Church of England for the addition of the Thirty-nine Articles to the ancient Creed of the Nicene Church? These were certainly not added by way of explanation of the faith of former times, like the Creed of Pope Pius IV., but in direct contradiction to that faith, and in asser. tion of the new doctrines of the 16th Century. more-how will you vindicate the English Church for admitting an important addition to the Nicene Creed, on an article of faith which forms the only difference (besides the Supremacy) between the Greek and Latin Churches at the present day? I refer, of course, to the word "Filioque", which asserts the doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son. It is well known that this article was not originally a part of the Nicene Creed, and that it was adopted by authority of Pope Nicholas I. in the 9th Century, confirmed by Pope Gregory X. and the Second General Council of Lyons in 1274—a period included within the term of "eight hundred years and more", during which it is affirmed in one of the Homilies of the English Church, that "the whole of Christendom was drowned in abominable Idolatry". And yet the Church of England, with strange inconsistency, receives an article of faith, relating to the Blessed Trinity, on the sole authority of the Church of Rome during the long "dark ages" of her existence! I cannot see, then, on what ground you can properly object to the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, defined by the same authority. You refer to this point, as the clearest proof of the innovations of the Roman Church, and certainly it appears to be the most plausible objection which can be urged on that side. You affirm that it is a doctrine which "the ancient Doctors and Martyrs expressly disavow", and which "the most eminent Romish writers of later date steadfastly deny". These assertions, how-

th tu: rei ult the An thi ma holv Irela ove ger Con clu mei bra the res dua Eve to nati opii doc 143 Chu

gate

that

Chu

fron

+ 8

ev