

Rumble, Leslie  
Quizzes on . . .  
ADV 5741

# QUIZZES

ON THE  
**Episcopal**  
AND THE  
**Anglican**  
CHURCHES

Fathers  
Rumble and Carty  
Radio Replies  
St. Paul 1, Minn., U. S. A.

1. RADIO REPLIES 60c
2. RADIO REPLIES 60c                      LIBRARY EDITION \$2.00 EA.
3. RADIO REPLIES 60c
- CHATS WITH PROSPECTIVE CONVERTS \$1.00
- THE CLEAN OBLATION \$2.75
- THE FAIR FLOWER OF EDEN \$1.00
- THE FRAGRANCE OF THE LITTLE FLOWER \$1.00
- THE LIFE OF FATHER PRO \$1.00
- WHAT SAY YOU \$2.75
- SUICIDE BENT \$2.00
- LETTERS HEBREW CATHOLIC TO MR. ISAACS \$2.00
- JEWISH PANORAMA \$3.00
- FORTY YEARS AFTER - PIUS XI - SOCIAL ORDER \$2.00
- THE LIFE OF FRANCIS OF ASSISI \$1.00
- RETREAT NOTES \$1.00
- DEATH OF CHRIST THE WARRIOR 50c
- CORRESPONDENCE COURSE IN CATHOLIC DOCTRINE 50c
- THE UNAVOIDABLE GOD 50c
- BIBLE QUIZZES 10c                      HELL QUIZZES 10c
- PURGATORY QUIZZES 10c              BIRTH PREVENTION QUIZZES 10c
- INDULGENCE QUIZZES 10c              EUCHARIST QUIZZES 10c
- CONFESSION QUIZZES 10c              TRUE CHURCH QUIZZES 10c
- MARRIAGE QUIZZES 10c              VIRGIN WORSHIP QUIZZES 10c
- BOUND IN BOOK FORM FOR INSTRUCTOR, QUIZZES \$1.50

---

Copyright 1943  
by the  
**RADIO REPLIES PRESS**  
Printed in U. S. A.

IMPRIMATUR

✠JOANNES GREGORIUS MURRAY,  
*Archiepiscopus Sancti Pauli*

Die 9a Augusti, 1942.

---

**1. Is there any essential difference between the Episcopalian Church in America and the Anglican Church in England?**

No. There is no essential difference. The Episcopalians in Canada and the U. S. A. claim that the Anglican Church in England is their Mother Church. The Episcopalian and Anglican Churches are Protestant although they speak of being Catholic. If Anglicans are not Protestants, no Anglican could be king of England, for the king, when crowned takes a solemn oath that he is a Protestant and will safeguard the Protestant succession to the Throne. Another point to notice is this: When America declared independence of England, the Church of England in America had to adapt itself to the new conditions. It promptly took the title: "The Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America." No doubts existed amongst those Anglicans or Episcopalianes at the time of their separation from England as to the Protestant character of their Church.

**2. The Episcopal or Anglican Church does not think of herself as a sect or denomination.**

The Episcopal or Anglican Church has no definite mind to express even concerning herself. High Churchmen claim kinship with Rome and Constantinople, and repudiate all other Protestant Churches as sects and denominations. And the sects, Methodists, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and others, are as indignant at such treatment as High Churchmen are when Rome refuses to recognize them! On the other hand, Low Churchmen deny any kinship with Rome, and insist that they are brethren of the sects and denominations.

**3. The Church of England or the Episcopal Church in America thinks of herself as the true representative of that historic Church founded by Jesus Christ through the Holy Ghost at Pentecost.**

At least we have there the admission that one ought to belong to the historic Church founded by Jesus Christ through the Holy Ghost at Pentecost. But the only Church which answers to the description is the Catholic Church. I deny that the Anglican or Episcopal Church thinks of herself as the true representative of that Church. Some Episcopalians and Anglicans think their Church a true representative of the historic Catholic Church, and a part of it. But the Church of which they claim to be a part rejects their claim.

**4. The Episcopal or Anglican Church**



---

**has no other foundation day than Pentecost.**

The Episcopalian or Anglican Church, as a separate religious body, independent of the Catholic Church, dates from 1534, when Henry VIII rejected the authority of the Pope, and usurped his jurisdiction over the Church in England, claiming that as well as the authority over the State which alone rightfully belonged to the King. Prior to 1534, Episcopalianism or Anglicanism was unheard of. There is a gap of 1500 years between Pentecost and the founding of the Church of England, a gap which can never be bridged. If one wants to belong to the historic Church founded by Jesus Christ, one has no option but to become a Catholic, subject to the Pope as Bishop of Rome and head of the true Church.

**5. The Episcopal or Anglican Church claims to be a part of the Catholic Church founded by Jesus Christ.**

That High Church claim cannot stand the test of history. There is no doubt that, at the time of the Reformation England broke away from the Catholic Church every bit as much as, in the national sphere, America broke away from England by its declaration of independence in 1776. And the Church of England could not break away from the Catholic Church, yet still belong to it.

**6. The Reformation did not mean a break from the tradition of the Church, but merely renounced a claim to au-**

thority by the See of Rome which had no justification in the Bible or in the early Church history.

The vast majority of Protestants would indignantly repudiate such a description of the Reformation. They would deny that it meant merely the rejection of Papal jurisdiction. Methodists, Baptists, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Low Church Anglicans, Lutherans, and representatives of all other Protestant Churches will insist that the Reformation broke with the traditions of a thousand years' standing, and that it rejected what it called blasphemous doctrines and idolatrous worship which it said that all professing Catholics had until then maintained. The Anglican Articles of Religion in the Book of Common Prayer tell us that, not only the Church of Rome, but the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch fell into error. High Church Anglicans may now think that a mistake. They may want to restrict the error to Rome, and only to Papal claims to authority. They may desire to restore the doctrines and worship wrongly thought blasphemous and idolatrous by the Protestant reformers. But that does not give them the right to say that such doctrines and worship were never rejected; and that, because they are maintained now, they have always been maintained by the Church of England.

7. In the fifteenth century the corruption of the Roman Court and the exactions of the Papacy became so scandalous that a great revolt took

place in the following century, and the Church of England set itself free from Papal domination.

I have no wish to deny or even to palliate the disedifying lives of many of the Catholic clergy, and Bishops, and even of some Popes prior to the Protestant Reformation. But whilst these things clamoured for reform, they did not justify revolt and the establishing of new Churches, as Lutheranism in Germany, Calvinism in Switzerland, Anglicanism in England, Episcopalianism in America, Presbyterianism in Scotland, etc. Also I must point out that, when Henry VIII broke with Rome, compelling the English Parliament to substitute his own supremacy for that of the Pope, it was his own personal corruption that instigated the move. For he wished to get rid of his lawful wife Catherine, in order to marry Anne Boleyn. The Pope refused to grant the divorce; whereupon Henry left the Catholic Church, and set up his own Church by law established in England. That was in 1534.

8. The authority which was repudiated in the Reformation had been recognized in England only for the last quarter of the Christian era up to that date.

As the Reformation occurred in the sixteenth century, that means that the authority of the Pope had been recognized in England only during the four hundred years preceding it.



But how can any man assert that the authority of Rome was not recognized in England before the twelfth century with the historical fact staring him in the face that Pope Gregory I sent St. Augustine in the sixth century to England, made him first Archbishop of Canterbury, and delegated authority to him over all the other Bishops then in England, Bishops who also acknowledged the supremacy of the Pope?

9. Four hundred years ago Cranmer wrote: "I declared that the Bishop of Rome was not God's Vicar on Earth, as he was taken; and although it was taught so these three or four hundred years, yet it was done by means of the Bishop of Rome, who compelled men by oaths so to teach, to the maintenance of his authority, contrary to God's word."

Firstly, little authority attaches to any declaration made by Cranmer. Secondly, it is historically false to suggest that the supreme authority over the whole Catholic Church possessed by the Pope was taught only during the three or four hundred years before the Reformation. It was taught and accepted from Apostolic times. A thousand years before the Reformation it was Pope Gregory the Great who exercised his supreme authority to send St. Augustine to England and make him the first Archbishop of Canterbury. Thirdly, even if the doctrine were accepted by all



Catholics for over four hundred years only prior to the Reformation, do Anglo-Catholics hold that the whole Catholic Church could fall into error on so vital a point? If they do they have no real notion of what the Catholic Church is when they declare their belief in it. Fourthly, it was Henry VIII who compelled men by oaths to acknowledge his own royal supremacy, contrary to God's word, and thus originated the Church of England.

**10. If England was right, the Church of England is no new Church, but still a part of the Catholic Church founded by Christ at Pentecost.**

England, as such, had no clear notion of what was happening, and no say in it. Henry VIII, as absolute monarch, decided to break with the Catholic Church for his own purposes. And he imposed his will upon all, sending to the block those who opposed him, even men like St. Thomas More. His conduct in thus leaving the Catholic Church was not right, and the Church over which he presided was a new Church, no longer part of the Catholic Church.

**11. This is the basis of the Anglican claim to the orthodoxy and continuity of its faith.**

As the claim is no stronger than its basis, the claim is worthless. The Anglican Church certainly did not continue to teach the faith held by all Christians in preceding ages; nor

can its doctrines, even could anyone tell us precisely what they are, be termed orthodox.

**12. No part of the Catholic Faith was rejected at the Reformation, but only an uncatholic and pernicious accretion to the faith.**

At the Reformation, the Church of England rejected the doctrine of the real objective presence of Christ in the Eucharist, the Mass as a Sacrifice, belief in purgatory, belief in the seven Sacraments, devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary, and the doctrine of the intercession of the Saints. Yet High Church Clergymen are trying to reintroduce these things into the Church of England. If they believe these to be part of the Catholic Faith, how can they say that no part of the Catholic Faith was rejected at the Reformation? And if they think they ought to be restored, how can they call them pernicious accretions?

**13. Bishops of the ancient Orthodox Eastern Churches have joined with Anglican Bishops in services at Westminster Abbey.**

Some Greek Orthodox Bishops of recent times have thus acted, inconsistently with the principles of Greek Orthodoxy. But that does not make the Anglican case any better. Recognition by schismatic Bishops counts for nothing. And matters are worse when we realize that the Greek Bishops have only High Church

theories put before them, and not the predominant Low Church views which they would utterly reject. Also, one cannot but doubt the sincerity of the Greek Bishops. There is, of course, a bond between Constantinople and Canterbury in their fellow feeling of opposition to Rome. But there are other things also. One Anglican clergyman, the Reverend L. G. Lean, has recently written that "one is compelled to regard certain aspects of the Anglo-Orthodox alliance with suspicion." He points out that the Orthodox Church finds temporal advantages in cultivating the friendship of England even at the price of a certain recognition of Anglicanism. The Greek Church has lost the protection of the Russian Government. England has the Palestine Mandate, and is strong in the East. It pays the Greek Bishops to modify the uncompromising attitude they maintained when they were true to their real principles.

14. This is an interesting manifestation of the faithfulness of the Church of England to the Catholic Faith.

The suggestion is that the faith of the Church of England must be sound because it is one with that of the Greek Orthodox Church. But the Greek Church still retains most of the things which Anglicanism rejected as uncatholic and pernicious accretions, with the exception of its rejection of Papal authority. Why are the same things pernicious accretions in the Roman Church, yet not in the Greek Church? Do the compliments paid by



a few Greek Bishops to High Church Anglicans make such a difference? It is difficult to give credit for sincerity and honesty to such remarks about Roman accretions. If the average Anglican studied Greek Orthodox doctrine and worship, its Sacrifices of Masses, its belief in purgatory, seven Sacraments, its worship of Mary, and of the Saints, and its cult of Ikons or Images far more extravagant than anything in the Catholic Church, the average Anglican would certainly deny the similarity between Anglican and Greek Orthodox beliefs.

15. The present Archbishop of Canterbury is the ninety-fifth of an unbroken line stretching from St. Augustine to the present day.

That is not true. The last Archbishop of Canterbury in the line of unbroken succession from St. Augustine was Cardinal Pole, who died in the year 1558. In the year 1559 Queen Elizabeth called upon all the Catholic Bishops in England to take the oath of Supremacy, acknowledging her as supreme in all things, spiritual as well as temporal, and repudiating the authority of the Pope. Every Bishop in England refused, except Kitchin of Llandaff. Without any ecclesiastical sanction of any kind, the Queen deprived every Bishop except Kitchin of his office and liberty. The whole of the existent Catholic episcopate with the exception of one solitary Bishop was abolished as far as civil law could accomplish this. And Elizabeth set up a new hier-



archy in place of the evicted Bishops, a hierarchy unrecognized by the lawful Bishops of the Catholic Church throughout the world to this day. For the first time a married man, Parker, was declared to be Archbishop of Canterbury; and he was not a lawful successor of St. Augustine, who had been appointed by the Pope. Parker and his successors may have held the old ecclesiastical buildings and titles since 1559; but they are no more lineal descendants of St. Augustine than an intruder would belong to a family merely because, having thrown that family into the street, he had established himself in their house and taken their name.

16. You have said that the Church of England came into being in 1534, the year in which Henry VIII refused to recognize the jurisdiction of the See of Rome in England.

That is so. The unity of any society, whether religious or national, depends upon the acknowledgment of one and the same supreme authority. Thus the United States of America became a new and independent national society in 1776 when the authority of the British Throne, hitherto acknowledged, was repudiated. In the same way, when Henry VIII, in 1534, rejected the supreme ecclesiastical authority acknowledged previously in England, substituting his own for that of the Pope, he broke away from the old Church, and created a new one. He established the Church of England, therefore, in

1534. And the two greatest historians of English Law, Professor Maitland of Cambridge, and Professor Holdsworth of Oxford, insist upon this as a legal fact.

17. After that event, did not the same bishops continue to preside over English Sees, the same priests to fulfil their office, and to minister to English Christians?

Those who conformed to Henry's wishes did so. Bishop Fisher of Rochester, and St. Thomas More, of course, died rather than renounce the jurisdiction of the Pope in favor of that of Henry. But the bishops and priests who yielded to Henry became schismatics with him, and went on ministering in the new schismatical Church.

18. How could their orders, which were given them by God, be destroyed by the action of a civil magistrate?

Their orders were given them by God through their lawful ordination or consecration at the hands of the Bishops of the Catholic Church. Those orders could not be destroyed by any civil magistrates. Therefore the bishops and priests who ministered in Henry's new and schismatical Church retained valid orders. But when Henry died and Edward VI came to the throne, Cranmer changed the rite for ordination in such a way that priests ordained and bishops consecrated

---

under the new Ordinal were not validly ordained or consecrated at all. Cranmer's Ordinal came into effect in 1550. Until then Henry's Church of England had retained a truly ordained priesthood. But after 1550 future Anglican ministers were not priests at all in the former sense of the word.

19. At the reconciliation of the Church of England with the Holy See some twenty years later, did any question arise as to the validity of the English Orders?

Yes. Queen Mary came to the throne in 1553, and at once set to work to bring the separated Church of England back into unity with Rome. At once there commenced a series of re-ordinations, those who had been ordained under the Edwardine Ordinal being ordained according to the Catholic rite.

20. If not, how could a new Church, which was not a Church, have come into being in 1534?

As I have pointed out, the break with Rome by Henry VIII in 1534 did not then affect the question of valid Orders. But his was a new Church as distinct and separate from the Catholic Church to which he and England had previously belonged as the Greek Orthodox Church is a separate Church even though the Greek Orthodox Church has ever retained valid Orders. The question as to whether

a Church retains unity with the Church of the ages, or is in a state of separation from it depends primarily upon jurisdiction, not upon the validity of Orders.

21. Why was there no pronouncement against the validity of English Orders for three and a half centuries after the breach with Rome?

You wrongly suppose that there was not. In abrogating Henry's laws, and legislating for the restoration of the Catholic religion in England, Queen Mary herself published a decree on March 4th, 1554, declaring in its fifteenth article that those ordained according to the Edwardine Ordinal were not ordained in very deed, and that they had to receive valid Orders. On June 20th, 1555 Pope Paul IV issued the Bull *Praeclara Carissimi* in which he said that the Edwardine ministers had to be ordained correctly, and that until they had been so ordained they were not to exercise any ecclesiastical duties in the restored Church. Mary, however, died in 1558 and Elizabeth broke with Rome once more, adopting the Edwardine Ordinal, and giving the Church of England a ministry whose Orders cannot be accepted as valid in any Catholic sense of the word.

22. Why does the Roman Catholic Church recognize the Orders of the Eastern Churches, which have not been in communion with her since the



eleventh century, and deny those of the Anglican Church which are recognized by the Eastern Churches?

Rome recognizes the Orders of the Eastern Churches because, although they fell into schism by breaking away from Rome, they did not alter their ordination rites; nor did they adopt Protestant doctrines repudiating the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist, the Sacrifice of the Mass, and the priesthood. Never at any time did they introduce a new Protestantised ordination rite, as Anglicans did in the reign of Edward VI. It cannot be said that the Eastern Churches recognize Anglican Orders as valid. Listen to these words of an Anglican writer, the Reverend T. H. Whitton, M. A., in his book on Reunion published in 1933. He writes as follows: "Recently five of the twenty independent Churches of the Eastern Orthodox Church have reconsidered their former attitude, and pronounced in favor of Anglican Orders." But he adds that they paid great attention to the Anglo-Catholics by whom, said the Bishop of Durham "the Synod of Constantinople was deliberately misled."

23. Was not the so-called reformation of the Church of England by the State strongly resisted by the English laity, and also by a large proportion of the clergy, for generations.

No. It was Elizabeth who protestantised the Church of England, and the bulk of the

people, not understanding deeply the religious principles at stake, blended patriotism with Protestantism, and regarded refusal of the Queen's Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity as treason. In the twenty years between 1580 and 1600 under Elizabeth, one hundred and thirty priests and sixty of the laity were put to death for resistance to the Protestant settlement of religion. Of course, many others suffered lesser penalties, but they could not be called a large proportion of the population. Later on, besides Catholic opposition, there was widespread opposition on the part of non-conformists who wanted Protestantism, but also their independence of the State-controlled Church of England. However, all this is really irrelevant to the fact that the Church of England was a new Church originated as a schism by Henry VIII, and protestantised by Edward VI and Elizabeth.

**24. Why did the Church of England continue to maintain that only by adherence to the Apostolic Succession could she remain a true Church?**

Professor Holdsworth, in his History of English Law, puts that tradition down to the Tudor genius for trying to make their innovations seem to be based on ancient rights. And he shows how Henry VIII was particularly given to this habit. When Elizabeth protestantised the Church of England, however, little was made of the need of Apostolic Succession. Bishop Jewel did not hesitate

to write, "If it were certain that Orders must pass from Bishop to Bishop, the Church of England has neither Bishops nor Priests, nor Deacons." With the Anglo-Catholic revival in the Church of England, however, since the Tractarian movement of the 1830's onwards, the attempt has been more ardently made to vindicate Apostolic Succession for Anglican Orders, and to rank the Anglican clergy as true priests together with Roman and Greek priests, and as opposed to the Protestant ministry of the Nonconformists. But despite all theories, their efforts cannot avail against historical facts.

**25. Was this not in distinct contradiction to the teaching of the great Protestant reformers, Luther, Calvin, and their successors, who taught that the Church was something outside the Apostolic Fellowship?**

As I have pointed out earlier, when Henry VIII broke with Rome, he founded a schismatical Church. That is, he repudiated the authority of Rome and usurped authority over his Church for himself. But he repudiated the teachings of the Protestant reformers on the Continent. Under Edward VI and Elizabeth, however, the Church of England was protestantised, and Apostolic Succession was rejected. Thus, in our own days, Doctor Ryle, Anglican Bishop of Liverpool, did not hesitate to write in his book, *What we Owe to the Reformers*. "The ecclesiastic of the Anglican Church is in no wise a priest, although



we call him such. The Reformers stripped the office of the clergy entirely of any sacerdotal character. They found the clergy sacrificing priests, and made them prayer-reading preaching ministers." The Anglican Bishop Knox of Manchester, in the National Review for September 1925, said that the Pope from the Catholic point of view was unquestionably right in condemning Anglican Orders. "No one reading the Roman Ordinal," he writes, "can doubt that it is full of the intention of ordaining sacrificing priests. No one reading the English Ordinal can suspect that it has any such object."

26. I would like you to settle a friendly argument between an Anglican acquaintance and myself.

My decision will be quite impartial and just.

27. My Anglican friend says that the Anglican clergy from pre-Reformation days carried the titles of Bishops, Priests, Deacons, Doctors of Divinity and other Catholic titles right through with them from the beginning, and were always known by these titles. I denied this.

Your Anglican friend was right, and you were wrong.



28. At what time in their history did the Anglican clergy begin to use these titles?

They retained them from the very beginning of their Church, when it was first separated from the Catholic Church in 1534. But they very soon lost the reality signified by the titles. For in 1550, Cranmer published a new Ordinal for the ordination of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, from which he carefully excluded all ideas of the Priesthood as formerly understood in England, and throughout the Catholic world. He wanted a ministry of preaching and administering Sacraments, but not, at any price a Priesthood for the offering of Sacrifice by the celebration of Mass. And of course that was the end of Priesthood, as we Catholics know it, so far as the Church of England is concerned.

29. I refused to agree because in the Penal Days a price was put on the head of the Priest, and he was hunted like a wolf.

That does not alter the fact that the titles, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, were retained in the Anglican Ordinal and Prayer Book. A price was put on the heads of "Popish Priests."

30. I did not think the Anglican clergy would covet the dignity of the Priesthood.

Though they retained the titles, they did not intend them to signify the same Priesthood as that acknowledged before the Reformation. In fact the early Anglican divines most vehemently denied that the Anglican Clergy were Priests in the Catholic sense of the word. They insisted that they were not Priests, but ministers. For example Hooker wrote, "Seeing then that sacrifice is now no part of the Church ministry, how should the name of Priesthood be thereunto rightly applied?" Sandys, Archbishop of York wrote, "Antichrist is the author of the Popish priesthood." Bishop Jewell declared that there was no essential difference between a Priest and a layman. Fulke, an Anglican professor of Divinity at Cambridge, gently expressed his estimate of the Catholic Priesthood they had renounced by saying, "With all our hearts we defy, abhor and detest your anti-christian Orders." In accordance with the new notions, of course, celibacy was abolished, and Anglican Parsons were free to marry just as any other laymen. And in general usage the term Priest gave way to Minister, or parson.

### 31. Not Henry VIII, but the ancient Church of the English people broke with the Papacy.

The admitted break with the Papacy meant the cessation of the ancient papal Church of the English people; and the non-papal Church to be established henceforth was a new thing altogether. Meantime, not the ancient Church,

but Henry VIII himself broke with the Papacy, and at his dictation, Parliament imposed a similar defection upon both clergy and laity in England. To Henry, therefore, the new Church of England owed its origin.

32. If Henry originated a new Church with a completely changed constitution, how could it be reconciled with Rome under Mary in 1554?

Quite easily. I do not say that it was reunited with Rome remaining as it was. The fact that it had to be reunited with Rome shows that it had got out of unity with Rome, and therefore was different in its character from the Church previously known in England. It was a new type of Church, essentially different from the old. But when it was reunited with Rome, it repudiated the new constitutional authority imposed upon it by Henry, and also the heretical importations under Edward VI.

33. Did Anglicanism then cease to be in England?

Yes. But in 1559 Elizabeth revived the ideas of Royal Supremacy first put forward by Henry VIII, and commenced Anglicanism anew, protestantising it in a way which Henry would have most certainly rejected with indignation, and probably much bloodshed. Present Anglicanism is the lineal descendant of Elizabeth's foundation, and really

has no organic continuity with the Anglican schismatic establishment set up by Henry VIII. It is perfectly true, however, to say that Anglicanism was unknown to England until Henry VIII came on the scene, and that he is the author of the Anglican demand for a national Church independent of Roman authority and jurisdiction. And therefore he is certainly the originator of Anglicanism in England. Elizabeth was the originator of a still newer type of Anglicanism, and the foundress of the present Anglican Church.

34. The Pope himself was responsible for the Reformation in England. In declaring Henry's marriage to Catherine valid, he acted against the advice of Wolsey and dozens of others all over Europe.

The Pope acted according to the evidence. I admit that the decision was against the hopes of Wolsey who was a time-server, and against those theologians and lawyers who were friends of Henry. And Henry was in no way justified in making the decision an excuse to abandon the Catholic Church and foist himself upon the people of England as their chief Apostle and guide.

35. Can a 14 year old boy be betrothed in the eyes of the Church? If not, where was Henry's sin.

It was the custom in those days for royal houses to arrange suitable marriages for



princes and princesses well before the marriage was to take place. Henry's brother Arthur had been married to Catherine, though the two had never lived together. Arthur died before they could do so. A dispensation was obtained to enable Henry to marry Catherine. Catherine was about 18, and Henry was about 12 when the dispensation was obtained from Rome. The actual marriage could not be gone on with then, for Henry had the right to protest his unwillingness as soon as he was 14. When Henry came to the age of 14, his father, Henry VII, made him record a formal protest on the score that the marriage had been arranged without his consent. Henry VII had other political schemes in mind, and prince Henry certainly had the right of refusal. But, when Henry VII died, and Henry VIII came to the throne in 1509, the new king changed his mind, and decided after all that he wanted to marry Catherine. He was then 18 years of age, and there can be no doubt about the validity of his self-chosen marriage to Catherine.

36. The law of the Church forbade Henry's marriage to his brother's widow, and therefore the dispensation for that marriage given by the Pope—not by the English Church—was beyond papal authority.

That objection was urged by Henry, when his belated scruples had been provoked by Anne Boleyn. But, firstly, the little aside that

the dispensation was granted by the Pope, and "not by the English Church" is absurd. If what you call the English Church were not merely the papal Church in England, but quite independent of the papal Church, why on earth was Henry appealing to the Pope to grant him a dispensation? Secondly, if only the law of the Church stood in the way of the marriage, then the Pope could dispense from it. Henry was not so foolish as to make that a plea in order to show that the Pope had no right to grant such a dispensation. Having submitted five other pleas which were all rejected, he submitted that the dispensation for his marriage to Catherine was invalid, not because it was opposed to any merely ecclesiastical law, but to positive divine law. This plea was also considered, and proved to be erroneous. Henry's marriage to Catherine was valid, and the Pope would have exceeded papal authority had he permitted Henry to put away Catherine and marry Anne Boleyn. However, whilst the Pope's refusal to grant a divorce occasioned Henry's revolt, the divorce question makes no difference to the problem of Anglican continuity, or rather discontinuity. Whatever the reasons for it, the fact remains that Henry set up a schismatical Church, and that Anglicanism is as much excluded from the Catholic Church as Anglicans themselves would exclude Judge Rutherford's Witnesses of Jehovah from their own Communion.

37. Apart from his matrimonial affairs, did not Henry live and die a Roman Catholic?

Since Henry had renounced all allegiance to Rome, and had constituted himself head of the Church in England, he ceased to be a Roman Catholic, and did not live as such. He did retain Catholic doctrines other than that of the necessity of obedience to the Holy See, and also Catholic forms of worship. But that did not make him a Catholic. A Catholic is one who is a subject of the lawful authority of the Catholic Church. Henry refused to be a subject of that authority, and died in his schismatical state.

**38. The Anglican Church in England has unbroken continuity for 13 centuries. The Roman Catholics are the dissenters.**

If such continuity be a fact, then the Anglican Church established by Henry VIII was exactly the same Church as that which existed previously. Now St. Thomas More was one of the wisest and best men in England at the time. He was a very clever lawyer, and a man of the utmost integrity. He knew that Henry's action meant the creation of a new Church altogether, and said that he could not accept a Church of which a layman, even though a king, was in supreme authority. And he died on the scaffold rather than abandon the Church of his fathers. But, if the new Church proposed by Henry was the same as the old Church, then Thomas More was a fool for his pains. And St.



Thomas More was no fool. The question will always be there. Why did St. Thomas More lay his head on the block? The answer is—because continuity with the previously existent Church was being wrecked. If ever there was a dissenter, it was Henry VIII, who repudiated the constitutional authority of the Pope, and established a dissenting Church. If the nonconformists were called dissenters because they would not accept the royal supremacy. Anglicans are dissenters because they refuse to accept papal supremacy.

**39. The Anglican Church is not a state department subject to the Crown. It goes back to Apostolic times.**

No Catholic Bishop in the world would admit that an Anglican Bishop possesses either apostolic orders or jurisdiction. It is historically certain that Henry VIII rejected the ecclesiastical jurisdiction which prevailed until the Reformation, and brought the Church in England under his own supreme jurisdiction. Queen Elizabeth exacted this oath from Anglican Bishops: "I, A. B., do utterly testify and declare in my conscience that the Queen's Highness is the only supreme governor in all spiritual and ecclesiastical things or causes as in all temporal matters." In the Book of Common Prayer, just before the Articles of Religion, we read an announcement made by Queen Victoria; "Whereas addresses were presented to us by both Houses of Parliament with a view to discontinuing certain



forms of prayer and service, it is our will and pleasure that they be revoked." "Being Supreme Governor of the Church, we hold it most agreeable to our kingly office to conserve the Church committed to our charge." In 1928 the British Parliament rejected the new Prayer Book proposed by the Anglican Bishops. The Church of England, as by law established, is subject to civil law, both in theory and in practice, despite the denials of High Churchmen.

**40. No English Sovereign has taken the title of "Head of the Church" since the days of Mary.**

Henry VIII usurped that title when he repudiated the authority of the Pope. When Mary came to the throne, she repudiated Henry's usurpation, and returned to papal supremacy. Elizabeth revived Henry's revolt against papal supremacy, making herself "Supreme Governor of the Church of England." She said that Christ was the Head of the Church, and that she herself was its supreme authority on earth only.

**41. No spiritual function has been claimed by or assigned to the Crown since her time.**

It is difficult to understand why you say "since her time." Mary declared the royal supremacy to be blasphemy, and abolished the law by which Henry established it.

Elizabeth revived that law, and it still stands. If you insist that the present king is not head of the Church of England, and exercises no spiritual function, how will you explain the preface to the "Official Year Book of the Church of England for 1937"? There the Dean of Westminster, Dr. F. W. Norris, says that the king "is anointed, consecrated, set apart for his high office with the fullest spiritual sanctions. Henceforth he represents in his own Royal Person both Church and State." This Anglican Dean of Westminster then proceeds to justify the appointment of Bishops by the Crown, and says, "An elected President is one thing—a consecrated King is something quite different. The King is a spiritual person, and is qualified in his own person to represent both Church and State." If the Official Year Book of the Church of England declares that the king is equally head of Church and State, you can hardly quarrel with me for my agreeing with it. And if one feels that he cannot accept such a state of affairs, it is no remedy to shut his eyes to it. One should seek the religion which is in conformity with the will of Christ.

42. If people of foreign nationality became Anglicans, would they have to admit the king of England as head of their Church on earth?

Logically they would have to do so if they thought of Anglicanism as one united Church. If they acknowledged only some particular independent Bishop who supported Anglican

forms of worship, then they would not deem real unity to be essential to their Church at all.

**43. As a child I was taught that the Church of England was but a section of the Catholic Church—reformed.**

I myself, as an Anglican child, was more correctly taught that the Church of England was given us by the Reformation as our own English Protestant Church.

**44. At the Reformation the Breath of God moved over the nations and revived the spirit of true religion.**

If the Breath of God moving over the nations were responsible for the Protestant Reformation, it is strange that one and the same God should inspire Lutheranism in Germany, Calvinism in Switzerland, Anglicanism in England, and other conflicting and contradictory types of religion in various sections of the world. Henry VIII certainly did not believe that the Breath of God inspired Luther. And he himself was inspired chiefly by Anne Boleyn.

**45. In the Church of England the faith was preserved, whilst everything of doubtful authenticity was carefully removed.**

Henry VIII's claim to be head of the Church was promulgated; and that claim at least was not of doubtful authenticity; it was quite invalid, and a blasphemous usurpation. But beyond the repudiation of the Pope's authority Henry would not go. Only after Henry's death, in the reigns of Edward VI and Elizabeth, did other Protestant principles invade the new Church of England. And then, not things of doubtful authenticity, but the most essential doctrines and practices of the Catholic Faith were swept away. So it is that today we find High Church Anglicans laboring to get back into the Church of England the very things that were thrown out at the Reformation. They are trying to restore a belief in the Sacrifice of the Mass, in the Sacrament of Confession, in Purgatory and prayers for the dead, in devotion to Mary and to the Saints. If these things are of doubtful authenticity, why are they trying to get them back? If not, why were they ever rejected.

**46. Anglicanism preserves the essentials of the Faith, Ministry, and Sacraments.**

The effort to identify the Anglican Church with the pre-Reformation Church in England is doomed to failure. The pre-Reformation Church accepted the same faith as all Catholics throughout the world, and subject to the Pope at that time. It accepted the Sacrifice of the Mass, the same Catholic Priesthood, and the seven Sacraments. The Catholic Church on the Continent and throughout the



world today has the same essentials of Faith, Ministry, and Sacraments. Yet, far from retaining the same essentials of Faith, Anglicanism tolerates the most radical denials of the Faith. No one can say what the Church of England as a Church does teach. Evangelicals, Anglo-Catholics, and Modernists, all teach radically opposed doctrines, yet claim to do so in the name of the Anglican Church. As for the Ministry, does Anglicanism retain a sacrificial priesthood, and the Sacrifice of the Mass? It does not. Anglicanism is out of harmony with the Catholics of all nations throughout the world. If a General Council of all Catholic Bishops in the world were called by the Pope, no Anglican Bishop would be invited to attend. Yet, prior to the Reformation, every Bishop in England would have been invited. The Anglican Church today is definitely not the Church all Englishmen acknowledged before the Reformation.

47. If there were a break in the continuity of the Church of England it must have occurred in the first years of Elizabeth.

It occurred in 1534, under Henry VIII. Mary restored the Church to unity with Rome in 1554. Elizabeth restored Henry's break in 1559. And continuity without continued unity is impossible.

48. No historical document can be found to show that Elizabeth abolished the old Church to found a new one.

Elizabeth came to the throne in 1558. Since she was borne of Anne Boleyn whilst Henry's first wife Catherine was still living, she knew that the Pope would never recognize her as legitimate. She reacted in the direction of Protestantism, selecting a Council of advisers who were all Protestants. They were headed by Sir William Cecil, who became Secretary of State. This Council drew up a document called "A Device for the Alteration of Religion", demanding rigid persecution of those of the clergy who would not abjure their allegiance to the Pope. This "Device" was to be presented to Parliament as soon as it should meet. Parliament met in 1559, and the recommendations of the "Device" were applied in the Act of Supremacy and the Act of Uniformity in Religion. The Act of Supremacy hit Catholics who held to the authority of the Pope, and to the old religion in England; the Act of Uniformity hit the new Protestants who did not like Anglicanism and who were therefore nonconformists. The penalties for non-compliance with this Device for the Alteration of Religion were, for a first offence—total confiscation of property; for a second offence—imprisonment during the Queen's pleasure; for a third offence—death, on the score of high treason. This Device succeeded in its purpose, and the English people were robbed of their Catholic Faith. The laws for the persecution of Catholics lasted from 1559 till 1829, when the Catholic Emancipation Act was passed after 270 years of hardship and repression. A deadly fear seemed to prevail lest Englishmen would wish to return to the Catholic Faith of their

forefathers, were they granted liberty to do so. And in reality that fear has been justified by the remarkable revival of Catholicism in England since the repeal of the penal laws.

**49. You cannot deprive us Anglicans of our Apostolic inheritance like that.**

The Church of England deliberately cut itself off from the Apostolic Church, and has no living connection with it. The Anglican clergy inherit neither valid Orders, nor any jurisdiction from the Apostles. Listen to these words which were addressed to the Anglican Bishop of Ely by Queen Elizabeth, "Proud Prelate, I would have you know that I who made you what you are can unmake you; and if you do not forthwith fulfil this engagement, by God I will immediately unfrock you."

**50. Historical sources show that the Roman Church had but a small part in the establishment of English Christianity.**

Lingard, whose reliability as an historian no well-informed man would question, says that "the earliest notice which we find of a British Church occurs in the writings of Bede, the Anglo-Saxon." Now the Venerable Bede, in his Ecclesiastical History Bk. I, c. IV, has these words: "In the year of Our Lord 156, whilst the holy Eleutherius presided over the Roman Church, Lucius, king of Britain, sent

a letter to him, entreating that by a mandate from him he might be made a Christian. He soon obtained his pious request, and the Britons preserved the faith which they had received uncorrupted and entire." It would be an anachronism of the deepest dye to identify Anglicanism with this early British Christianity received from Rome in the 2nd century. Bede himself, who lived in the 7th century, was of course a Catholic monk, who professed the religion of all Englishmen at that time, and who constantly vindicates the supreme authority of the Bishop of Rome. Anglicanism was quite unknown to him.

51. Did not Joseph of Arimathea bring Christianity to Britain, and die at Glastonbury in 82 A. D.?

That is a purely legendary story. G. P. Fisher, Protestant professor of Church History at Yale University writes as follows: "Though history is silent about the origin of the early British Church, the credulity of later generations has never wanted for legends to supply its place. Some of these tell of Joseph of Arimathea, and of the Church he founded at Glastonbury. Setting aside these and like tales as unsupported by evidence, we may safely conjecture that the gospel was carried to Britain soon after the Romans gained a firm foothold there." Of course, even were the story of Joseph of Arimathea true, it in no way affects the case for the Church of England. You would have to prove that he preached, not the Catholic, but the Anglican religion—an impossible task.



52. Tertullian, writing in the year 200, said that there were in Britain people not subject to Rome, but already won for Christ.

Tertullian did not mean that they were not subject to the Bishop of Rome. He meant simply that they were outside the confines of the Roman Empire, so widespread had Christianity become. So, too, one could say that there are people not subject to the British Flag who speak English. The Christians in Britain were members of the one true Church ruled over by the Bishop of Rome.

53. British Christianity most probably came from Gaul.

That is true. Pope Eleutherius probably arranged that missionaries should go from Gaul, for the Christians in Gaul were as Catholic as Christians in France today. Nobody would suggest that there is no continuity between the Catholic Church in France now, and the Catholic Church in Gaul then. But if the Church of the British was in communion with the Church in Gaul then, why isn't the Church of England now in communion with the Catholic Church in France today?

54. The Scots, however, caused the greater part of the Christianization of England.

This effort to trace British Christianity to a non-Roman source fails utterly in the light of history. The missionaries drawn from Iona and Lindisfarne came originally to Scotland from Ireland with the religion they had derived from St. Patrick who had been sent to Ireland by the Pope, and who frequently exhorted his people, "As ye are children of Christ, so be ye children of Rome." Aidan, Columba, Finan, Colman, and their monks all belonged to the Catholic Church, and were subject to the Pope.

55. As Augustine came later from Rome, the Church of England is rooted in early British, Celtic, and Roman Churches.

All these sources were Catholic and Roman. But the Church of England is no more rooted in the previous Church in England than present white Australians are rooted genealogically in the black aborigines who occupied Australia prior to English settlement. There is not an English Bishop or Priest who would not turn in his grave, be he British, Celtic, or Roman, at the very thought of his name being coupled with Anglicanism.

56. In 314, long before Augustine brought Roman Christianity, three Bishops of the British Church were present at the Council of Arles, in Gaul, representing London, York, and Lincoln.

That proves that there was a Church in England prior to the arrival of St. Augustine. But this Church was not the "Church of England" as we know that expression. It was the Catholic Church extended to England from its common centre—Rome. The Council of Arles was held in France. Every Bishop there was subject to the Pope. The Legate of Pope Sylvester presided, and the Decrees were sent to the Pope for his confirmation of them. The document sent began with the words, "Assembled here at Arles, united in the bonds of fraternal charity, and in communion with our Mother the Catholic Church, we salute you, most glorious Pope, with the respect due to you." After describing the scope of their deliberations, the document concludes, "In the presence of the Holy Spirit and of the Angels, we have drawn up regulations here as we judged best according to our poor ability. It is for you who enjoy wider jurisdiction to use your authority for their promulgation in all the Churches." Such expressions are anything but Anglican.

57. It was St. Augustine who brought Rome in, thus causing schisms and divisions.

You are not familiar with the history of those times. St. Augustine did not bring Rome to Britain. The British Bishops before his time were all in union with Rome. When the Saxons invaded Britain, however, they drove the early British Christians into the fastnesses of Wales, and settled down in their paganism

to enjoy the occupied territory. To these pagan Anglo-Saxons Pope Gregory sent St. Augustine in 597, with instructions to convert them to the Catholic religion, and unite them in one and the same Church with the British Bishops already in England. That all those British Bishops were subject to Rome is evident from the documents given to Augustine by the Pope. For the Pope made St. Augustine the first Archbishop of Canterbury, giving him authority over all the Bishops then in Britain. "We give you no authority," the Pope wrote, "over the Bishops in Gaul. But as for all the Bishops of Britain, we commit them to your care, that the unlearned may be taught, the weak strengthened by persuasion, the perverse corrected by authority." Some years were required thus to organize the Church in England, but in 664 at the synod of Whitby all the Bishops agreed that henceforth all jurisdiction would be centralized at Canterbury. Far from his advent causing schisms and divisions, therefore, the influence of St. Augustine was all the other way, intensifying the spirit of unity in belief, worship, and discipline.

58. The English never fully accepted the rule of Rome, and in 1215 the chafing culminated in the Great Charter, whereof the first clause was, "The Church of England shall be free."

Those words did not mean that the Church in England was to be free from the Pope.



They meant that it was to be free from King John's tyranny. In other words, Magna Charta was aimed at the king, not at the Pope. Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, together with the Barons, wrung the Charter from King John—a Charter of liberty for the Church and for the people. John was forced to acknowledge that the Church in England was not subject to the Crown, and to grant full access to the Pope, and full liberty to the Church in its dealings with Rome. So a threatened royal supremacy was prevented. To pretend that Magna Charta meant freedom from the Pope rather than from the oppression of King John who was being forced to sign and grant its provisions is the height of historical dishonesty.

59. Do you deny that the present Archbishop of Canterbury is the 97th to occupy that See in the long line of succession from St. Augustine in 597 A. D.?

I certainly deny that. The present Archbishop of Canterbury may retain the ancient title, but he does not succeed in the long line of succession inaugurated by St. Augustine. He does not belong to that same Church as St. Augustine. St. Augustine acknowledged that he had received his jurisdiction from the Pope. The present Archbishop of Canterbury has no such jurisdiction. He is a State created Anglican Archbishop who cannot become the lineal descendant of St. Augustine merely by retaining the external title.

**60. Did not Ethelbert, King of Kent, give Augustine a Church to worship in which had been built before the Saxon invasion?**

Yes. But the fact that it was built before the Saxon invasion has no particular bearing on the subject of Anglican continuity. It was built by ancient Britons who had been converted to the Roman Church by earlier missionaries; and since St. Augustine belonged to the same Church as that which had inspired the building of St. Martin's at Canterbury, the king suggested that St. Augustine should there establish his headquarters.

**61. The same Church is still standing and is the Anglican parish Church of St. Martin, Canterbury.**

It would not affect the subject under discussion whether it were still standing or not. However, as a matter of fact, it is not still standing. Old St. Martin's has been rebuilt many times, and only portion of the ancient ruins is incorporated in the present walls. Meantime, the relics of the old Church building show that the old building once existed. They do not prove that ancient St. Martin's was built for Anglican worship, nor that the Anglican Church created by Henry VIII in 1534 is the same Church as that known in England in previous centuries. The Church of England did not exist when old St. Martin's was built. Nor would Church of England

authorities build a Church in Honor of St. Martin, who was a Bishop of Gaul, in full communion with the Bishop of Rome.

**62.** In England at least all who want to belong to the true Church are obliged to join the Church of England.

That is rather hard on the Anglicans outside England. But taking the statement as it stands, once an Anglican sets foot on French soil, as a member of the one true Church he becomes a Roman Catholic, for that is the true Church in France according to the "Branch Theory" you apparently hold. Back across the channel, he automatically becomes an Anglican again, though the true Church in France declares Anglicanism to be heresy and schism. It is all very bewildering.

**63.** Anglicanism adheres to the Creeds, Ministry, Sacraments, and Discipline of the ancient Church.

Some Anglicans claim that it does so. But the Creeds are denied by Anglican authorities daily; Anglican Orders are invalid; various groups profess to accept various Sacraments, variously interpreting those they do accept; whilst the whole Anglican Church is in rebellion against the discipline of the one true Church. Anglicanism has not even discipline in its own ranks, and is certainly not subject to the same discipline as Catholics throughout the world who belong to the

Church of Rome which you concede to be part of the True Church. However, Anglicanism is not "a part" of the true Church. It is "apart from" the one true Church. The one true Church is the Catholic Church under the rule of the one supreme shepherd—the Pope.

#### **64. We are but a reformed branch of the Catholic Church.**

The Catholic Church does not acknowledge Anglicanism as a branch. Anglicans should not complain of that, for whilst they speak of themselves as part of the Catholic Church, they tell nonconformists that no recognition can be extended to them as branches of the one true Church. Rome merely tells Anglicanism that it is no more a branch of the Catholic Church than are the Quakers, or Christadelphians, or any others amongst the Protestant sects. Rome cannot view the Church of England in any other way save as one of the Protestant denominations.

#### **65. We hold the Catholic Faith.**

There is scarcely an article of the Catholic Faith which the Church of England does not allow both to be denied and to be taught by her authorized officials.

#### **66. Is not the King of England called the "Defender of the Faith"?**



He is, and the title still appears on all British coinage with the letters F. D. But that title was conferred on Henry VIII by the Pope for his defence of the Catholic Faith and of Papal authority against the attacks of Martin Luther. Later, Henry rejected the Church which conferred it upon him, yet retained the title, as have all succeeding British sovereigns. In the Coronation Oath the King of England now has to say, "I do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess, testify and declare that I am a faithful Protestant, and that I will, according to the true intent of the enactments which secure the Protestant succession to the Throne of my Realm, uphold and maintain the said enactments to the best of my power according to law."

**67. Has the title any real significance today?**

No. As regards the actual defence of any particular tenet of the Christian Faith, the title is no more than nominal. The very Anglican Church which the king represents in his royal person lacks the power to define what is of Christian Faith, or to exclude the introduction of error. The Anglican Church is compelled to tolerate most conflicting doctrines taught in the name of Christian truth by both Bishops and Clergy. The problem for Anglicanism is to decide what is the Faith before any official declaration could be made as to the significance of the title "Defender of the Faith" today.

**68.** In some Anglican Churches Requiem Masses are celebrated for deceased Anglican clergymen.

Some High Church clergymen adopt the ritual of the Mass, and go through its external rites, even offering their celebrations for the repose of departed souls. But this is a violation of the doctrines of their own Church, and often in defiance of their own Anglican Bishops. Also High Church clergymen who borrow the ceremonies of the Mass from Catholic Liturgy, and profess a continued belief in Anglicanism, show a mental dexterity which is quite baffling to the ordinary, common-sensed man who still believes in his simplicity that contradictory things cannot be simultaneously true. It is not possible, of course, for an Anglican clergyman to celebrate a genuine Mass. The Mass supposes the valid priestly ordination of the one celebrating it, and also the Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist. But Anglican Orders are not valid for that purpose, and the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist is rejected by the Anglican Church. I might mention, too, that Requiem Masses presuppose a belief in Purgatory, which is another un-Anglican doctrine.

**69.** You speak of High Churchmen as opposed to Low Churchmen. What is a Low Churchman?

A Low Churchman, or, as he is sometimes called, an Evangelical, is one who adheres to

the Protestant outlook of the Church of England which prevailed generally before the advent of what is known as the Tractarian Movement. He stands for the Church of England as essentially a Protestant institution, clinging to the Book of Common Prayer and the Thirty Nine Articles of Religion in their original Protestant sense. He regards the introduction of Catholic ideas and ways of worship as disloyal and "Romanizing" tendencies; and he would be more at home in a Wesleyan Church, or even with the Salvation Army, than in an Anglican Church belonging to the Anglo-Catholic party of his own Church of England.

## 70. What was the Tractarian Movement?

The Tractarian or Oxford Movement (not to be confused with the Oxford Group or Buchmanism) really commenced in the year 1833. It was commenced at Oxford by Pusey, Newman, and other Anglican clergymen when the British Parliament suppressed 10 bishoprics of the Anglican Church. They disliked this evidence of the subjection of the Church to the Crown, and set out to awaken a consciousness of a Church spiritually independent of political interference. In doctrine, worship, and discipline, they began to think along more Catholic lines, and labored to restore much that had been rejected at the Reformation. They published various "Tracts" to show that the Anglican "Articles of Religion", and the Anglican Prayer Book could be in-

terpreted in a Catholic way. However their efforts awakened a storm of opposition; political, because the Movement was towards emancipation from secular domination; religious, because the majority of Anglicans rejoiced in their Protestantism. The opposition made Newman and many others realize that, if they wished to be truly Catholic, there could be no home for them in the Anglican Church. So they left the Church of England and joined the Catholic Church in reality. In 1845, and again in 1850 there came two waves of secession to Rome, accounting for almost 900 clergymen altogether, Low Churchmen regarded the Movement as a calamity, both because so many left to join the Roman Church, and because it meant the introduction of so many un-Protestant doctrines and practices into the Church of England. They denounced the Movement as treason to the Established Church and apostacy from the Gospel. However many of the Tractarian sympathizers remained in the Church of England to form a new party. The result is that there are now in the Church of England the Low Churchmen who cling to the Protestant outlook, and who are called "Evangelicals"; and the High Churchmen who accept many of the new Catholic tendencies, and who are called "Anglo-Catholics."

71. I think it speaks volumes for the magnanimity of the Anglican Church that men of such different theological opinions are united in their loyalty to Christ.



How can men be united in their loyalty to Christ when they are not united in acceptance of what He taught? In Anglicanism we see a body of men, some of whom believe in the Articles of Religion, and some of whom do not; some profess to say Mass, others reject the Mass as a blasphemy; some hear confessions, others are horrified by the idea; some pray for the dead, others call this superstition; some permit remarriage after divorce, others regard this as a great sin; some insist on eternal punishment, others scout the idea as absurd. If one set of these teachings be true, their opposites are not true. If one set be in accordance with the teachings of Christ, the other set is a denial of the teachings of Christ, branding the Eternal Son of God with a lack of veracity. Yet you see a united loyalty to Christ in this teaching of truth and lies simultaneously! It says much, not for the magnanimity of Anglicanism, but for its muddle-headedness. If you insist on the idea of magnanimity, who gave the Anglican Church the right to be magnanimous at the expense of Christ?

72. If a particular shade of theological thought helps a man to serve Christ better than the shade held by somebody else, he should be allowed to retain it.

If we Catholics are right, and it is the will of Christ that His followers should be subject to the Pope, how can one serve Christ better by not being subject to the Pope?

**73. Anglicans are of many different shades of thought, and are not afraid to admit it.**

If one Anglican minister says that the consecrated Host must be adored as God, whilst another declares that to be sheer idolatry, would you call that a merely different shade of thought?

**74. Such tolerance of different doctrines provokes thought.**

It does. And if a man has any sense of the consistency of truth, and any real loyalty to Christ as the truth, such thought ends in a very nightmare of distress and doubt, and in the loss of all belief in Anglicanism.

**75. It keeps our religion alive intellectually.**

It is killing the Anglican Church. The Anglican Bishop Knox wrote in 1928, "Within the Church of England there are followers of two fundamentally distinct religions. This situation has been recognized as scandalous by all who believe that a Church ought to teach consistent truth in all matters essential to salvation." In 1913 the Anglican Bishop Gore wrote to the Times, "Unless the Anglican Church can speedily arrive at some statement of principle which will pull it together into unity, it will go the way to certain disruption."

76. It shows how broad our Church is that such diversity can exist side by side.

It shows that the authorities in the Anglican Church do not know what is the true teaching of Jesus Christ, and that they have no authority from God to declare and impose what they believe to be that true teaching.

77. In speaking of the Mass you denied Anglican Orders to be valid.

Yes. The Apostolic ministry is a truly sacramental sense was lost to the Church of England in the reign of Edward VI. The outward appearances of a hierarchy of bishops, priests, and deacons may have persisted; but Rome is compelled to declare Anglican Orders invalid for the purposes intended by Christ; and, of course, there is no trace of Apostolic jurisdiction in Anglicanism.

78. Do you say that Anglican Bishops are nothing more than laymen?

All depends upon what you mean. It is true that, since Anglican Orders are invalid, they have no priestly or episcopal power and jurisdiction derived from Christ. They are not truly Priests or Bishops in the genuine sense of the word, as are, for example, the Priests and Bishops of the Greek Orthodox Church. Clerical converts from Greek Orthodoxy have not to be reordained as Priests in the Cath-

olic Church. But Anglican clergymen and Anglican Bishops, who are converted to the Catholic Church and desire to exercise the ministry, must be reordained, fulfilling all that is required of any other aspirants who have never received Holy Orders. But whilst, in this sense, Anglican Bishops are merely laymen in the eyes of the Catholic Church, we must remember that, so long as they remain members of the Anglican Church, they are accepted by members of that Church as distinct from the laity. For whatever it may be worth, they have a commission and jurisdiction to officiate within Anglicanism; a commission and jurisdiction not possessed by Anglican laymen. Therefore we cannot say that within the Anglican Church they are merely laymen. All we can say is that they have no Orders, commission, or jurisdiction derived from Christ and the Apostles. In the end, of course, this is the one thing that matters for the purposes of our discussion. We offer to Anglican Bishops a due measure of respect as to cultured men who are accepted in civil life as possessing honor and dignity amongst our fellow citizens. But we cannot accept them as true Bishops.

79. Why does the Roman Church refuse to recognize Anglican Orders as valid?

Because Cranmer, in his efforts to protestantize the Church of England, altered the Ordinal for the ordaining of Priests and the consecration of Bishops in the year 1550. The



form he evolved was useless for the ordaining of Priests in the Catholic sense of the word. Nor did he have any intention of ordaining such Priests. Cranmer himself wrote: "Christ made no such difference between the priest and the laymen that the priest should make oblation and sacrifice for the layman . . . the difference that is between a priest and the layman in this matter is only in the ministration." (A Defence, p. 350) Dr. Ryle, Anglican Bishop of Liverpool, rightly says, "The Reformers stripped the office of the clergy entirely of any sacerdotal character. They cast out the words 'sacrifice' and 'altar' from the Prayer Book, and though they retained the word 'priest', retained it only in the sense of elder or presbyter. . . . The Reformers found our clergy sacrificing priests, and made them prayer-reading preaching ministers." (What We Owe To The Reformation, p. 14.) Writing in the National Review of Sept. 1925 the Anglican Bishop Knox, of Manchester, said, "The Prayer Book and ordinal are simply un-Catholic." See Radio Replies Vol. 1, N. 286. When this same Bishop Knox was ordaining a group of young Anglican ministers he said to them quite clearly, "Young men, I am not ordaining you priests in the Roman sense of the word." Can you blame the Catholic Church for not admitting that they are priests in her sense of the word?

80. The Pope declared Anglican Orders invalid under pressure from Cardinal Vaughan who insisted that

a favorable judgment would end Roman Catholic progress in England.

That is certainly not true. Pope Leo XIII hoped against hope that Anglican Orders could be admitted as valid, for he thought that the reunion of the Anglican Church with the Catholic Church would be ever so much easier if Anglican Orders were valid. If the evidence could have permitted a declaration of validity, no force in the world would have prevailed upon Leo XIII to condemn Anglican Orders. To Leo XIII's disappointment the evidence was quite against them, and he had no option but to give a negative decision.

81. No Catholic can say whether the Pope's condemnation of Anglican Orders in 1896 was an "ex Cathedra" utterance, or not.

The technical point as to whether it was an infallible ex Cathedra decision or not has no bearing on the fact that the Pope has irrevocably decided that Anglican Orders are invalid for the purposes of the Christian priesthood. Catholic theologians discuss the question as to whether this decision, which deals not with a definition of doctrine, but with what is known as a "dogmatic fact", complies with all the strict requirements of infallibility. But no Catholic theologian questions the truth of the decision. The technical discussion has no practical importance. The matter is finally settled. And no Anglican clergyman could become a Catholic on the understanding that

his Anglican ordination would be recognized by the Catholic Church.

**82. You constantly rank the Church of England as a Protestant Church. But it is entirely erroneous to apply the term Protestant to Anglicanism.**

The term Protestant was freely used by Parker, Pilkington, Grindal, and others in the time of Elizabeth. Laud professed that in his Prayer Book there was nothing contrary to the Protestant religion. The king, when crowned by the Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury, takes a solemn oath that he is a Protestant and will safeguard the Protestant succession to the Throne. If Anglicans are not Protestants, no Anglican could be king of England! Another point to notice is this: When America declared independence of England, the Church of England in America had to adapt itself to the new conditions. It promptly took the title: "The Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America." No doubts existed amongst those Anglicans at the time of their separation from England as to the Protestant character of their Church.

**83. The Anglican Church justly claims to be Catholic.**

Protestant and Catholic are irreconcilable terms. Protestants protest against that Church which was in existence at the time of the Reformation and which their ancestors aban-

done. They cannot claim to have left it, yet still to belong to it. Again, the word Catholic means whole and entire. The Catholic Church, which has its headquarters at Rome, is Catholic in time—existing in all ages since Christ; in place—being found in all countries; in doctrine—teaching all the doctrines of Christ; in extent—adapted to and embracing subjects of all nationalities. But the Church of England is not Catholic in time. For over 1,500 years it did not exist in this world. Christ simply could not have founded Anglicanism. It is not Catholic in place. Go through Italy, Spain, France, Germany, and other foreign countries, and you will search in vain for Anglican dioceses and parishes. It is not Catholic in doctrine, for it omits to teach much that is Christian, and does teach much of merely human invention. It is not Catholic in extent, but is a national Church, chiefly for English-speaking peoples. Anglicanism is but one of the forms of Protestantism, and has no more right to call itself Catholic than any other of the various Protestant Churches.

84. We Anglicans say in the Apostles' Creed, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church."

It does not follow that you are therefore Catholics, or that your Church is part of the Catholic Church. Many nonconformists also recite that Creed, yet Anglicanism does not admit them to be Catholics. The repetition of the formula can no more make Anglicans Catholic than the repetition of the words, "I



believe in America" could make a man an American citizen. We have to study, not what Anglicans say, but what the Anglican Church is. And in faith, worship, and discipline, the Anglican Church is a Protestant Church. The Creed should remind Anglicans that they ought to become Catholics instead of remaining where they are.

**85. Our Catholic heritage is to be found in the Book of Common Prayer, and in the 39 Articles of Religion.**

The Book of Common Prayer condemns articles of faith held right through the ages by both the Roman and Greek Churches. It rejects the sacrificial worship of the Mass, and maintains the supremacy of the Crown in matters of religion and Church government, which is a complete violation of discipline. The Anglican Bishop Knox, in the National Review for 1925, does not hesitate to say, "The Prayer Book and Ordinal are simply un-Catholic." And is it not significant that the New Prayer Book controversy arose because the new Book tried to incorporate many Catholic things which had been rejected at the Reformation? The British Parliament took the attitude that the Book of Common Prayer is the legal manual of the Church of England. And as that Book rejects Catholicism, the new importations of Catholic tendencies must be rejected.

**86. The Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches are both parts of the one true Church.**

The Roman "part" does not agree, and repudiates the would-be Anglican relative just as Anglicanism rejects nonconformity. It is impossible that "Roman Catholicism" is right in France, Italy, Spain, and other countries, yet wrong in England.

## 87. Roman Catholicism did wrong in setting up altar against altar in England.

Firstly, under Edward VI and Elizabeth, the existing altars in England which had been set up by the Catholic Church, were pulled down and desecrated by the newly-formed Anglican Church. Grindal (died 1583), elected successor to Parker as Archbishop of Canterbury in 1575, gave orders that all altars were to be pulled down and the altar stones defaced and put to common use. The Mass he declared to be "an accursed abomination and a diabolical profanation of the Lord's Supper." And the Anglican Church to this day has no sacrificial altars. The genuine Catholic Church, seeing her Churches confiscated, had to build new Churches and set up altars once more in England. But they were not set up against any Anglican altars. The High Church party is trying to restore the idea of altars and of the sacrifice of the Mass. But that party is not truly representative of Anglicanism. Secondly, if Anglicanism is a true part of the Catholic Church, why does it establish its Churches in foreign missions where the Roman Catholic true part already exists? And how could it sanction the appointment of an Anglican

Bishop of Jerusalem with a lawful Bishop already there? Thirdly, why is the true Church in France subject to the Pope, but not the "true Anglican part" in England?

**88. What are the relations and differences between the Roman Catholic Church, and the Catholic Churches throughout the world?**

There is but one Catholic Church, and that Church is subject to the one supreme shepherd on earth, the Bishop of Rome. In a local sense we can speak of "Catholic Churches" in so far as there are Catholic Churches in all the countries, cities, or suburbs, of the world. But all these local dioceses and parishes are united as one Holy Catholic Church in faith, worship, and discipline, all being subject to the Pope. No Churches not subject to the Pope can rightly be called Catholic. Other Churches differ from the Catholic Church in faith, worship, and discipline, and are but sects which originated by unjustified separation from Rome, or by subsequent invention of unauthorized individuals.

**89. Why is the Roman Catholic Church so eager to bring England under its yoke once more?**

You pay the Catholic Church a very great compliment by such a question. If indeed she believes herself to be the one true Church of Jesus Christ, must she not, like a good shep-

herd, seek to bring back to the fold the sheep that have been side-tracked and lost? Conscious of her commission by Christ to teach all nations, she must be ever active in spreading the Catholic Faith in foreign lands, and in seeking to win back those who have drifted from it in older countries. You make it a reproach that she should be fulfilling this elementary duty, whereas it would be a reproach were she not attempting to fulfil it. She does not want to win the non-Catholics of England any more than those of other countries. But she does want to win them just as others; and that, for their benefit rather than her own. Their lack of Catholic Faith is their loss, after all; not hers. See the condition of England today. Protestantism robbed Englishmen of the Catholic Faith, and has not been able to hold them for Christ. The vast majority of the people in England are simply indifferent to religion. Can you blame the Catholic Church for trying to win them back to Christianity, even as Pope Gregory originally sent St. Augustine to win our ancestors to the Faith? The one real hope for England is her return to the Catholic Church.







QUIZZES ON SECRET SOCIETIES 10c  
QUIZZES ON EPISCOPALIAN AND ANGLICAN CHURCHES 15c  
QUIZZES ON CHRISTIAN SCIENCE 15c  
SEVENTH DAY ADVENTISTS 10c  
NON-CATHOLIC DENOMINATIONS 15c  
NEW LIGHT ON MARTIN LUTHER 15c  
SPIRITUAL LESSONS FROM THE PASSION 25c  
THE JEHOVAH WITNESSES 10c  
THE MOSAIC MANIFESTO 50c  
FRANK YOUTH QUIZZES ON SEX 10c  
WHY SQUANDER ILLNESS 15c. DELUXE \$2.00  
THE BLESSED VIRGIN AND THE JEWS 10c  
JEWISH PROBLEMS 15c  
ANTI-SEMITISM 15c  
GUIDE POST TO INDUSTRIAL PEACE 10c  
AMERICAN GIRL! HALT! 10c (WHY A TEACHING SISTER)  
WHY A HOSPITAL SISTER 15c  
WHY A MISSION SISTER 15c  
TO BE A PRIEST 10c  
VAN 15c  
CATHOLIC THEOLOGY OF THE CRUCIFIXION 10c  
SIX PRE-MARRIAGE INSTRUCTIONS 10c  
CATHOLIC AND NON-CATHOLIC INSTRUCTION  
CARD SERIES 25c. BOUND FORM 50c  
TEN COMMANDMENTS OF GOD 10c  
SIX COMMANDMENTS OF CHURCH 5c  
INSTRUCTOR'S MANUAL, BOUND \$1.00  
WHAT IS THE CATHOLIC FAITH ANYWAY 20c  
QUIZZES ON HOSPITAL ETHICS 35c

MUSIC OF IRELAND 20c  
MUSIC OF THE MASS 25c  
THREE HOURS AND ALL FRIDAYS OF THE YEAR 35c  
DEVOTIONS TO THE BLESSED VIRGIN 15c. DELUXE \$2.00  
JESUS IN THE BLESSED SACRAMENT 15c  
FIRST FRIDAY AND JUNE DEVOTIONS 15c  
WAY OF THE CROSS FOR ADULTS 10c  
WAY OF THE CROSS FOR CHILDREN 15c  
FORTY HOURS FOR PRIEST AND PEOPLE 35c  
FUNERAL MASS AND BURIAL SERVICE 50c  
THE PARACLETE 15c  
CONFESSION AND COMMUNION CARDS 1c  
CONFIRMATION CARDS 1c  
FIRST CONFESSION PRAYER CARD 1/2c  
CONFESSION CARD NO. 2 1/2c  
COMMUNION CARDS, NOS. 1 AND 2 1/2c EA.  
ALTAR BOY CARDS, LOOSE 2 FOR 5c  
ALTAR CARD, BOUND 50c  
CONGREGATIONAL HYMN CARD 2c  
MARRIAGE CEREMONY CARD \$2.50 PER HUNDRED  
FUNERAL CEREMONY CARD \$2.50 PER HUNDRED  
BLESSING OF WOMEN AFTER CHILDBIRTH, CARD 2 1/2c  
ACTS OF LOVE OF GOD, LEAFLET 1c  
LOW OR HIGH MASS CARDS 1c EACH  
NURSES UNIFORM POCKET NOTEBOOK 15c  
NURSES CLINICAL EXPERIENCES 75c EACH

---

For copies address  
**FATHERS RUMBLE & CARTY**  
*Radio Replies Press*  
Saint Paul 1, Minn., U. S. A.