

d up their

THEO.

by a letter
s, as being
ese Church
specially in
eems to be
ad her work
ganization,
culus Epis-
ated as the
e dioceses,
pervise and
essential to
lead of s)
why could
force in the
ity visiting
state of the
existing and
t that now
d attention,
chial visita-
—and next
would have
own as the
difficulties
thus better
generally
end satisf-
subject in the
etrolia, "a
an a great
commissions
expenses of
ses such as
this office,
or the last
archdeacon,
a year, and
hurch; this
f two such
nd be well
question en-
work of the
ed in one of
hus a mere
king power
least, per-
e Bishops,"
as to par-
ne State of
appointed a
hat diocese;
ne, but this
ent of four
respective
ork is pro-
not this also
es? Yours
LAYMAN.

from early
e "Faith"
t would be
sanctity of
-they being
and others
t of truth.
asserts that
rth, regen-
en used as
lied—Even
a period of
ror or error
pillar and
and of our
hout all the
g that the
ly Spirit in
eginning in
the impeni-
graft in a
neither does
roduce the
ails to do so.
why regen-
ymous, by
se last days.
Church of
uld not be
ynonymous
ous in the
ted, but not
Magus was
d. So now,
a penitence
egenerated.
ing member

of Christ's Body, the Church. On the other hand, the adult receiving Holy Baptism without repentance and faith, is assuredly regenerated; but, like a still-born child, is a spiritually dead member of Christ—his actual sins retained, because impenitent, but his original sin washed in the Blood of the Lamb. Again, the unconscious infant comes to Holy Baptism. The water applied, the sacred words pronounced—what more soul-stirring sight to the eye of faith. The loving Master, as of old, folds in His embrace the innocent *made a living member* of His Body by His Spirit; into the "Vine" a tender branch is grafted, not yet capable of bearing fruit. And still how many Churchmen, cleric and lay, deny that infants are united to Christ in baptism; by such denial branding alike the Catechism, the Prayer Book and the Holy Scriptures as untrue. How is it possible for a child to be trained to "grow in grace" by those who *ignore or deny* that blessed union? As well expect a tree to grow with root upward as expect a child to grow in grace without first instilling into his young mind that "he was made a member of Christ in his Baptism." Vain are all appeals to those who, having been taught that the Church of Christ on earth is "Invisible," in consequence look upon their baptism as a mere outward ceremony; and swell the popular cry, "one Church is as good as another." One ceases to wonder that the Church, in many places in Canada, is in a state of spiritual stagnation. In conclusion, I appeal to all Churchmen, who are loyal to the Prayer Book, shall the non-evangelical clergy, who arrogate to themselves the title "evangelical," be permitted any longer, *without rebuke*, to bar the salvation of their flocks, retard the progress of the Church, and block the way to the re-union of Christians, by their substituting deadly false doctrine for the Holy Gospel as taught by Holy Church? A. SLEMMONT.

Baysville, Muskoka.

A Layman's Answer to "Priest" re the Creed of St. Athanasius.

SIR,—In reading your esteemed paper I had not taken the trouble to read any of the several communications on the above subject till I chanced to look over that of "Priest's" in your issue of the 10th inst., since reading which I have read one or two others. So in this letter anything I may say can be taken as applying to all or any who think as "Priest" does, if the cap fits. He ("Priest") seems to think this subject open for discussion as any ordinary matter to which he would be asked to assent. There is a distinction with a difference here. He is putting the cart before the horse. He *has* assented, and discusses it after—usually a case of so much labour lost. He can put his mind at ease as to there being full discussion and deliberation when this version of the Creed was adopted by the Church as an auxiliary to what had already been adopted. It was Athanasius against the world, which fact, being a priest, he ought to know more about than I. This Creed is not a symbol: it is a reality—a foundation stone; many may stumble at it or over it, but that is not the fault of the stone. It need not be handled carefully either, as it has withstood many harder blows, and will be able to continue to do so, as not a flaw is yet visible. In reality we have but one Creed, the Nicene and Athanasian being simply expansions or further explanation of the same. Surely those in orders know why it was found necessary to expand and emphasize the original Creed, which simply consisted in a *Confession of Belief in the Holy Trinity*, without explanation. My friend thinks the doctrine of the Holy Trinity would not be imperilled if the Athanasian Creed were done away with. It is all right talking that way after that same Creed has thoroughly imbued his with its doctrine as concerning the Holy Trinity; but had it been taken away a generation or two ago, where would he have been able to learn this same doctrine as well? The Church in the U. S. having discarded this Creed is a poor illustration, as time enough has not elapsed to show the effects as yet, but sufficient to produce a decided sentiment for a move to restore the Creed to its proper place, as you must be aware of. The doctrine of the Holy Trinity was in danger when this version of the Creed was formulated, and would be again if it was done away with. Look at the Ornaments Rubric as a monumental example of curtailment. How many priests, let alone laymen, know what was in use in the reign of King Edward VI.? Some, I am afraid, do not want to know. Had this been formulated as carefully and definitely as was the Athanasian Creed, it would have to be observed. As it is, its brevity is a good excuse, with many, for totally ignoring it. True, it is not a vital point that puts one's salvation in danger, but it is an essential all the same. "Priest" states that his objection is in the first verse. That reminds me of the boy who only had one meal a day (that was all day long). If that constitutes his objection, then, in order to quiet his conscience, all the different versions of the Creed would have to be done away with so as to

get rid of the Catholic Faith. I hope he does not want that. Space will not allow me to say much as to re-union. I would like to ask, however, if such were consummated, and his friend of Presbyterian antecedents presented himself for ordination, where would he (the candidate) find a receptacle, as far as we of Anglican antecedents were concerned, to stow away his dogma of Predestination? It would require a larger and stronger one than the Athanasian Creed. If this re-union ever does take place, and I, for one, confess I do not see how it can, "Priest" can rest assured it will be called The Church. It *has* been designated as such through the ages all along, is *now* so designated, and will continue to be so, according to the Master's promise, to which we have the added assurance that the gates of hell shall never prevail against it. There would never have been the divisions that now exist had it not been for this very principle of trying to adjust the doctrines of the Church (which are the doctrines of the Bible) to the individual, instead of trying to conform the individual to the doctrines, as is required by Scripture; the lifting up of self to higher and holier things, to the Light of Light. When people in times past imagined that the Church had doctrines they could not digest, the usual remedy has been to start a new sect with the objectionable thing left out. A repetition of this within themselves soon gets rid of most of the former things, and an entire new belief is formulated, still subject to change. This is one and the principle difference between the Catholic Church and those who dissent thereto. There is no contradiction between this Creed and the Church Catechism. The first duty of man, as required in the Commandments, is his duty towards God, and the first requirement in that first duty is to believe in God. The Athanasian Creed teaches him how to do so intelligently. In St. Paul's teaching *re faith*, hope and charity—with charity preferred—faith is here spoken of in the abstract. St. Paul never puts anything before the Faith once delivered to the Saints. Many of the clergy who go to the U. S., whether under a supposed call or otherwise, would be, no doubt, pleased to come back, and never object in the least to the Athanasian Creed. St. Catharines. J. W. WALSH.

Athanasian Creed.

SIR,—It must be distressing to many minds to see how flippantly the fundamental doctrine of Christianity embodied in "Quicunque Vult" is handled by some who I suppose profess full faith in the "Holy, Blessed and Glorious Trinity." The Rev. J. Francis in his onslaught on your correspondent, G. H. W., has to learn that "Divine Charity" is not latitudinarianism, is not indifference, does not condone heresy. Mr. Francis charges G. H. W. with impertinence because he questions the orthodoxy of those who "object to the reading of a long, elaborate, and scholastic definition of that faith." Of course he means the Christian Faith. Well, the so-called "creed of St. Athanasius" is long, is elaborate, scholastic, but it is not a definition, it is a statement of a fact, a fact indispensable to that faith. It is sometimes said of us, "You claim that the Holy Trinity is a great mystery, and yet here you explain it." I say "no, we do not attempt to explain it, but we most positively assert it." But how far is its "cursing and condemnation of others" (*vide* Mr. Francis) in excess of 2 Peter ii. 1, "There shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies." Of 2nd St. John v. 10, "If there come any unto and bring not this doctrine" (that of the Father and the Son) "receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed." Of St. Paul, I. Cor. xvi. 22, "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be *anathema maranatha*—accursed at the coming of Christ; or the same apostle in Gal. i. 9; of St. Jude also. But is the reading of this "elaborate" document (?), are the damnable clauses the real objection to this statement of the Christian Faith? Is not the real reason to be found in the subtle and unswerving device of the Enemy, to throw doubt on the doctrine of the Holy Trinity? And are not these objectors unwittingly, wholly unconsciously, aiding and abetting that device? I have repeated this creed for I believe 70 years or more, and never saw anything unscriptural or contrary to "Divine Charity." I have read of a large gathering, among whom were many Arians, standing up and audibly, in public, reciting the Apostles' Creed. Allow me to follow Mr. Bissett Thom's example and quote:—"When the council (of Nicene) met, Arius was allowed to explain his doctrine to the assembled Fathers; and in it there was not any ambiguity. It was a bold application of logic and of human analogy to the mystery of the Divine Nature. Christ is said in Scripture to be a Son; but a Father must exist before a Son. There was therefore a time, however remote, when the Son of God did not exist, and afterward He was called into existence out of nothing: Christ was a creature; and He could be called God only by a strong figure of speech. When the Fathers heard this doctrine they pronounced it

a daring impiety, and prepared at once to condemn it. The Arians denied that they held any new doctrine regarding Christ, and proposed a creed which would not have excited suspicion had there been no previous controversy. The orthodox Fathers decided that they must use some expression which would explicitly condemn the doctrine of Arius, and confirm Catholic truth. Such an expression they found in the Greek word 'Homoousion,' 'of one substance with the Father.' Arius would accept 'Homoiousion'—'of like substance'; but the Fathers stood firm and prevailed." And St. Athanasius, though but a deacon, was the leading influence among them. Now here is the spirit which yet works in the children of disobedience. It is and ever has been the policy of the Adversary, in his character of "an angel of light," so to misrepresent the truth as to deceive, "if it were possible, the very elect." It is generally known that Calvin burnt Servetus for preaching the heresy which the creed of St. Athanasius condemns; and I suppose all your readers know that the pulpit in Geneva from which Calvin denounced Servetus is now occupied by men who preach some form of Arianism. So vast is the change that a traveller a few years ago said that not more than one clergyman in a hundred dared to assert that Christ is God. And it is in my recollection that some 200 dissenting chapels in England were in danger of being lost to their trustees because Trinitarian doctrines on which their trusts were based, were departed from. Mr. A. Bissett Thom makes a point of the fact that the Church in the U.S.A. has excluded this creed from her services; does he not know that the Apostles' Creed is tampered with? that a rubric says of it, "Any churches may omit the words 'He descended into hell,' or may instead use the words, 'He went into the place of departed spirits.'" Also that the Nicene Creed may be omitted and the Apostles' Creed substituted, both at matins or at the celebration of Holy Communion, and that both may be omitted at that holy office if used previously at matins. There has been much of the nature of personality in this correspondence, and something of assumption. One writer makes the strange assertion that "the damnable clauses are put in our mouths by the officiating clergyman"! I thought it was the Church, by her rubric, which ordered it to "be sung or said by the minister and people standing." There are phrases which remind me of the "three tailors of Tooley St." who began a certain address—"We, the people of England." I presume Mr. A. Bissett Thom and all who agree with him are admirers of Luther; and he says emphatically, "The Athanasian Creed is the bulwark of the Christian religion." And a writer in the *Guardian* some years ago said, "It is of the utmost value, both to the world and to the modern Church—to the world, because it forces on unwilling ears the reality of truth and the necessity of faith;—to the modern Church, because it assures us that the Catholic Faith which we must hold is not a variegated thing, made up of the crotchets of sectarianism or narrow partisanship, but only the doctrine of the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Atonement, with the consequences flowing therefrom. If the Church of England is less troubled than other churches by Deism, Unitarianism, and other heresies, it is because of the frequent repetition in her public services . . . of the Athanasian Creed." Much is said of the effect which *Quicunque Vult* has on laymen, and how obnoxious parts of it are. A layman, strictly speaking, is a non-clerical member of the Holy Catholic Church in which we believe, and I feel confident that the very great majority of them are sound on this creed. When St. Athanasius was required by the Emperor Constantine to reinstate Arius whom he had excommunicated, Athanasius replied "that there could be no communion between the Catholic Church and a heresy that was fighting against Christ." So may it ever be!

P. HARDING.

Epiphany, 1895.

BRIEF MENTION.

The Rev. W. B. Armstrong, of Welsford, N.B., is ill.

American Indians had deities of thunder and storm, of sunshine and shower.

The highest of the Green Mountains in Vermont is Mount Mansfield, 4,280 feet.

The first glass windows in western Europe were made by a Greek in 548 for a church built by the Frank King Childebert.

We are glad to learn that the Rev. Canon Greene, of Orillia, is recovering satisfactorily from his attack of diphtheria.

The Rev. E. Hutchinson, formerly of Lion's Head, has been appointed to the charge of Christ Church, Forest, Ont.

K.D.C. the household remedy for stomach troubles.