

CHRISTIAN HERALD.

EDITOR:
J. F. FLOYD.

FRIDAY, FEB. 2, 1883.

Zeal.

In a general way zeal may be defined as a passionate eagerness in favor of a person or cause; an active interest in the pursuit of a thing. A godly zeal is a zeal directed to God, to Christ and to the salvation of the world. It is a zeal that is actuated by pure and holy motives and that takes hold of the heart and the soul of the individual. It is a zeal that must be seen and felt in the land, and that can not be kept in the dark. That such a zeal is commendable and right there can be no question; and that it is an element of genuine Christianity, is made equally plain in the light of the Scriptures. This is true of both the individual and the church. The man who does not possess a godly zeal has not the Spirit of Jesus Christ and is hence none of his; and the church that has no zeal has lost her spiritual life. Hence Christ said to the church of the Laodiceans, "As many as I love, I rebuke and chasten; be zealous therefore, and repent." Hence, Paul also teaches that Christ "gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." Then again, Paul says to the Corinthians: "For I know the forwardness of your mind, for which I boast of you to them of Macedonia, that Achaia was ready a year ago; and your zeal hath provoked very many. These passages are sufficient to teach us the importance and the necessity of a godly zeal in all our churches and on the part of all the members. Let the churches then that have lost their zeal renew it at once; and just in proportion to the extent they do this will their influence for good be felt among the people, and they will meet the approval of Christ. If this feature of our work is overlooked, we are not likely to have much success in the number, strength and influence of our churches. Besides, the success of the apostles and the primitive churches was largely due to the wonderful and untiring zeal they manifested. The apostles were not only men of zeal, but they were full

of godly zeal as long as they lived to labor for their Master and Savior.

But there is another side to this question that must be considered.

While it is true that zeal is necessary to the existence of all practical religion, it is also true that zeal may be found where there is no pure and undefiled religion. In other words a person must have a zeal in order to do his duty to God and to man; but he may possess all this zeal and yet not be a Christian. This element then can not always be accepted as an infallible evidence of the spiritual life in the soul. The zeal that is required by the word of God and that will benefit the church and the individual depends on two essentials. 1. It must be a *godly* zeal 2. It must be properly directed.

A misguided zeal is worse than no zeal at all. A person may possess such a zeal as long as he lives and then die without a hope of eternal

life. We should be careful not to be mistaken just at this point. It is quite common now-a-days to estimate the acceptableness of a people's or church's religion by the amount of zeal they possess. If they are only zealous towards God, they are most assuredly doing his will. They think the more zeal the more religion, and they do not stop to ask whether it is a zeal of God, or whether it is properly educated. Saul of Tarsus was one of the most zealous men in the Jewish nation, yet he rejected Jesus Christ as an imposter. His was a godly zeal, yet he was a most bitter persecutor of the churches. He says, "Concerning zeal, persecuting the church." And again he said to the Jews at Jerusalem that he was zealous towards the law, as they all were that day. Now all this teaches us that even a godly zeal is not necessarily an evidence that a person is serving God acceptably, for all this time Saul was engaged in opposing the Christ and destroying his religion; and what is true of Saul may be true of any one else professing to be God's servant, and if these can make a mistake, so may churches. But it must be remembered that when Saul was converted he did not lose his zeal for God. It was only necessary for it to be turned about in another direction. In his conversion his zeal received a good schooling, was educated in a knowledge of the Christ, accepted Him as the Savior and thus the

whole man was changed and his zeal made stronger while enjoying more spiritual light and engaged in a better cause. Neither did he lose sight of this important lesson

we are now teaching after becoming a Christian. For in writing to the Romans he says: "Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is that they might be saved. For I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge." These Jews, as a nation, for whom Paul was praying were lost, and why? It could not be because they lacked zeal, for the apostle bears them record that they have that. Neither can it be because their zeal was not actuated by pure motives, for he says they have a zeal of God. But he explains the whole matter when he adds, "*but not according to knowledge.*" The trouble then was with their knowledge. If their knowledge of Christ had been correct, their prospects for salvation might have been much brighter. While then we must exercise great zeal in the Christian life, it will not do to depend altogether on zeal.

Infallibility.

On another page of this paper under the above heading will be found the reply of the *Catholic Sentinel* to our strictures on its editorial some weeks ago advocating the infallibility of the Pope and the church. We note with pleasure that the articles of our contemporary manifest a much more commendable spirit since his first attack on the Protestant world; and for this if for nothing else, we consent to give them a respectful hearing. As the *Sentinel* is in the affirmative it is not our purpose to enter into a general discussion of infallibility, but to attend strictly to what our friend may have to say on that subject. Hence a brief reply as follows is all that his present article demands:

1. The *Sentinel* thinks our ideas of infallibility were very much confused, and accuses us of confounding things that differ. Would it not have been more in harmony with the spirit of true journalism for the editor of the *Sentinel* to let his readers see and judge for themselves just what we did say about infallibility? For an editor to refuse to let the people see what we write in defense of our position, and then to offer as a substitute his own faulty interpretation may be

regarded as an act of fairness inside of the Catholic Church; but to us we must confess it looks like anything but infallibility. If the *Sentinel* will take the pains to look up the matter he will find that we used the word infallibility in its ordinarily accepted sense; and if this is not satisfactory, then he had better either select a better term to apply to the Pope or turn his battery against our toxicographers. Neither can we allow the *Sentinel* to give his own definition to words and thus make distinctions where none exists in order to carry his point, for if we grant to him this privilege we suppose he can easily prove the infallibility of the Pope, or most anything else he might wish. If the Pope is not infallible in any ordinary sense of that word, then he is not infallible at all, and why not be frank as many honest Catholics are and just say so?

2. But the *Sentinel* wishes to know if we believe that Matthew, Mark, Luke and John were infallible men? We do not. These writers of the gospels were inspired men of God, and we know that their writings are God's word because they are the words of an *infallible Spirit*, and *not* because these *writers* were infallible. "Infallibility is the highest perfection of the knowing faculty," says Tillotson, and belongs only to God, Christ and the Holy Spirit. There is not a particle of evidence in either reason or the Bible that any man is infallible. Hence we still believe that it is blasphemy to attribute to a mere man an attribute that belongs to God only. The *Sentinel* asks, "Can not God do all things?" No; God can not lie. But again, he says, "Can He not communicate His attributes to His creatures?" Yes; but has He promised to do so? If He were to communicate these to his creatures in the same perfection as He possesses them, then his creatures would be equal to Himself, and there would be Gods many and Lords many. Should He not do this, then He would fail to impart infallibility. The *Sentinel* can take either horn of this dilemma he wishes. His distinction between infallibility and impeccability does not help the matter; for the Pope, like all other mere men, is both fallible and peccable.

But suppose we admit the *Sentinel's* definition of infallibility, does that prove the infallibility of the Pope? Let us see. While

The Li
operation
convened
tral church
Meeting
Bro. J. W.
Board. A
offered by
Reports
gregations
sponded to
Central
Propst rep
delegates a
tral Church
month by
Officers of
Propst and
H. C. Pow
deacons.
Bro. J. I
from Oak
church are J
Courter, eld
Hendrickson
Scio, rep
Doty. Pres
fifth Sunday
Bro. D. M.
Richardson,
acons: Bros.
rell.
C. W. Co
Pleasant con
once a mon
Elders: John
Goodman; D
mand and W.
On motion,
gramine was
Doty, H. C.
were appointe
Bro. Doty
ment in regar
that it was pe
with State Ev
The commi
reported and,
till 8 o'clock A.
ing.
MORN
Bro. Richard
Minutes read
Social meetin
S. Slater, after
sion of the sub
Church Officers
Marshall, whi
pressions from
On motion, tl
sideration for tl
"The Qualifica
ship. We then
discourse by Br
age of the Savi
"Whom do you
of man am?" a