

of the Catholic Church, which is but another expression of the rule of Vincent, *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*—as near to a definition as human wit ever reached.

And now what of this, more than they, have we to offer to others seeking the same?

First, clearly we have the faith in the Apostles' and Nicene symbols—the objective faith. We need not dwell on this. It is a rock immovable, fixed. Nothing more; nothing less. Our only question can be whether we fairly exhibit this faith—neither add to nor take away.

Next, we have the apostolic order of the ministry “from the apostles’ time.” Here issue will be drawn by those without; but it is not an open question among ourselves. And yet there is a question in regard to it for ourselves to consider; it is one of function, use. We have the machinery, no doubt of that, but is it in working order as intended to be, or is it in any way out of gear? Is it as effective as it ought to be? Is it doing its work as it should? We are compelled to answer, “No,” to these questions, and they are the living questions of to-day. Catholicity touches use and practice, as well as order; and right here is defect—functional, but not organic defect. It is one thing to have bishops—another to have them in proper place, to enable them to do all the work they never intended to do. It is one thing to have priests and deacons—another to place them in such position as in a Catholic Church they should occupy. Few who have considered this matter will say that such is now the case. We can offer the world the framework of the apostolic ministry. In regard to its function and use we should have more to offer than we now have. The great revival of the past half century had for its centre the doctrine and sacraments of the Church—the clear exposition of the one, and the practical function and use of the others. It was a blessed work. We believe the revival of the coming century will have for its centre the matter of polity and organization; especially will it deal with the varied functions and position of the ministry. There is great disturbance and loss here. A clear breach in the wall of Catholicity exists. The machinery is “out of gear.” This is the meaning of what the Church is so earnestly discussing to-day. We have the ministry; how can it best be used?

Of the sacraments, and “*quasi sacraments*,” as Hooker calls them, we can say but little. The denominations, for the most part, have eviscerated the one and forgotten the rest. The “revival,” of which we have spoken, has restored these to their proper place in the Catholic economy of the Church, and as such, in their integrity, we can now offer them to the world.

Again, we have the Catholic Liturgy, the best, in some respects, in all the world; but the last General Convention confessed that it is not perfect, that it may be better and more “Catholic.” A liturgy is a means and not an end, and hence is never perfect—is good or bad chiefly as it accomplishes its end. Catholicity consists not in *being* only, but in *doing* as well.

The most perfect machine in the world out of place is a useless thing.

The doctrine, the ministry, the sacraments, and liturgy, are the main landmarks and possessions, organically, of the Catholic Church. That we possess these is not in question. That we do not use them as such, as might be done, is equally clear. The stream in its progress through the ages, has been much disturbed, defiled by contact with the world, diverted from its course. And yet the main elements remain. It is the same blessed “River” still. Our strength is in this fact—our weakness in the want of adaptation of means to ends, in the legitimate and Catholic use of what we possess.—D. D. CHAPIN in *N. Y. Churchman*.

ZEAL.

POINT du ze’le is the characteristic expression of the world’s mind, although at times the world shows great zeal in accusing the clergy of the want of zeal.

No doubt there is much to be said against zeal. It is hasty and ill-considerate, begins to build what it is not able to finish, is over-bearing whilst it pushes forward its own schemes without regarding the condition and feelings of others; it is often uncharitable, throws back its own work and makes people colder and more callous by its indiscretions and failures. All this may be said, is said, and is true.

Even good and zealous men have to speak strongly concerning the dangers of zeal. Thus Jeremy Taylor: “Passions of the sensitive soul are like an exhalation hot and dry, borne up from the earth on the wings of a cloud, and detained by violence out of its place, causing thunders, and making eruptions into lightning and sudden fires. . . . It is an inordination in the spirit of a man, when his passions are tumultuous and mighty; though they do not determine directly upon a sin, they discompose his peace and disturb his spirit, and make it like troubled waters in which no man can see his figure and just proportions; and therefore, by being less a man, he cannot be so much a Christian, in the midst of so great indispositions. For although the cause may hallow the passion (and if a man be very angry for GOD’S cause, it is zeal, not fury), yet the cause cannot secure the person from violence, transportation, and inconvenience . . . and sometimes this zeal goes besides the intention of the man, and beyond the degrees of prudent or lawful, and engages in a sin, though at first it was zeal for religion. . . . We also, if we be not moderate and well-tempered, even in our passions for GOD, may, like Moses, break the tables of the law, and throw them out of our hands, with zeal to have them performed.”

So again, good Robert Nelson asks:

“Wherein consists the nature of zeal?”

And replies:

“It is an earnest concernment for or against something, and a violent Pursuit and Prosecution of it; and is in its own nature indifferent like the rest of the Passions, but good or bad according to the Object and Degree of it;” and then after citing the good zeal of the Cor-

inthians, and the duty of Christians to be zealous of good works, and S. Paul’s own zeal (2 Cor. ix. 2; 2 Cor. xi. 2; Tit. ii. 14), and the evil zeal of the Jews (Acts xiii. 45, xvii. 5), he asks after a short space, “When does our zeal become criminal?” and he replies, “When we violently contend for any Doctrine that is erroneous, and are more earnestly concerned for the Externals of Religion and Instruments of Piety, than for solid and substantial goodness which they are designed to work in us; when it betrays us to the breach of any of GOD’S Laws in order to promote His Glory, and creates divisions and schisms in the Church of CHRIST; and when we prosecute even Truth itself without that meekness and charity which are essential to the character of a true Christian.”

So that there is a strong case against zeal which demands careful attention.

Let us now hear what may be said on the other side. And first, is not the world’s dislike of zeal very suspicious? Is not zeal a condemnation *per se* of indolence and self-indulgence? And is not religious zeal a condemnation of the world? It refuses to take the world on its own valuation; forces on its unwilling ear its own convictions that there is something higher than this world, and One Greater and Wiser and Better than the lord of this world; that the world is utterly selfish and low-minded, and has a code of morality and of manners which is deceptive, rotten, worthless. It will not leave the world at ease to enjoy itself, but is as a bad conscience to it which must be stifled, or else there is no more enjoyment to be had. And what is this zeal, and who is this zealous one that the wisdom of all mankind, and the hereditary morality and the laws of society and of business, should be disturbed by a meddlesome restless conceit? It is natural for the world to hate zeal. It *must* do so, and therefore the charges which it brings against zeal are hostile, prejudiced, unscrupulous, and require cross-examination before they are admitted as evidence.

We ask, therefore, of the enemies of zeal what could be done without it? How would Europe have checked the devastating advance of Mahomedanism without the zeal of the Crusaders; how the zeal of Howard, Clarkson, Wilberforce, could have been spared by the oppressed and suffering?

If they reply that they object not to zeal itself but to the excesses and indiscretions of a force which they admit to have done good service, we may answer that zeal dwells in fallible men, not in perfect beings. If we would have the gold we must accept the quartz in which it is enshrined. If we know our ourselves we must honestly confess that we constantly mar our good designs and efforts by our imperfections. Who is blind to the faults as well as the benefits of the Reformation? And if the Evangelical movement had its excesses, and the Tractarian movement also, yet where would the English Church have been without both of them?

Would it have survived to these days?

Peace, ye who censure the mistaken zeal of