

CHRISTIAN HERALD.

EDITOR:

J. F. FLOYD.

FRIDAY, JAN. 26, 1883.

Our Needs on the Coast.

Our present needs on this coast are very many, but we only have space and time at this writing to point out a few of the leading ones.

I. We need more preachers. The harvest is plenteous, but the laborers are few. We have here a broad and beautiful field all ready for the harvest. Who will come and gather in the sheaves? Almost daily we receive letters at this office from this State, California and Washington Territory calling for help from our preachers. There are large districts of country where our plea has never been heard and where the people are living almost in the blackest of spiritual darkness, with now and then a disciple who has come from the East and settled down among them. Some of these tell us that they have not heard a sermon preached by our brethren for years. Many of these are taking the HERALD which is a source of much encouragement to them; otherwise they would almost give up in despair. There are also churches all along this coast, some in towns and cities of much importance, who are able and willing to secure good preaching provided the right man for the place can be found. But it is a fact that there are not enough preachers to fill all the places that need preaching, and to evangelize the field. But be it remembered that we do not by any means wish to convey the idea that we do not now have many good and able preachers on this coast; some occupying places of much prominence, for this would be far from the facts in the case. A better and more self-sacrificing class of preachers it has never been our pleasure to meet. But what are all these when compared with the population of the Pacific slope? What we need and what we must have in the near future is enough preaching talent to stem the vast and increasing tide of emigration from every part of the world now pouring in upon us. These people must have the bread of spiritual life, and our resources for spreading the gospel should keep pace with this increase of population. This can only be done by constantly recruiting our

ministerial force. Be it, furthermore, remembered that we do not need mechanically manufactured clergymen possessed of the idea that a thirty minutes declamation on Lord's day is all that is needed. We have not yet reached that point, although when it comes to an appreciation of good preaching, we claim to be in the front ranks.

What we want is men of energy and ability who know what it is to deny themselves and work for the Master, and who are willing to do it. Neither do we need men to come for the purpose of looking on for awhile without feeling a deep interest in our work; but we especially want those who can burn the bridges behind them, as one brother expressed it, and become permanently identified with us and our work, and become thoroughly imbued with our spirit. In this way and this only can we expect to make much headway in building up the churches among us. Let us then as Christ directs, pray the Lord of the harvest that he may send more laborers into the field.

2. We need more money. We don't mean that we are as a people so poor financially, but while we have money, it should be so used that it will accomplish the greatest amount of good. This can only be done by paying and paying well those whom we call to our State and to our work. Then there are those among us who have been here for years whose usefulness could be greatly increased in a more substantial way. The Lord loveth a cheerful giver, and we are told that those who preach the gospel shall live of the gospel.

3. We need more coöperation among the churches. Coöperation is one of the very best ways of spreading the gospel and increasing the finances of the churches. The strong should assist the weak in building up the cause. Then let those churches that are more fortunate in possessing this world's goods be liberal, and willing to look after the prosperity of those who need assistance. We have many things to say on the subject of Missionary work and coöperation, but this must suffice for the present.

The Blessed Virgin.

Week before last the *Catholic Sentinel* made a vigorous attack on the Protestant world and the ministers of Portland in particular, on account of their supposed irreverence for the mother of Jesus,

ridiculed the private study and interpretation of the Scriptures, tried to prove the infallibility of the Pope and the Church, and wound up by declaring that Mormonism and polygamy are the results of the Lutheran Reformation and the free investigation of the Bible. As no one else seemed disposed, we took up the challenge and assumed the responsibility of pointing out some of the absurdities of Romanism and the true principles of apostolic Christianity. This week the *Sentinel* comes to our office with considerable space devoted to our special benefit under the caption "The Christian Herald." This time the editor confines his article to the "Blessed Virgin." A few paragraphs only demand attention, and we number them and reply to each separately.

1. We will do the "HERALD" the justice of acknowledging that this time, at least, he does not say that, in the honor we pay to the B. Virgin, there is idolatry. That is so much gained.

Don't go too fast friend; we might say a great deal more about the idolatrous feature of such honor than we have said. But we would like to have the *Sentinel* to define idolatry, and then tell us the difference between it and the honor they do to the B. Virgin. It might turn out that he has not gained so much after all. Will the *Sentinel* also tell us exactly what in the honor they pay to the Virgin consists? Please do not overlook these points as we wish to give them our attention.

2. But, when quoting what we had written, the editor of the "HERALD," should not give as our words the very expressions of the Holy Fathers of the Church.

If the editor of the *Sentinel* does not indorse the words of the "Holy Fathers of the Church" in reference to the Blessed Virgin, why did he quote them to prove his point? We did not say they were his words; yet in the very next sentence he tells us, "When THEY speak of the Mother of God with tender love and filial reverence, we, undoubtedly think the Protestant world irreverent because the latter do not look at the mother of our Savior with this same reverence." Then in this, as is the custom of Catholics, he places the superstitious utterances of the "Holy Fathers" above the authority of Jesus Christ, for he very well knows that our Savior was never guilty of the blasphemous nonsense of talking about the "Blessed Virgin," the "Mother of God, pure forever," a "beautiful Virgin, incap-

able of sin," a "Virgin, through grace, free from all stain of sin," etc. If we are irreverent in the eyes of Catholic priests because we prefer to follow Jesus Christ rather than the Fathers in paying this same reverence to the Blessed Virgin, then let it be so.

3. Turning to the Bible, the "HERALD" quotes: "There came then his brethren and his mother? * * * And he answered them, saying: Who is my mother or my brethren. And he looked round about him and said, Behold my mother and my brethren. For whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my mother and my sister and my brother." And we will ask the "HERALD," Who ever did the will of God as sincerely, as thoroughly and as perfectly as the Blessed Virgin? Therefore, these words, instead of discarding her, are an endorsement of all the claims of her maternity.

Or, does the "HERALD" perhaps maintain that Our Blessed Savior was ever wanting in reverence toward his Mother? The very idea of it is blasphemous.

We never said that these words discarded her, nor that Christ was ever wanting in reverence towards his mother; but we do say that he was ever wanting in undue reverence towards her or any one else as the *Sentinel* manifests and would have us exercise. We quoted this passage for the single purpose of showing that instead of making his mother an object of worship, he simply placed her among his other disciples. Is it blasphemous for us to speak of her as did Jesus? Shall we follow his example, or that of the superstitious fathers? That Mary did the will of God in more than one respect, we do not deny. But if on this account we attribute to her a greater degree of holiness, more veneration and reverence than to any other true disciple of Jesus Christ, where do we find the authority? Now we submit that the *Sentinel's* own interpretation of this passage is against him. Read the following:

4. What the "HERALD's" interpretation of the above text of the Gospel is, he does not condescend to make known. We will interpret it for him, and that with the teaching of one we venerate immensely more than our contemporary. "Every pious soul," says St. Augustine, "that does the will of the Heavenly Father, is the mother of Christ, inasmuch as, through the fecundity of charity, Christ is being formed therein. Mary therefore, having fulfilled God's will, is, corporally, Christ's mother, and, spiritually, Christ's mother and sister: thus, this same holy woman is, not spiritually, only, but also corporally, both mother and Virgin. Yea, she is also the mother of the members of Christ, that is ourselves; spiritually, because she has co-operated, through her charity, to the spiritual birth the faithful within the Church; and corporally, because she is the real mother of the Head whereof we are the member." Profound words; worthy of more than a cursory reading which we leave to the meditation of the "HERALD."

If as Augustine says, "every