

was added is nevertheless a certain truth, and *may be so used in that Creed by them who believe the same to be a truth*, so long as they pretend it, not to be a definition of that Council (the Council of Constantinople), but an addition or explication inserted, *and condemn not those who, out of a greater respect to such synodical determinations, will admit of no such insertions, nor speak any other language than the Scriptures and their Fathers spoke.*" This, I say, is fatal to the imposition of the Athanasian Creed, which embodies the additional article, even if we regard the question from a strictly High Church point of view.

I am not ignorant of the contents of the Nicene Creed. I alluded to them when I said that quiet acquiescence in doctrinal definitions was a different thing from participation in anathema. Jeremy Taylor in his "Liberty of Prophecy," says: "But now if I should be questioned concerning the symbol of Athanasius (for we see the Nicene symbol was the father of many more, some twelve or thirteen symbols in the space of an hundred years), I confess I cannot see that moderate sentence and gentleness of charity in his preface and conclusion as there was in the Nicene Creed. Nothing there but damnation and perishing everlastingly unless the article of the Trinity be believed, as it is there with curiosity and minute particularities explained." It is pretty clear that instead of "curiosity" and "minute particularities," Taylor, had he given free expression to his sentiments, would have used some less respectful words.

Hooker defends the retention of the Athanasian Creed, as he defends everything else in the Liturgy. But he couples it with the Doxology, and says nothing about its damnatory clauses. He imagines it to have been written about the year three hundred and fifty, and labours to devise a reason for its having been withheld from publication.

"T. W. P.," being no doubt a kindhearted man and understanding the temper of these times, puts a charitable gloss on the damnatory clauses. But we know what a mediæval priest meant when he uttered or penned an anathema. The charitable construction is charitable legerdemain.

It has been pointed out by a writer in the *Mail* that the Bishops, Clergy and Laity of the American Church when they revised their Prayer-Book in 1789 omitted the Athanasian Creed. Yet the rest of the Anglican Church remains in full communion with the American branch.

The whole of the Eastern Church not only rejects the Athanasian Creed, but positively denies the article of it asserting the procession of the Third Person of the Trinity from the Second as well as from the First. Is "T. W. P." prepared to say that all the Bishops, Clergy, and other members of the Eastern Church will without doubt perish everlastingly?

I am not driven, as some fancy, to shelter myself under the names of Stanley and the modern Latitudinarians. I have on my side Wake and Sherlock. I might claim all those prelates and members of the Anglican Church who with Elie Dupin and the Gallicans took part, or since that time have taken part, in overtures of union to the Eastern Church. Assuredly I might claim Dr. Arnold and many others whom no one but an extreme High Churchman would class among "assailants of the Bible and of Christianity." Perilous is the situation of Christianity if it has no upholders but those who love to repeat the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed.

The word used in the fourteenth verse of the Fourth Gospel to denote the conversion of the Logos into flesh or into humanity—for that is the broad meaning of the word translated flesh—is the same that is used in the ninth verse of the next chapter to denote the conversion of water into wine. Bishop Wordsworth's interpretation is at the best a philological *tour de force*; and it seems strange that to a philological *tour de force* executed in his favour by Bishop Wordsworth an Evangelist should owe his escape from anathema.

Such a word as "begotten," when used in the Gospel of a Divine relation, is symbolical and an adaptation to human understanding; but, when formally contrasted with "proceeding" in the Athanasian Creed, it assumes a totally different character and meaning: it becomes metaphysical, and an attempt to define and describe precisely a mode of divine generation which no human understanding can comprehend. This conversion of the symbolical into the metaphysical and dogmatic by the supersubtle intellects of Alexandria and Constantinople was a fruitful source of the cloud of theosophic dogma which now darkens our perception of the character and the veritable teaching of Christ, and which the Second Reformation bids fair to sweep away.

Belief is an act of the understanding: that to which we can attach no meaning, though we may repeat it with our lips, we cannot with our minds believe; not though, instead of being spun out of the brain of some mediæval monk in an hour of theological acrimony, it were proclaimed in thunder from Sinai. This the most unlearned of laymen must know as

well as he knows the number of his own arms or legs. Nor is any learning needed to support the petition that the voice of ecclesiastical cursing should be silent on the Natal Day of Charity and Peace. A BYSTANDER.

[The absence of the signature, "A Bystander," must never be taken as indicating that the writer has withdrawn from THE WEEK, to which, on the contrary, he hopes to be a regular contributor, though he may not adhere to a particular *nom de plume*, which has now served the literary purpose for which it was adopted.]

THE JOHN BROWN SONG.

AMONG national lyrics in America the song of John Brown's body as it lies mouldering in the grave has attained a place equally as high in the hearts of the American people as the famous New England tune of "Yankee Doodle." R. H. Dana, junior, in a letter to James T. Fields, once wrote as follows: "It would have been past belief had we been told that this almost undistinguishable name of John Brown should be whispered among four millions of slaves and sung wherever the English tongue is spoken, and incorporated into an anthem to whose solemn cadences men should march to battle by the tens of thousands."

For many years various conflicting statements have been made as regards the origin and authorship of the John Brown song. It was said of the song, at a meeting of the Grand Army of the Republic some years since, that "the air was as universally sung as any other in and out of the army during the war; but its origin of authorship has never been satisfactorily traced." Many of the stories of the origin of this famous song are curiously told. As early as 1856 a Mr. William Steffe, a somewhat popular song and Sunday-school hymn writer, was requested by a fire company at Charleston, South Carolina, to write an air for a series of verses, the chorus of which ran:

Say, bummers, will you meet us?

The effort resulted, claims the friends of Mr. Steffe, in the production of a tune now commonly called "John Brown's Body." The air possessed a spirited and pleasant measure, and at once attracted the attention of revivalists and persons interested in camp meetings. An entirely new set of words were written as a camp meeting hymn, the tune being retained and ending in a chorus, as follows:

Say, brothers, will you meet us?

The friends of Mr. Steffe, who claim that he still resides in Philadelphia, say that he has the original score of the tune in his possession.

This particular story of the origin of the John Brown song continues with the statement that in the Second Battalion Infantry, Massachusetts Volunteers, there was a singing quartette whose favourite song was "Say, brothers, will you meet us?" One of the members of the quartette was named John Brown, and he was chaffed a good deal on account of it. The other members of the quartette were Newton Purnette, James Jenkins and Charles Edgerly. The battalion was ordered to Fort Warren, Boston Harbour, in April, 1861, and, as the story goes, one day towards the end of April Edgerly and Purnette, who had been to Boston, returned in the evening boat. Jenkins and Brown were sitting near the guard-house watching the boat come in, and, as Jenkins caught sight of Edgerly, he called, "What news from the city?" Edgerly, upon seeing Brown, who was standing near, replied, "Oh, nothing special, except John Brown's dead." Brown began to fume and fret, which occasioned Purnette remarking, "He's a pretty lively corpse anyway, and moves around considerably." By nightfall the hazing had crystallized into the lines:

John Brown's body lies a-mouldering in the grave,
But his soul goes marching on.

The camp-meeting tune was fitted to these words, and by daylight on the following morning the John Brown Song was heard all over the camp, and from thence all over the country.

This is the story which has been told me, and I dislike to destroy the effect of so fine a narrative. The story shows that the John Brown Song originated in 1861. John Brown was executed at Charleston, Va., December 2nd, 1859, and was buried some days later at North Elba, New York. Miss Edna A. Proctor composed the "John Brown Song," which was set to music and made public. The original version of the song was as follows:

THE JOHN BROWN SONG.

By Edna A. Proctor.

John Brown died on the scaffold for the slave;
Dark was the hour when we dug his hallowed grave;
Now God avenges the life he gladly gave:
Freedom reigns to-day!
Glory, Glory Hallelujah,
Glory, Glory Hallelujah,
Glory, Glory Hallelujah,
Glory reigns to-day!