; that he who baptizes fifty converts in a year is ten times more successful than he who baptizes five; that whatever the pastor's record on high may be, his fellow Christians are judging him by the statistical tables of the annual report of his church; that the only result of faithfulness these strenuous times can afford to put to his account is that which figures will support? I can read between the lines of your letter, son Timothy, the confession that you have gone home from a public meeting at which "successful" ministers have discussed "The Demands of the Twentieth Century Upon the Ministry of To-day," to count solicitously upon your ten fingers the possible evidences of your own success or failure as a good minister of Jesus Christ. And finding that ten fingers were enough and to spare in the mortifying recital, you have set your teeth in the stern resolve that henceforth you will "hustle" for accessions to your church membership, for increased pew rentals and missionary contributions, for larger Sunday evening congregations and brisker prayer-meetings and more frequent newspaper notices. Yes, yes, Timothy! Your "new standard" explains your "new methods." This is why you propose to put your ushers into uniform and to buy a stereopticon and to distribute chromos of "scripture scenes" at the church door. This is why you argue with me that a comely young woman who has received of the Lord a talent for whistling should be encouraged to consecrate this precious gift to the service of the sanctuary and be employed, at a reasonable compensation, to lure sinners into the kingdom by warbling softly through pursed-up lips "Nearer, my God, to Thee." It is the commercial standard of success that compels ministers to provoke public attention by bargain day advertisements of their services, to preach series of Sunday evening sermons on "Teachings of the Trolley Cars," to announce publicly that the Lord has promised them exactly 100 converts before Easter Sunday shall come around.

My heart is heavy at the shameful enumeration and I will not pursue it. I do not charge the grossest of these "display ads" upon you. You have not yet fallen so low. Be warned in time and repudiate this counsel of evil. He who assumes that you will consent to be judged by the "numerical" standard, the "tangible results" standard, the "quick returns" standard, puts upon you an indignity which you ought to resent with a righteous scorn.

For a church, though it should be honorably enterprising and aggressive, is not primarily a business enterprise, and should the discipline of Christ who ministers to it, envy the commercial traveler the success he gains by "push" and a glib tongue; and the relentless crowding to the wall of competitors. The twentieth century has not made obsolete the injunction that the man of God should follow him after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness, whatever else he may gain or lose.

Is this counsel too high for you, my dear Timothy? Are you still thinking of "what your people have a right to expect from you?" Who gave them that right? Admitted that a business

man is successful who increases his profits 100 per cent in twelve months. It does not follow that the minister is successful who in the same time doubles the contributions and the membership of the church. It depends. A pulpit mountebank may report these gains. Nay, it is precisely this success to which the pulpit mountebank is always making his appeal for the justification of his methods. We have already agreed, son Timothy, that facts are facts. Let us not shut our eyes to facts like these: The F. St. Church has a boom under a popular and talented young stranger. Rejoicing converts are baptized in platoons and the meeting-house, once always empty on Sunday evenings, is now crowded to the doors. So marked a success justifies the trustees in building a gallery and putting in electric lights and engaging a cornetist and making a large appropriation for flowers. By and by, there is an unexpected and mysterious ministerial resignation, followed by the unexpected but inevitable financial collapse. The inflated congregation collapses also. Perhaps the case is even worse. There may follow a secession, a church council, a scandal. Is it difficult to fix the responsibility and the blame? When the pews serve notice on the pulpit that it is by "the commercial standard" that the pulpit is to be adjudged a failure or a success, the pews are putting a premium upon charlatanism and inviting irreparable disaster.

You have been taking counsel of foolish men, son Timothy. You have gone astray after false gods. Drag down these base ideals and cast them to the bats and owls. Come to a plain understanding with yourself that you do not care at all what estimate the commercial world puts upon your ministry, since one is your master, even Christ. In that hour of high resolution you will become a free man, and you will take up the burden of your heavy responsibilities again with a light heart.

And here I must stop. I do not say "end," for there is still much matter belonging to this topic. But I am writing a letter, not a "Treatise on the Elements of a Worthy Ministerial Success."

Will you consider the claims of Brankton when vacation plans are under discussion? You might go further and fare worse.

Faithfully your friend,

JOHN HOPKINS.

## Pope Leo vs. The New Testament.

By O. P. Eaches.

On his ninety-third birthday Pope Leo gave to the world a Latin hymn—the final prayer of Leo. It closes with these words:

"That I may see thy face, Heaven's Queen, whose Mother love Has brought me home above. To thee, saved through the tangles of a perilous way I lift my grateful lay."

The New Testament everywhere gives Christ a pre-eminence. The Almighty Father says: "This is my beloved son" (Matt 3:17). The saints in heaven have two names on their lips, the name of the Father, the name of the Redeemer (Rev. 5). Jesus is the name above every name (Phil. 2:9). Jesus declared that through Him alone is access to God (John 14:6). Jesus is the way to eternal blessedness. Paul affirms that Christ is that one through whom the creation took place (Col. 1:15-17). The letters to the Hebrews reveals Christ as upholding all things (1:3). In the entire New Testament Christ shines out, the one resplendent figure, revealing God, forgiving sin, summing up all things in Himself (Eph. 1:10). Peter, the asserted founder of the Romish Church, declared that there is no other name through which we may be saved (Acts 4:12).

Pope Leo finds no room in his closing prayer for the name of Christ at all. He longs for a sight of God's face.

"That God's face and light May ever thrill my sight."

But the consummation is to be reached through the Queen of Heaven, the Virgin Mother. It is not strange that in some of the devotional books in Spain and in Cuba and Porto Rico the name of Mary has almost entirely displaced that of Jesus. The supreme pontiff, the head of the Church, the spiritual leader of two hundred million people, has so completely ignored the name and work of Jesus, we need not wonder that Mary has taken the place that Jesus ought to occupy in the minds of the common people.

Leo gives foundation for the worship of the creature rather than the Creator of salvation, Jesus Christ. Jesus and Mary walked side by side in the New Testament history. Jesus said, "I and my Father are one;" "I am the resurrection and the life;" "I give unto them eternal life." There came a resurrection and an ascension. We behold Mary in a conspiracy to take Jesus from his work, charging him with derangement (Mark 3:21-33). We see her in a prayer-meeting, praying to the ascended Christ (Acts 1:14-24). Mary put herself in the right attitude toward the Son, recognizing him as the Lord. What Leo writes would be utterly incomprehensible to her. She was "Blessed among women" because the mother of the Saviour, but she was a woman. Leo attributes to Mary all that belongs to the Redeemer as an upbuilding and guiding power in life. From the perils and bewilderingments of life he is rescued, not by God's providence and the Redeemer's intercession (Rom. 8:27) but through the watchful care of a woman. Mary, to him, is providence and guidance and deliverance and ultimate salvation. To her must be attributed an everywhere presence—otherwise she could not so guide an imperilled soul. Words are things. This poem that seems to have an atmosphere of supreme devotion to God, that longs for God's face—must yet work out in Catholic countries a power that makes for utterly false views of Christianity.

It is a Christianity that has, in a formal poem that speaks of the soul's ascent to God, no place for the recognition of Jesus. It displaces the Christ and puts in his place a woman, a creature. It clothes her, in reality, with the power and wisdom of a controlling providence; it makes of her a goddess.

In a theological paper the Pope would doubtless affirm an incarnation, a sacrifice for sin, a divinity in Jesus. But there is a monstrous perversion of the New Testament teaching, when in a poem that gives the dying thoughts of that man who claims to be the vice-gerent of God, He is intentionally pushed aside that the mother, Mary, be seen as the crowned Queen. God's face and Mary's face are alone seen by Leo. He thus scatters darkness, dishonor to Christ, blasphemous claims for a woman, false conceptions of the method of salvation in the minds of millions of worshippers. Newman, in his Church History, says: "As pagans had been accustomed to worship a host of gods and goddesses, they felt the need, after becoming Christians, of numerous objects of adoration. The most honored characters of the early apostolic and succeeding times were, of course, selected, such as Mary, the mother of Christ; the apostles and other martyrs." Mary-worship is the off-spring of paganism. A right conception of Jesus finds in Him the strong Son of God, Judge of all, and a tenderness that is motherly; He needs no woman advocate. Hebrews 4:16 and Leo's poem are at infinite remove from each other. This poem makes war upon all the standard hymns of the ages, upon "All hail the power of Jesus' name," upon "My faith looks up to thee," upon "Jesus, lover of my soul," upon the song of Moses and the Lamb (Rev. 15:3). Mariolatry and an intelligent conception of Christianity are irreconcilably opposed to each other. They cannot live together.

The peace of God is not something that he puts into your hearts and that you must keep that it may keep you. If the peace of God is to rule in my heart it is because the God of peace himself is there.—Andrew Murray.