

*Original Contributions.*Reply to the Article Headed
"Foolish Preaching."

I have made repeated efforts privately and publicly, to secure a statement of the way in which this article found its way into the columns of the HERALD. If I had succeeded, I should have deemed its personalities and misrepresentations sufficiently answered. Instead of this, which would have been simply justice to me, I am placed in a false and most unenviable position before the readers of the HERALD, and then its columns are closed against me before I had even intimated that I had presented my "closing criticism."

I know that both the former editors of the HERALD condemned the teaching of the articles to which I was replying and that one of them condemned this article in more severe terms than I would be willing to use publicly. If the writer and publisher of the articles are not ashamed of it, I am ashamed for them. The personalities in the article are their own sufficient answer. They would not have been indulged in, had anything better presented itself to their author. The complete misrepresentations of my statement will be apparent when it and they are placed side by side. I said, "The rudiments of the world—dancing, circus and theatre-going, the practice of adultery under the divorce laws of our States, etc., are as far from the law of God as evil from Good." This is twice misrepresented as follows: " * * * * was nothing more nor less "circus and theater going, and marrying a divorced woman in whose legal divorce a certain allegation had not been the grounds of her divorce!" and again, " * * * * was just dancing, circus-going, and marrying a divorced woman, who had obtained a divorce from a drunken brutal husband, albeit the crime of adultery had not been the grounds of the divorce!" These will be seen to be most exaggerated caricatures of my position.

Being unable to meet the real issue, a man of straw was made, and in his violent efforts both it and its maker fell among the swine and geese. Such company not being to my taste; I ask to be excused from following them.

To the attempted argument upon Gal. 4: 9, I reply as follows: There is very little if any relevancy

to the point at issue in what is said. That the Jews had been in bondage under the law of Moses and freed from the law of Christ is true. It is not true, however, that that the Gentile Galatians were ever in bondage to that law. It is stated by the prophet that the Gentiles were to be without law or the law until Christ came. There is no Scripture for the idea of men being redeemed from law. Christ redeemed those who were under the law, from the curse of the law but not from law. He also redeems Gentiles who were never under the law from sin, but not from law. There is no proof in the record that the "false brethren" spoken of in 2: 4, were any nearer Galatia than Jerusalem. True some of the teaching was there, but they could have made a letter its vehicle, as has been often done since. We are told that the bondage under the rudiments of the world, is "the same bondage spoken of in chap. 2: 4, where false brethren had turned them back again under law." A reading of chap. 2 will show any one that the false brethren there spoken of were in Jerusalem, and that they tried to bring Paul under bondage again, but did not succeed as he would not give place unto them for even an hour. Paul was too good a logician to write about bringing the Gentiles again under bondage to that which they had not been once under.

As they were never under that bondage they could not be brought back again under it. There is no need to disregard orthography, grammar and the principles of biblical interpretation, by going back to the 4th verse of the 2d chap., to find a bondage (which they were never under), when one which was much worse is found in the 8th verse of the 4th chap., and they were undoubtedly once under it. "Howbeit then, (when men were children, 3rd verse) when ye knew not God, ye did service (even in bondage) unto them which by nature are no gods." The law of Moses never brought men in bondage to false gods. One of its elementary principles was the worship of the one true God. Paul's allusion to the observance of "days and months, and times, and years, is entirely misapprehended by the authority of the article. If the brethren had not had such observances it might be some proof that he alluded to the observances required by the law. Every one

knows, I think, that such observances were common among the Gentiles. They were by no means confined to the Jews. The wording here was not that employed by the inspired writers, when Jewish observances were spoken of. When they were alluded to the word sabbath was used. The reason for this is, that all Jewish observances had the idea of sabbath or rest connected with them. It was not days, but sabbath days that the Jews observed. There was no observance of months or times (seasons) among the Jews. It was sabbatical years that they observed. The brethren did observe days and months and times and years. In doing so they danced, had circus and theater performances, adultery and fornication were common in them. Read the 1st chap. of Romans, 5th of Gal., 5th of Eph., 1st of 1 Tim. and 2d of 2 Pet. for a more extended list of the rudiments of the world. The whole list was condemned by the law. It is true that Paul teaches the Jews that since Christ had come their observances were of no more value than those heathen ones which men so completely condemned by their law. But he does not say that they "pertained to the flesh and ended with it." But he does say, 1 Tim. 1: 5, "Now the end of the commandment (of God) is charity out of a pure heart, and a good conscience, and faith unfeigned." This is as true of the law of Moses as of the law of Christ since both were God's law. The allusion to the brethren now for whom I have been preaching is unworthy of its author and the columns of the HERALD. The brethren have felt it very much but have been forbearing to those who do them such a gross injustice. I think it is high time that the brethren on the coast and the HERALD speak out openly their convictions upon a question which so vitally concerns the purity and peace of the church as this one of divorce and remarriage does. This has been the main issue in this controversy. The uncalled for intimation to the contrary notwithstanding, I am well satisfied with my part of it. I have done what I thought was my duty, and am perfectly willing to abide the result.

I thank God, that he gave me strength and ability to write as I did. I knew that the harsh and unkind expressions in the series of articles were intended for me but was unwilling to answer them in

kind. I tried to answer the argument without gloves but to treat its author kindly. I leave the readers to judge of my success in this effort. Unless future developments call for more this will end the matter with me.

R. H. Moss.

Centerville, Or., Feb. 1, 1883.

The Blessed Virgin.

In his answer to our article on the Blessed Virgin, the "Christian Herald," of Monmouth, makes himself guilty of a flagrant misstatement of the question. The question, brother, is not whom we have to follow, whether Jesus Christ or the Fathers; but whose explanation of the words of Jesus Christ is to be preferred, whether that of those holy, learned and great men whom we call the Holy Fathers, or that of modern editors of newspapers. We contend that the Scripture was much better understood, expounded and commented by those celebrated Doctors of the Church than by any preacher of our age. But such is the Protestant way of conducting a controversy; as long as they have a glimmer of hope to find Tradition, the Fathers and the faith of old on their side, Protestants are loud in their appeals to Tradition, the Fathers and the faith of old; so did the first Reformers, Melancthon, Calvin, Kemnitz and hundreds of Episcopalians; but now, that the victorious arguments of Catholic divines have placed in undeniable evidence how Protestantism is at variance with the constant Tradition of the Church, with the teaching of the Holy Fathers and with the faith of bygone ages, now, they throw all that unceremoniously overboard as useless ballast. Let it be so. We prefer to believe and to profess the truth with those Holy men, of whose salvation and glory in heaven we have no doubt, rather than to be tossed about on the waves of uncertain opinions of preachers who have as yet to work out their salvation and run great risk of failing to do so.

As the "Herald" is rather courteous in his remarks, we will do him the courtesy to answer his queries: He desires us to "tell him exactly in what the honor we pay to the Virgin consists," and what we have to say about the two texts adduced by him, one from Luke, the other from John.

The second query would require too much space and will be deferred