

Our Contributors.

MINISTERIAL SUCCESS—ITS SOURCE AND CHANNELS.

BY KNOXIAN.

A few days ago Dr. Howard Crosby's congregation celebrated his twentieth anniversary as pastor of the Fourth Avenue Church, New York. Dr. Crosby is one of New York's strongest ministers. One of his specialties is war to the knife against the saloon. He is a high license man and does not believe that the country is ready for prohibition. In fact there is some reason to doubt whether he believes in the principles of legal prohibition. Be that as it may, Dr. Crosby has, the *New York Evangelist* says, done more to root out saloons than any dozen police captains in the city. For years he has stood between two fires. The saloon keepers fire into him on one side and the advanced prohibitionists on the other. He stands fire well. He seldom returns the fire but when he does somebody always feels that something has struck him. Besides being chancellor of the New York University, a learned and voluminous writer, and a number of other good things, Dr. Crosby is a good pastor and very able preacher. His congregation contributes about \$17,000 a year for missionary and benevolent objects, and spend about \$18,000 for congregational purposes. There is not a very rich man among them. Under Dr. Crosby's pastorate the membership has risen from 120 to 1,600, including the membership of the mission stations worked by the congregation.

In his brief address at the anniversary meeting Dr. Crosby made some observations that may be very useful to ministers and congregations. It was a touching and instructive address, and the egotism and boasting too frequently found in speeches on such occasions were conspicuous by their absence. Some men can afford to let their work speak and Dr. Crosby is one of them. A small man needs to tell people that he did the work because no one would suspect that he did anything in particular unless told. Dr. Crosby is a large enough man to ascribe his success to the right

SOURCE.

He said :

The one thought, dear brethren, that is on my mind to-night, while I thank these dear brethren who have come and saluted us, and thank you for your kindness in instituting this anniversary festivity—the one thought I would have us all entertain is the wonderful grace of God, which is the source of all that is good. If there has been anything at all good in this ministry, I can recognize that grace as especially exhibiting itself through three channels.

That is the right spirit. Standing where Dr. Crosby stood and honoured as he was, some men would have ascribed the success mainly to their own exertions. The Ego would have stuck out in every sentence. Their whole speech might be condensed into one short sentence—See what great things I have done in twenty years. Dr. Crosby is content to sink the Ego and ascribe it all to the wonderful grace of God.

This grace, he says, flowed through three channels.

THE FIRST CHANNEL.

First, my own dear father and mother, who brought me up from my earliest childhood in the fear of the Lord, and who prayed for me from the beginning that I should be a minister of the Gospel of Christ.

In these days when so much is said about theological education, and "full courses," and "degrees," and "scholarships," and "honours," it is refreshing to see a great, strong, successful man like Dr. Crosby stand up before the world and declare that his father and mother had something to do with making him the minister that he is. A mere clerical prig could not afford to say that. His imbecility would be a reflection on his parents. The great day may reveal that praying fathers and mothers have had much more to do with ministerial success than university degrees. Behind the *alma mater* there has often been another *mater* whose prayers, instruction, and example have done more to help the minister in his work than all the colleges on earth could do. One of the blighting, withering curses of this age and country is to exalt the school, the college, the society, the association, at the expense of the home. When fathers and mothers cease to consecrate their sons to the ministry by prayer, even B.D. examinations will not turn out many effective ministers.

THE SECOND CHANNEL.

Secondly, the loving regard and fellowship and example of those dear brethren with whom I associate from day to day, and from whom I learn so much.

That is one of the undoubted advantages of having a pastorate in a large city. There are some disadvantages but it is a great thing to have constant intercourse with successful ministers working in the same line as yourself. Mere ecclesiastical gossip is as debilitating as any other kind of gossip, but an hour's talk with a leading minister about the last good book published or an hour spent in dividing texts with a preacher who knows how to divide them, is a tonic. Tonics of that kind are good.

THE THIRD CHANNEL.

Thirdly, your own constant, faithful, sympathetic upholding, your unwearied Christian labours, your consistent example to me, your pastor. No pastor could help being fervent, if not faithful, with such a constituency as you are always with him.

A weak brother could not have put in that "thirdly." He could not afford to say that his congregation "upheld" him. His business would be to try to prove that he could uphold himself. No wonder Dr. Crosby is a successful minister. Almost any man would succeed with a live congregation "upholding" him *sympathetically, faithfully and constantly*. And the people show him a consistent "example." Too frequently the pastor is expected to show all the "example" himself.

This anniversary celebration proves once more that the congregation has about as much to do with making a minister as the minister has to do with making the congregation. That may be one reason why some ministers are never fully made.

THE JESUITS.

BY REV. R. F. BURNS, D.D., HALIFAX.

JESUITS THINK ALIKE.

We are perfectly aware that the accused will answer that we should not judge of the Order by the sentiments of individual members. They will grant the accuracy of the quotations we have made, but demur to the conclusion that collectively or as a whole they are responsible. Now we frankly admit that in ordinary cases such a line of argument as that we have printed would lie justly open to this objection. It is not right to judge of an entire body by the published sentiments of individual members. But the case before us is altogether out of the ordinary run.

So rigid is the oversight exercised by General and Superiors that the Jesuit mind is stereotyped. There is no room for difference of opinion. Everyone is compelled to think and feel and act alike. Cast in the same iron mould the shape which each assumes exactly corresponds.

This unity amongst Jesuits is like that of Romanists at large, a ground of glorying on their part. Harken to the ill-suppressed exultation of a man of mark amongst them, the compiler of the history of the Society's doings during the first century of its existence.

"The members of the Society are dispersed through every corner of the world—distinguished by as many nations and kingdoms as the earth has intersections; but this is a division arising from diversity of place, not of opinion, a difference of language, not of affection, a dissimilarity of countenance, not of morals. In this association the Latin thinks with the Greek, the Portuguese with the Brazilian, the Irishman with the Sarmatian, the Englishman with the Belgian, and among so many different dispositions there is no strife, no contention, nothing which affords opportunity of discovering that they are more than one. The same design, the same manner of life, the same uniting vow combine them." They also directly appeal to their writings as the source whence their sentiments on all subjects are to be learned. In defending his Order against the assaults of its foes Gretser exclaims: "There are many theological works written by the doctors of the Society. We profess the same doctrine in a vast number of places, both privately and publicly in the schools. It is not from obscure descriptions that an opinion of the doctrines of the Jesuits can be formed, but from their books, which, by the blessing of God, are already very numerous." It is further to be noticed that no Jesuit was allowed to publish a work until it had undergone the inspection and received the imprimatur of the Superior. Booksellers, too, are strictly prohibited from printing and circulating a single page unless it has passed through this ordeal. Every separate book, therefore, is authoritative and speaks the mind of the whole Order.

We go further still. We hesitate not to assert that the Roman Catholic Church, as a whole, is pledged to the principles and implicated in the practices of the Jesuits. We appeal to history. How stands the case? It was by a Bull of the Pope the Order came into existence. In a Bull succeeding the one which gave them birth, Paul III. solemnly invests them with unlimited power to make whatever regulations they pleased, and guarantees as a "special favour" that they will be "approved by the Holy See." This Bull is backed by a succession of others passed in 1549, 1682 and 1684.

Moreover the Council of Trent whose decrees form Rome's present Confession of Faith, hurls its thunderbolts in the shape of anathemas against all and sundry who respect not the Order of Jesus. But nothing on this point can be more explicit than the language of Pope Pius VII. when re-establishing the Order in 1814. "We should feel ourselves guilty, (said he in a formal Bull) of a great crime towards God if amidst these dangers of a Christian Republic, we neglected the aids which the special Providence of God has put at our disposal—and, if placed in the hands of Peter to be separated by continual storms we refused to employ the vigorous and experienced powers who volunteer their services, in order to break the waves of a sea which threaten every moment shipwreck and death.

Let it be remembered also that the fourth and principal vow taken by every Jesuit is that of perpetual and unlimited allegiance to the Pope.

By a line of Bulls then—by the decision of Rome's most celebrated Council—as well as by their own Constitutions and vows, the Jesuits are bound neck and heel to the body of the Papacy.

HERESIES.

FROM THE POSTHUMOUS PAPERS OF THE LATE MR. THOMAS HENNING.

The first important heresy of Germanic origin was that to which the name of Adoptionism has been given, and which originated in Spain. Following up the doctrine about the person of Christ, as it had been defined by the sixth Ecumenical Council of Constantinople, in 680, A.D., it was agreed that the idea of a twofold nature and of a twofold will implied also that of a twofold sonship. Two Spanish prelates, Elipand, of Toledo, and Felix, of Urgel, held that Christ was properly the Son of God, only in reference to His divinity; in reference to His humanity, he was only adopted as Son by

the determination of God. This adoption of his human nature into sonship had commenced at His conception by the Holy Ghost, appeared more fully at His baptism, and had been completed at His resurrection. Pope Adrian I. condemned Adoptionism as essentially akin to the Nestorian heresy 786, A.D. Charlemagne, wishing perhaps to come before the west in the character of Protector of Orthodoxy, also interfered and convoked the celebrated Synod of Frankfort (794), which is almost entitled to the dignity of an Ecumenical Council. It was at once a diet, or parliament of the realm, and an ecclesiastical council, illustrating the close connection that obtained at that time between the Church and the State. Charlemagne was himself present and presided. A large number of Bishops attended from Italy, Germany, Gaul, Britain, and other western lands. The Pope [Adrian] sent two legates as his representatives. The doctrines of Elipand and Felix were fully discussed and condemned.

But a more important act of this council was the rejection of the second Council of Nice, to which the East had given its assent. Image worship had a strong hold on all the population of southern Europe "as the land of the yet unextinguished arts; as the birth place of the new polytheistic Christianity," but was less congenial to the Teutonic mind. The Franks, owing either to "their more profound spirituality of conception, their inclination to the vague, the mystic, the indefinite, or their deadness to the influence of art," revolted from that ardent devotion to images which prevailed throughout the south. Charlemagne and his council reject alike "adoration, worship, reverence and veneration" of images. He will not admit the kneeling before them, the burning of lights or the offering of incense, or the kissing of a lifeless image, though it represent the Virgin and the Child. At the same time he admits images and pictures into churches as ornaments, and as keeping alive the memory of pious men and of pious deeds. Singularly enough the representatives of the Pope made no remonstrance, either against the accuracy, or the conclusion of the council. Many other canons relating both to secular and ecclesiastical affairs were passed, but on these we cannot dwell. We refer to this council of Frankfort chiefly because it offers the first example of that Teutonic independence, in which the clergy appear as feudal beneficiaries around the throne of their temporal liege lord, with but remote acknowledgment of their spiritual sovereign, passing acts not merely without his direct assent, but in contravention, of his declared opinions. At the same time, on the other hand the hierarchy of the Church is advancing far beyond the ancient boundaries of its power; it is imperceptibly, almost unconsciously trenching on temporal ground. While Charlemagne is manifestly lord over the whole mind of the west, yet the Pope, as well as the hierarchy, is also manifestly aggrandised by his policy. "The Frankish Alliance, the dissolution of the degrading connection with the east, the magnificent donation, the acceptance of the Imperial crown from the Pope's hand, the visits to Rome, whether to protect the Pope from his unruly subjects, or for devotion, everything tended to throw a deepening mysterious majesty around the Pope, the more imposing according to the greater distance from which it was contemplated, the more sublime from its indefinite and boundless pretensions."

During the minority of Michael III., surnamed the Drunkard, the son of Theodora, the Byzantine government was administered by Bardas, the uncle of that prince, and brother of the Empress Theodora. Ignatius, the patriarch of Constantinople, had sharply censured the dissolute Bardas, and even refused to admit him to the communion. For this offence, the prelate was deposed and exiled. Photius, the most learned man of his age, was named his successor. With the view of procuring in his favour the influence of Rome, he sent to Pope Nicolas I. a false representation of the circumstances, but after investigation, the Pope declared Ignatius the rightful patriarch of Constantinople. The opposition thus excited against Rome in Constantinople became intense, when shortly after Bulgaria renounced allegiance to the Byzantine Church, and owned that of the Pope. Photius now accused the Church of Rome of various heresies, such as its ordinance of fasting on Saturdays, its permission of the use of milk, of butter and of cheese during Lent, its injunction of clerical celibacy, etc; a council was convened in 867, and the Pope was deposed and excommunicated. The aspect of affairs soon changed. The Emperor Michael was assassinated, and Basil the Macedonian, his murderer and successor, joined the party of Ignatius, and requested Pope Adrian II. to institute a new enquiry.

A Synod held at Constantinople in 869, called by the Latins the eighth Ecumenical Council, condemned Photius and restored Ignatius. The crimes, the calumnies of Photius, who was dragged before the council by the Emperor's guards, were rehearsed before his face. He stood mute; his degradation was at once determined, and so fierce was the resentment that, not content with dipping their pens in the ink with which they were to sign his condemnation, they wrote in the sacramental wine, as it is plainly said, in the blood of Christ. The biographer of Ignatius bitterly deplores the lenity of the council; he does not explain what measures he wished them to adopt, but to their mistimed tenderness he ascribes all the evils of the second elevation of Photius. He interprets the terrible earthquake, which threw down many churches, and furious tempest, as the remonstrances of heaven against this weak leniency. Other signs, on the same authority, glorified the restoration of Ignatius. By a new kind of transubstantiation, the consecrated bread glowed like a live coal from heaven, and the cross over the altar was agitated by a gentle motion.