

this creed, as used by the Western Church, differs from the creed of Nicœa and Constantinople; one is that the creed, as we recite it, states the procession of the Holy Ghost to have been from the Father and the Son; the other that the word "holy" is omitted before the word Church in the subsequent clause which states our belief in the One Catholic and Apostolic Church. The interpolation of the "*Filioque*" ("and from the Son") is due to some of the French and Spanish Churches in the 5th century; after having been condemned by one Bishop of Rome it was authorised by another subsequent Pope, and became an additional source of dispute between the oriental and occidental Churches, the one accusing the other of adding to the creed without the authority of a general Council, while the Latins endeavored to force upon the Greeks this addition made on the authority of the Roman Bishop. That the creed is so recited in our Churches, is due to the fact of our being sprung from a Western stock, and so long as it is retained there, we can scarcely be in communion with the great and Catholic Oriental Church. It is not a question of doctrine upon which we are at issue, but solely of authority. The doctrine is a certain truth, both as regards the temporal and eternal procession; nor would our erasure of it from the creed imply our denial of it, but simply our desire to return to that exact form in which it issued from the great Council of Constantinople. This subject we may hope, will receive some attention from the Pan-Anglican Synod, which may be a prelude to a still more important step, viz., the assembling of a General Council of all Churches in communion with us for the adjustment of differences, the removal of doubts, and the extension of Christianity.

There is another point receiving attention in the American Church, which in its place is far from being unimportant. They are not satisfied with their name: it is self-imposed yet eminently unsatisfactory, for it implies the very existence of that which they deny. An Episcopal Church assumes churches which are not episcopal, and thus denies the divine origin of a Church government; if a Church can exist without bishops, who trace their authority back to our Saviour himself, then is our faith vain—the faith of the Church for 1800 years is in this sceptical age pronounced absurd. But the "Episcopal Church" of America, in the faith of its members, renounces the falsehood implied in its name, and will soon doubtless alter that name. Further, a Protestant Church implies no less an error: it grants to the Roman Church all it asks of us—it grants Catholicity; and that once granted, the sooner Christians who assert their belief in the Holy Catholic Church, join the Catholic Church, the better for their hope of salvation. Moreover, in what possible sense is the American or Canadian Church a Protestant Church? Can a Church which is a Catholic Church, as ours is, be Protestant? Rather should we assert against the claims of the Romanists our true Catholicity; assert that we belong to a branch of the Catholic Church which, amid errors and struggles and sins, yet has maintained the primitive faith more pure than the Roman branch. There is undoubtedly a class among us who, in their imagined opposition to the Papacy, are doing the work and aiding the cause of the Roman See. There is no section of the Angli-

can Church among the Roman days, but unity is feeble we can show and Infi Since has app question

"T

"You that 'diff the rubric worsh in the B England in the ch by the mi dient that said with tions, so a deemed es into all ar time as to dient, hav in the sai lating to tl ments or a any ten or

"We, y your Maje vestments ministratio into certain

"We fin bical of d do honour t are by none