

Our Contributors.

THE MAIN ELEMENTS OF SUCCESS.

BY KNOXONIAN.

The president of the New York Central Railway stated the other day that the main elements of success in this world are

GOOD SENSE, GOOD TEMPER AND MINDING YOUR OWN BUSINESS.

No doubt President Depew is good authority on the question of success. He has succeeded himself. The Central is a great railway, and its president must be a great railway man. The owners and managers of a railway like the Central don't make a man president simply because he is a nice fellow. Bowing and scraping and kissing the babies don't count for anything in the management of great railways. No man can smile himself into the presidency of a great railway company. A man may smile himself into a mayor's chair, or into a seat in Parliament, or into a snug pastorate, but he can't smile himself into a railway presidency. Railway people want a president who can look after their money, and when people choose a man to look after their money, they are very likely to choose him on his merits. When a man who has been pre-eminently successful in his own line tells us what the elements of success are, he should have a respectful hearing. The most dismal failures are always ready enough to lecture on success, and blame others for not succeeding, but their vapouring never throws much light on the subject. The right man to speak on success is the man who has succeeded. Men of that kind usually speak with marked modesty. They know how hard it is to get on the highest rung of the ladder, and they usually sympathize with all honest climbers.

President Depew is of the opinion that the first element of success is

GOOD SENSE.

This is not the popular idea. Most people think that brilliance, eloquence, shining ability of some kind, is far more important than sense. They are sadly mistaken. Count the number of men who have succeeded in any department of life and nine out of every ten of them are men more noted for sense than for brilliance. Brilliant men have done very little for the world or the Church. They may dazzle fools, but dazzling fools is not a very useful kind of work. A comet is not of as much use to the world as a common lamp. Eloquence without sense never does much good. Zeal without sense is dangerous. There is no more troublesome and dangerous man in a Church than a man of fiery zeal and no sense. Compared with him the most moderate of moderates is a pleasant and useful parishioner. Ability of any kind without sense never does much good and often does a great deal of harm. Sense is indispensable to good work in any department. How is it that people never pray for good sense? Is it because so many of us haven't sense enough to know we need sense? That may be one reason. The people who think they don't need any more sense always need it the most.

The next element is

GOOD TEMPER.

Aye, there's the rub. By good temper the president no doubt means a temper that can stand to be rasped without being ruffled. A good-tempered man is one who can keep cool while he is contradicted and badgered and bullied and belied and abused in several other ways. It does require a good temper to keep cool under such a visitation as that. No doubt a man who can smother his feelings and keep down anger under provocation has a tremendous advantage over one who can't. But it may well be questioned if he is often a better man than one who gets angry. Some men keep cool under provocation because they know it is a good policy and because they are waiting for a chance to get even. They always do get even sooner or later. Some men have physical temperaments that keep cool without any effort. An oyster never gets excited. A clam is always cool. A clam is not a nobler animal than a lion. A man may keep cool because he has nothing in him to get hot. Small credit to him for not getting in a passion if he can't. Still it must be admitted that a good temper is a powerful element of success. People are always ready to help what they call "a

good-natured fellow." Opening the safety valve occasionally and taking a healthy blow off does not hinder a man's worldly success much, but constant petulance, peevishness and general bad temper is almost certain to keep him on the lowest rungs.

MINDING YOUR OWN BUSINESS

is the climax in this arrangement of the elements that make success. Perhaps it was made the climax because it is such a difficult thing to do and because there is so little of it done. With some people it is an utter impossibility because they have no business of their own to mind. Being utterly useless and absolutely idle, they attend heroically to the affairs of their neighbours. As they sponge a living out of other people the very least they may do is attend to other people's affairs. Of course there is no use in telling a man who has no business of his own to mind his own business. His business is to burrow in other people's business, and he always attends to it.

There is another class with whom minding their own business is almost an impossibility. This class is composed of those benevolent and large-minded people who think they can discharge the duties of their neighbours better than their neighbours can. The most odious members of this class are the people who keep a conscience for the regulation of their neighbours' conduct. The number of people who have time and leisure to attend to their neighbours' business, though some of them utterly fail in their own, is wonderful. There must be about 2,000,000 of people in Canada who think they can manage the affairs of this Dominion better than Sir John Macdonald, and 1,000,000 who could govern Ontario better than Mr. Mowat. Nearly every sane person in Ontario who is not an infant could edit a newspaper better than the editor. The number of ministers who can manage a college, but cannot take care of a congregation is wonderful. The worst thing about attending to our neighbours' affairs is that it does not pay. If it did millionaires would be as plentiful in Canada as grasshoppers in a Kansas cornfield.

Young man, mark this fact.—Burrowing in your neighbour's business does not pay. It does not bring influence or money, but it does bring an occasional and well-deserved application of the toe of somebody's boot.

IS CHRIST OR PETER THE FOUNDATION OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH?

BY THE REV. R. WALLACE.

(Concluded.)

Dr. Christopher Wordsworth, Bishop of Lincoln, one of the ablest and most learned writers of the age, says, "The end and aim of his question is not Peter, but Christ." Here is the clue to the interpretation of our Lord's words to Peter, "On this Petra I will build My Church." And hence we are led to believe that the rock is Christ. Again in the Old Testament, as far as the word "rock" is used figuratively as a foundation to build upon (as it is used here), it is used of God. (It is thus used more than a dozen times in Deut. xxxii. 4, 15; Psa. xviii. 2, 31; xxxvi. 2; lxii. 2; 2 Sam. xxii. 2, 32, etc.) The language of the New Testament is similar, "That rock was Christ" (1 Cor. x. 4.). In Matt. vii. 24, 25, we are told that he who builds on Christ's words builds on a rock. And in 1 Cor. iii. 11, Paul says, "Other foundation can no man lay than that which lieth," that is laid, as the apostles are laid, on the foundation Jesus Christ, that is He who is Jesus as Man and Christ as the Son of the living God, which is Peter's confession here. What Christ says is this: "I Myself, now confessed by thee to be both God and Man, am the Rock of the Church. This is the foundation on which the Church is built." And because Peter had confessed Him as such, He says to Peter, "Thou hast confessed Me, and I will now confess thee. Thou art a genuine petros of Me, the Divine Petra. And whosoever would be a living stone—a Peter—must imitate thee in this true confession of Me, the Living Rock; for upon the Rock, that is, on Myself believed and confessed to be both God and Man, I will build My Church." The declaration in 1 Cor. iii. 11, that the Church has no other foundation than Christ decides the matter that Peter cannot be meant here as the foundation of the Church; for God's Word never contradicts itself, and all other passages relative to the foundation of the Church must therefore be explained in har-

mony with this plain statement of divine truth that Christ is the only foundation of the Church in accordance with the primary rule of interpretation, that all figurative language must be brought into harmony with the plain grammatical statements of Divine truth. There is no need to make such a concession that Peter is the rock here referred to; for there is no force in the statement that our Lord spoke in Syriac and used kepha in both clauses, for the Holy Spirit inspired the sacred writer to change the term when writing in Greek.

In some fifty passages of Scripture the term "is" is used for "represent" as when Joseph says, "The seven ears are seven years," and when our Lord says "This is My body," that is, represents seven years, represents My body; and these may be taken as somewhat analogous to the case before us. Observe, our Lord says: "Thou art Petros," a stone, in the masculine, and then changing the term to the feminine, He says: "And upon this Petra I will build my Church." Dr. J. J. Owen says: "The word Petra, here translated rock, has the generic sense of a mass of rock, and is never used in the signification of Petros [Peter] a single stone. It is employed here, not only to distinguish the word from Petros, the proper name in 'Thou art Peter,' but as more consistent with the idea of foundation, which in the case of edifices designed to be durable, was composed, if possible, of the living rock." Dr. George Townsend says: "The word Petros, in its highest figurative sense of a stone, when applied to Peter, can represent only one true believer, or faithful member of Christ's Church; that is, one out of the great multitude of true believers in Christ, who figurative stones, form altogether the glorious, spiritual building of Christ's Church, and not the foundation on which that Church is built; because that figurative character cannot, consistently with truth, be applied to any other person than to God, or to Christ alone. A due consideration also of the second noun Petra, a rock, will demonstrate that the supreme title of the rock, which in other texts of Holy Scripture is applied to Jehovah or God alone, most certainly was not intended by our Lord to be understood as applicable to His disciple Peter, but only to that true testimony which Peter had just before declared concerning the divine dignity of the Messiah, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God!' Dr. William Smith, in his "New Testament History" says: "The true interpretation is to be found in the Hebrew custom of giving significant names, not solely, nor even chiefly, to ascribe qualities in the persons who bore them, but to commemorate truths in which they were concerned. It is simply absurd to insist on finding in the words 'Thou art Peter,' the necessary antecedent to 'On this rock will I build my Church.' The true connection is this, Thou art rightly called Peter, for thou hast uttered a confession which embodies the foundation of Christian truth, the Divine Nature and the Messiahship of Jesus Christ, and upon this rock will I build My Church. The concurrent testimony, both of prophecy and the New Testament, points to Christ Himself as the rock and the only foundation of His Church; and surely it must be His strength and not Peter's which forms a basis too steadfast for the powers of destruction (the gates of Hades) to prevail against. But still, in a secondary sense, the apostles are spoken of, together with the prophets, as the foundation on which the Church is built, but in subordination to Christ, the chief corner stone; and in this sense Peter himself forms one of the first stones of the edifice, of which he himself calls all believers living stones (1 Peter ii. 5). His position in the Church is then illustrated by another figure (verse 19) which has been equally perverted, as if the servant who has charge of the keys of the house were almost on a level with the Master Himself. The event furnished the simple and natural interpretation when on the day of Pentecost Peter was the first to admit a multitude of the believing Jews; and afterwards in the home of Cornelius, a number of Gentile proselytes into the Christian Church. He did both as the organ of the other apostles, who shared his action in the first case, and confirmed it in the second; for to them afterward Christ gave the same privilege that He now gave to Peter. The only distinction between him and the other apostles is priority in time, corresponding to the priority in his confession of Christ."

We should mark the language of Bishop Wordsworth on 1 Corinthians iii. 11, "Other foundation can no man lay than that which lieth, not is laid, as