ich on t with g the whatithoutsteredthe reis not former y exist all, in intenquired, sc cont Bapot into ie comt; and sons as all her ed from tion, or thority, r juris. nselves mply as aptized  $\iota$ , in the tized in- $_{
m iembers}$ and that

n Creed

by their

as compared with the Nicene Creed, which you describe as "that ancient Creed, to which an Œcumenical Council forbid anything to be added". You insinuate that I have now virtually abandoned "that ancient Creed", though it is the only one which is recited, to this day, in the public Service of the Catholic Church, and though it is only in my present position that I can profess my full agreement with it, when I declare that "I believe Onc, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church" -an article which no member of the Church of England can consistently acknowledge. But, my Lord, you must excuse me for saying that you are totally mistaken in asserting that the Œeur mical Council of Ephe as (to which you allude) "forbias anything to be added" to the Nicene Creed. The 7th Canon of that Council merely prohibited the adoption of a new Creed, proposed by the heretics of that time, under the name of "a different Faith, contrary to that defined by the holy Fathers, who were assembled at Nice, with the assistance of the Holy Ghost."\* And accordingly we find that the following Œcumenical Council of Chalcedon formally sanctioned the additions made to the Nicene Creed by the Second Œeumenical Council of Constantinople, together with the new definition of faith, which had been subsequently decreed in opposition to the Nestorian and Eutychian heresies, while at the same time the assembled Fathers repeated the language of the Council of Ephesus, in condemnation of "any other Faith", and by these Acts directly recognised the principle of the progressive development of the articles of the Creed, in opposition to the various heresies of each successive age.

But, my Lord, if you are right in your interpretation of this Canon, let me ask you, how will you justify the

<sup>\*</sup> Beveridge's Pand. Can. Tom. I. p. 103.